AUDIO_RAMPION2_ISH1_SESSION8_080224

Thu, Feb 08, 2024 3:39PM • 1:12:59

00:06
Okay, good afternoon everybody it's called to to this hearings resumed I don't think we have any matters from this morning that we want to come back to. So, we will progress on with the agenda to item 12, next, which is offshore physical processes in ecology. I will just briefly say that I think we all know obviously by T by the time we take our break this afternoon, whether we we were likely to be able to finish today or we're gonna go in and have to go into Friday but I'm, I will well, hopefully we're to take stock at the break. Yeah, so I'll leave it there. So we'll move on to item 12, offshore physical processes and ecology, Mr. Any,

00:55
thank you.

01:02
As proposed mitigation for benefit of collars of ES sets out that there will there should be the adoption of specialist offshore export cabling and installation techniques cable installation limitations will minimise the direct and indirect or secondary seabed disturbance footprint to reduce impacts, which will provide mitigation of impacts to all seabed habits and habitats, but particularly chalk and reef areas as well as potential unknown black seabream nesting locations where avoidance is not possible at C 272. However, the E s also states at nine point 10.43 that overall the engineering study has identified that a mechanical Captain trencher is necessary for up to 54% of the route length of which 13% is considered like the to require further protection with rock placement. The remaining 46% is considered possible to achieve with jet trenching, I think that comes with the the EMF section. How can a commitment to be to use in cable installation techniques or specialist cable installation techniques to minimise disturbance and impacts be reconciled with the probability that just 46% is likely to be available for jet to mention, which is maybe the least impactful method of cable installation. From this information, it sounds as if the cable installation will be mainly done by mechanical cutting, and possibly with use of cable protection. Could they could you provide a response to that, please?

02:42
Thanks so palmiero for the applicant. I'd like to introduce a couple of members or get the couple of members of the team to introduce themselves before we answer that question. Thank you.

02:57
Good afternoon, auntie dubare on behalf of the applicant benthic technical specialist.

03:05

Good afternoon, David Lamkin, associated ABP mer, providing advice on coastal processes offshore and at the landfall on behalf of the applicant.

03:20
I'm Tim golden Gobi consultants. I'm a director at COVID consultants. And I'm providing advice on the offshore aspects of the application.

03:35
Toby Lee, engineering manager representing the applicant

03:42
and then in sort of leading off probably on the response in maybe one actually for for Mr. Lee. Start with in terms of the the installation techniques

04:01
I think

04:05
it building on behalf of the applicant. I think whilst those estimates of proportions of the XLR cables that require the different techniques are correct as far as we can tell at this stage. The fact that a large proportion of the cable route might be subject to mechanical trenching doesn't mean that it's going to affect priority habitat, etc. It's not necessarily choc, for example, that needs to be mechanically trenched. Yes, neither is it the case that mechanical trenching automatically requires cable protection material over the top of it because the trench may be sufficiently deep that secondary protection isn't required. Although that's subject to site investigation and surveys prior to That final design. So, I think there they are sort of worst case estimates of what potentially might happen. And also the different techniques have different environmental consequences or potential impacts. Jet trenching may not be the least damaging or at least impacting technique or for some respects, in terms of suspension of sediment into the water column, etc.

05:33
And stand. So, I mean, could you explain maybe what you what the applicant means by adoption of specialists offshore export cable Lane installation techniques? And using those sorts of figures of overhead 30%, mechanical cut and things like that? How, how would you adopt a specialist of short cable lay and technique? Using mechanical trenches? For example, is there a way that you can do that in a specialist way to have less of an impact?

06:08
Is Tim golden on behalf of the applicant? I think the intention here is to identify that where something like a mechanical trencher might be required. If we're in a region where there are sensitive habitats, we can look to use specialist equipment which would be which would have a smaller impact footprint than a standard piece of equipment. So there's various provisions within the mitigation plans to include selection of exactly that a piece of equipment that has a much narrower footprint on the seabed and therefore minimises the amount of disturbance to a sensitive habitat if we are not able to follow through

the preceding hierarchy of mitigation, which would be as you know, initially, avoidance etc. Before we're down to selecting something that mitigates an unavoidable impact.

07:08
So it could still be a mechanical cutter, for example, being used, but it would be chosen to have there's variations within that to be to have less impact. Exactly. Okay. Following on, in the in principle sensitive features mitigation plans submitted, the applicant sets out a routing design exercise that has been undertaken. This is shown on figure five, one of this document and shows a refined export cable corridor centre line doesn't matter if you haven't got this to hand to display, but I'm sure you know, the figure, I mean, is the exit to assume that the cable centre line would win, if it was actually implemented would follow this route, subject to the microsite and changes? Or could the final course the cable alter substantially from this?

08:12
Tim Golding on behalf of the applicant? We got that. So I think the I think the graphic that you're referring to has three stages. Is that the correct one? That's the one? Yes. So the cable centre line, referred to, I think, refers to that first part of the figure. So that that's the you know, let's put a cable down the middle of the corridor. Yes, the simple solution. And then what we tried to do from that is to then see where we can take a cable that successfully avoids the known features sensitivity. And overlaying those different constraints come up with the the the third panel.

09:04
Yeah, so I think I was referring to the third one across. So at the end of that process, so you were you've got taken on board, what you know, of geology and centrifuges so far? Yeah. So

09:15
it could vary from what we have depicted there. That design is based on the known principally geogenic features. So those ones aren't going to vary over time very much because they're solid substrates. So it's quite likely that the final route will resemble that one. There will be some refinement on the basis of the preconstruction surveys that are undertaken particularly to inform on potential ephemeral features, which may be a bit changeable in terms of the data set that we've got there from a and 2020 or 2021, I can't quite recall on thread. So, yeah, in general terms, it should result or resemble that third one. But obviously subject to details, site investigation prior to that final design coming forward.

10:18
So you anticipate more refinements, as you said, rather than any substantial change from that

10:24
utility for the applicant? Yeah, it'll probably be that situation. But as stated, this has been a sort of fairly desktop exercise from the data we've collected so far. As part of the project, we will be doing much more detailed surveys getting in to inform the detailed design. And we'll also be looking to obviously contract someone to design the route, not just again for looking at the routing, but also looking at the landfall situation, how that how that works. So I think what this provides is a a reasonable guess as to

where the final cable route could be, but it is subject to that further investigation work and the detailed design, which will be undertaken the post consent.

11:19
Thank you. Yeah, I understand. That's, that's great. Thank you. So, moving on from that, then the sensitive features mitigation plan sets out that the refinement of the export cable routing would avoid known sensitive features as far as practicable. Why would all sensitive features not be able to be avoided if micro if the route was micro sighted following pre construction surveys and which sounds to features may not be able to be avoided?

11:55
Angela did, but on behalf of the applicant, the sensitive features within the area or with an export cable corridor that we know from the preconstruction surveys and advice from Natural England include a small patch of sub malaria reef that was or low grade saddlery for that was determined at the entrance to their area. So that will be determined their full extent will be determined during pre construction survey. So avoidance of that feature in particular will certainly be able to be microsites around bearing in mind this occurrence within the area, piecing clay exposures, the same minimal exposure of those features near the array area. And in terms of the annex one stone you in bedrock brief. That's, that's the, that's the challenge for the project, where you have the exposure of the chalk bed within the near shore area, which actually extends quite quite significantly across the kind of the southern coastline and will become re exposed and buried throughout the year and next year. So really, that the impact of that will will also be determined from pre construction services. But we know that that that exposure is there. So we'll work through the mitigation hierarchy in that instance.

13:17
Yeah, they're going to speak to that. It's particularly the chalk just looking at the sort of geological plans, because it's quite covers quite a lot of the near shore area that might be much more difficult to avoid. And as I think it was mentioned earlier, mechanical cutters would need to be used when it comes to chalk.

13:39
Just thinking it seems as if rock reefs at sea bed might be the most difficult to avoid completely, such as the chalk reefs in the near shore area. Is there any possibility of extending the HDD to avoid chalk areas? Or would that just be too far?

14:00
To Toby on behalf of the applicant? Yeah, I think it might be a challenge for us mean, you'll have noticed in the application we've already put in a duct extend extension as well. So we anticipate that actually, it's actually very, very shallow getting into the into the lung full. So we will try and get it out as far as possible, because that helps us we will consider this extension as well. But it's gonna say is getting into quite technical detail of how we do this landfall. These landfall works and it will be dependent very much on will be looking to the market to provide a solution which we will we shall assess. And obviously we'll provide them with the all the constraints from the from the consent if we if we if we receive that to obviously try and minimise As far as possible, but it's impossible to say at this

stage exactly how that will work we are reliant on on these experts to provide us with a method for hopefully successfully and safely delivering these landfill works.

15:15
So you can't be reliant on HDD to avoid the near shore chalk areas and because, yeah, okay, understand that's fine. Next question has been answered. Natural England have had some concerns regarding the impact of any methodology that places loose material on the seabed, which is unlikely to be retrievable, in their view, could the applicant commit to avoidance of use of of any loose material for cable protection? Furthermore, can the applicant provide more information of any potential bagging material that may be used?

15:56
Typically, on behalf of the applicant, so I guess the first question they were they were interested in with regard to cable protection. Yeah. So under our contracts, we will try and we said generally use a, a reasonable endeavours clause for the installer, reaching the target depth, where that's not possible. That's where we'd be looking to deploy cable protection. Typically, we would use rock dumping. So this is placing relatively decent sized pieces of rock over the cable to provide effectively the equivalent of burial to ensure that the cable isn't exposed and and obviously subject to damage from the shipping, for example, and also things like maintain separation from electro sensitive species as well. lucidly. It's rocking on the sea, but chances are some of it will move and it is designed to remain be in situ, what we don't want to be doing is going and having to replace every every so often. So it will be specifically designed to remain in place.

17:08
Is there any issue though, with the use of maybe rock bags instead?

17:13
Yeah, I mean, we can certainly use rock bags. And that and we've certainly used rock bags on previous projects. Yeah. So yeah, that's, again, I know the solution we could use for doing the same work. Again, it will be down to practicalities and constant and the like, as to what the what the method we choose is. But yeah, we could certainly use Dropbox as well.

17:45
I think one of the reasons Natural England are quite keen on that is because, yeah, the rocks won't spread. If they're in the bags, they will keep where they're supposed to be generally and also, they can be retrievable. And that goes on to the next question of whether there could be a commitment to removing the cable protection or decommissioning stage. If they were, if it was removable, like rock bags, for example.

18:12
Can we take that one away, please? Okay. Thanks.

18:20

Don't think there's the commitment at the moment to remove the cable protection. But, you know, it is obviously something that naturally men have specifically requested on the issue of the materials for any potential bags. Maybe that might be something you might want to think about and come back to us as well. Thank you.

18:50
Again, following natural England's relevant reps, there has clearly been a substantial amount of work done by the applicants relating to benefit conditions, characterization and the like, and where the cable may be installed, as we've seen with this graphic, however, naturally, then by use that to understand the likely effectiveness of mitigation measures, geotechnical data should be provided at the consenting stage to inform a cable barrier risk assessment and outline cables specification and installation plan at the consenting stage, what is the applicant's response to this request from Natural England?

19:32
Totally on behalf of the applicant, we will not be providing any geotechnical information during the sending stage. And the reason for that is we do not have a survey planned. Offshore surveys are incredibly expensive. What we are planning to do is to get those surveys done post consent and relatively shortly after post consent so that information can inform tendering activities for construction of the project. Yeah, when I say it's expensive if you're talking 10s of millions to do the campaign, so we need to have reasonable certainty on the project before we can successfully obtain such funding from our, our shareholders.

20:20
I understand okay. Like with the other points raised, obviously that is a specific request that's come from Natural England so if that could be responded to in your response from relevant reps that would be useful. For benthic subtitle intertidal ecology, the applicant has used a predictive modelling approach, which is explained to to be able to fill in data gaps of the baseline characterization. Wherever natural England's best practice advice is to collect comprehensive, robust, site specific product data. They state that predictive modelling relies heavily on data from literature and other surveys, which are dated and not specific, and not specifically collected for this purpose. I'm actually gonna go on to say that they do not support the substitution of site specific data with predictive modelling and gives the competence of using this sort of data method is low. How does the applicant respond to this? And is there any way of validating the predictive modelling results within the examination period

21:26
and need to bear on behalf of the applicant. So just to confirm the predictive habitat model was created to infill surveys that weren't collected during the pier process, and due to certain survey delays, I think omecamtiv COVID. And so, so that predictive habitat mapping X exercise was undertaken so that we could undertake our assessment, based on best available data. We we kept the predictive habitat modelling into the EIS process, but we updated it with all of the site specific data and geophysical data, which over overrides everything, we could have removed it, but actually, including the characterise the contextual data within the process is actually quite helpful in terms of understanding the wider environment as well. So and the assessment was based on a biotech that we found within the order limits anyway, so it was just there for kind of additional additionality aspect. Okay.

22:24
I mean, it seems that Natural England feel that the applicants may be able to rely too much on that. But what you're telling me is the site specific data is there. Yeah. And it was

22:33
a site specific data is what was used for the assessment is specifically so I think clarification within our element wraps natural English should and should clarify that quite clearly to them.

22:44
Okay. Yeah, it was clear for me so that Yeah, fine. Thank you for watching. This before I move on, is there any questions from anything you've heard so far? Got a few more questions on this, but did anyone say anything?

23:04
Okay, thank you.

23:05
I'll move on, then. We've got a few questions left. The examining authority understands from natural England's relevant map that the floatation pet to use within rampion one resulted in seabed harm to chalk areas. The applicant has made it clear that they do not propose to use any flotation pits. But could the applicant clarify what alternative they may use? Is this the use of haich D D, meaning that the shallow areas can be completely avoided, for instance? So it's if you're not using the floatation pets, what what is the what is the plan basically?

23:46
Totally on behalf of the applicant in terms of the first course of action, we would as I mentioned earlier, actually the the approach to landfall is relatively shallow. Yeah. We will be conducting the obviously for mentioned geotechnical surveys to understand the seabed conditions, so that wouldn't be included within the tender package for the cabling installation works. Ideally, the information will provide enough comfort to the installation installers. They can ground vessels in the shallow areas at low tide. And that was the reason why the by float pits were used on rampion. One was because they couldn't get comfortable with that particular position. Okay. So in the event that they can't get comfortable with it, we have proposed an alternative which is to effectively use a layer of gravel bags to support the vessel should it need to ground on the seabed for the cable installation works And, again, we'll be putting this to the preferred professionals in the offshore installation. Industry, they may come up with something else which does not require the vessel to ground. Hopefully, yeah, all of those things will will come into play when we get to the tender, we'll select the most appropriate method for delivering the these these landfill installation works.

25:25
Okay. The only concern I would have with that is, I don't think that has been put forward in the ies as as a potential solution, only that flotation pits aren't going to be used? And could there possibly be some

sort of environmental impact from using gravel beds on the seabed, which hasn't been considered within the Yes.

25:55
And the barren on behalf of the applicant. And currently, we haven't assessed that additional gravel protection within the nearshore environment. However, we will have assessed cable protection mechanisms. So hard rock substrata Guatemala rock and gravel bags is cable protection. So the magnitudes and the impacts are probably going to be quite similar. However, we could we could we could clarify in our relevant reps.

26:24
Yes, I think we would need to know if there's a selection of alternatives, what those alternatives could be, because what you don't know is the situation that say there was to be consent that then you were putting that forward as a solution, because that wouldn't have been assessed within the ies. So I'm not saying there would be particularly adverse impacts to it. I don't know. But I think we would need to see that information as part of the examination. And I'm sure naturally none would want to see it as well. Okay, so action that for more details to come along those lines, okay.

27:05
Just a few more. There have been numerous comments within the relevant maps about kelp regeneration along the Sussex coast, including from the Environment Agency, the Sussex kelp recovery project, I believe it's known as I think as aligned with the Sussex near shore, trawling by bylaw, which was set in 2021. The cable cord that goes through the near shore area, of course, how does the applicant believe the cable installation would affect regenerating kelp within the area.

27:39
And you debate on behalf of the applicant. So where we have a direct impact to kelp beds, there will obviously be the removal of that species for in that that exact area. In terms of the secondary impacts, they are going to be very limited to the niche, the installation activities. And kelp itself is relatively resilient to recovery after the deposition that we're talking about in that in that kind of very near environment. The installation activities as well. The CELT biotopes have pulled through into is chapters and assessment. So that evidence is there in terms of regeneration projects, and I guess that evidence can be directly correlated to what we've assessed. Okay,

28:25
good. I think with the relevant map response, it's obviously something that's come up multiple times, including by the Environment Agency, feels like a lot of people around this area feel quite passionate about this project. So I think a response a clear response on those points will be useful as

28:40
Tim Golding on behalf of the applicant. As my colleague and YouTuber and just noted, the actual footprint of effect that could have from the cables that could impact upon areas of kelp recovery are very small. And the one of the major concerns will be light attenuation as a result of seabed disturbance siltation or suspended sediments in the water column. And from the assessment that we presented

those effects, if should they arise will be quite localised and short term and wouldn't have there'd be no anticipated significant effects to the potential for help to establish and grow in the area as a result of the construction or indeed the operation and maintenance project.

29:44
Okay. Thank you. And the last question I have on this subject, from the Environment Agency, again, the state in their representation that they have some concerns about the potential release of significant quantities of bentonite during the drilling process. It has to do with a coastal HDD. What's the applicants response to this?

30:15
David Lampkin on behalf of the applicant. Benton bentonite is a clay in water suspension used as a drilling lubricant. It's pumped under pressure down the drill string and it's used to either power the turning of the drill or, and also help return cuttings back up the drill string. It's a very normal part of that process. bentonite clay is a naturally occurring clay mineral, it's non toxic, and nonreactive. It's naturally present in most normal environments in small, smaller quantities. The concern that is likely to arise is that at the point of punch out, so at the time the drill exits into the marine environment at the far end, there'll be a small sudden release of that drilling fluid under pressure. So an initial sort of dense cloud might fall down near the seabed. Typically, that's quite a concentrated fluid and it may pond at the bottom of the water and there could be some side effect there, it will become resuspended, diffused and dispersed over time. The release of bentonite drilling fluid released during HDD at the landfill is one of the potential impacts in relation to changes to suspend a sediment concentrations bed levels and sediment type, which can be found in Section 2.9. of application document a PP 131 which is volume four, Appendix 6.3 more detailed technical assessment in the coastal processes section. And you'll find details there about the nature of that likely plume in the marine environment and the fate of that material. Yes,

32:18
I've seen that within the ies and it's just curious that we've got still we've got some sort of concern from the Environment Agency. It's only a small section they refer to it, but maybe a bit of signposting maybe for Environment Agency on that to highlight that.

32:38
Thank you very much.

32:39
Thank you. Unless anyone's got any questions on anything matters. I'm quite happy. Yeah. Mrs. Ania.

32:52
Hello, thank you. I just had a quick point to make about the kelp, which, obviously we are very passionate about it. And David Attenborough came on side and made a video and that's how the trailer ban came about. And in our opinion, it's not just the cable insulation, insulation, that will be an issue but also the pile driving which will create a lot of sedimentation. And the area's already under threat from sedimentation from dredging Portsmouth and the Bay is with the kelp. Now coming back, there's a lot of

new species coming back in greater numbers. And it's, it's more of a threat than I think can be. I'm not sure what kind of studies that have been done. But you're speaking with divers and with the Sussex regeneration people it there's a lot more going on than I think has been studied. So it'd be interesting to maybe bring this up again, at some point. It doesn't it doesn't feed into sustainable development in our opinion. And it brings into the question of biodiversity net gain, which is something that developer said that they would they would have in their in their project, but I'm not really not seeing how this is going to happen if each system that is happening is taking away species and diversity of species and harming the environment.

34:27
Thank you very much. Does the applicant want to come back and respond?

34:33
Hi, I'm Tim Golding on behalf the applicant. The environmental statement presents a full assessment of the potential for increased suspended sediment concentrations in the array as a result of foundation installation as well as cable installation into array and export. There aren't any significant effects arising from On that those activities, including on our species, and it's all set out in some detail within the application documents. We are confident therefore that we won't be affecting the kelp project long term or any other algal species or four species and set out in the in the assessment.

35:35
Okay, thank you. Unless there's anything else can I just move on to action points for the benefit section? Just email if you got the actions.

35:49
Yes, thank you. So again, I think many of these are to pick up matters in responses to relevant representations. But the first action was in relation to cable protection. And whether there was a possible commitment to removing cable protection during decommissioning. And as part of that response, also to provide details of materials to be used for rock bags. Then in relation to natural England's relevant rep, where to detail in our response, the cost of undertaking additional geotechnical surveys as suggested by Natural England at the other consent stage. Again, in response to natural England's position regarding flotation pits, I think and alternatives. We're going to provide details of the alternatives that have been considered and any related assessment information that's required as a result. And then in relation to kelp, various interested parties have raised this issue in their relevant representations and will ensure that our responses duly address address that point. And then lastly, ensuring that our response to the environment agency's relevant rep. signposts where information can be found to address their concerns relating to bentonite release.

37:52
So that brings us close to the benthic and benthic ecology section. What I can now do is move on to discuss shipping and navigation. So firstly, I think there's a couple of members of the maritime coastguard agency have joined us if you'd like to introduce yourselves, please.

38:13

Good afternoon, Nick Salter of shore near was lead for the maritime coastguard agency.

38:20
Good afternoon, Vaughn Jackson, we are showing you those project leads maritime coastguard agency, soak

38:24
up the microphone a bit closer. I couldn't quite hear that. Deborah. Yeah. Can you do that again? Sorry. Yeah.

38:29
Vaughn Jackson, maritime Coast agency and the offshore renewables project lead.

38:37
Thank you, welcome.

38:43
So I haven't got a lot of questions today on shipping and navigation. But firstly, just the examiner authority would like to just express that is pleased to see that, that the MCA comments dated January the 16th, showed that pre examination engagement has been effective in refining the proposed project order limits for the offshore array and reducing the significance of effects. The MCA letter now indicates that the mitigation measured measures are deemed adequate to reduce hazards to as low as reasonably practicable or lap. So as an examiner authority welcome that work that's gone on a pre application stage. However, there's a few remaining questions I have today from the examining authority on the matter of shipping effects. So first of all, I'll come to the applicant. Whilst there are no details of the array layout. Currently, the MCA advises that it would be seeking a layout of straight rows or columns for wind turbines. Could this be an issue from the applicant? Might there be other issues such as seabed geology, for example, which might mean that Rosa turbines may not be passed? suitable

40:07
standard westward for the applicant, within the navigational risk assessment, we do reference commitment to compliance with MGN 654. And within the DML, obviously, there's the condition in schedule 11 and 12. Part 211. One A, that permits us to a design plan, which will be agreed in consultation with the Maritime and Coastguard agency and 20. House posts consent requirements of that design, in line with en Gen 654 will consider elements such as search and rescue facilitation, internal navigation. And as stated in MGN, 654, we are required to consider at least two lines of orientation before we go and look at anything else, so I guess if something did get raised at the time of surveys, then that would be a conversation we'd have at the MCA at that time. But I guess the simplest way to phrase that is we will be in compliance with MGM six, five for

41:09
it. Yes. So

41:12
I'll just add to that. So Toby Lee, on behalf of the applicant, this is actually a parent on the Grampian one project, it was designed with a three axis grid pattern. And if you look at the layout from the top down here, you'll notice actually, there's a number of turbines not not installed within the middle of the wind farm. And that was to avoid a geological feature. And so we were able to maintain the grid pattern and keep the rows whilst avoiding the geological feature we were seeking to avoid. I see.

41:51
Okay. And

41:52
just one further point to add on that, which I think it's important is the obviously we're talking about Red Line boundary reductions in terms of overall reduction of the site and increasing sea room, but the structures exclusion zone also was put in place between the existing rampion site and the proposed development to to already mitigate alignment with the existing rampion. One side, though, we know that there may be some changes in turbine size, and therefore row spacing may defer. And that minimum spacing of one nautical mile that's required by the maritime coastguard agency is already built into those plans.

42:31
So you don't have to conform with the grid system or rampion. One because Exactly, exactly that. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. For MC I do want to come back on those points to

42:41
earning sort of DMCA Yes, I agree with everything that Mrs. Westwood has just said. Great. Thanks very much.

42:53
Okay, well directed for the MCA then with the use of safety zones around the perimeter of the array, order limit boundary potentially result in issues in terms of navigation due to reduction serum, in other words, if you've got a turbine right at the edge, you got the safety zone, could that be an issue?

43:15
Next ultimately, MCA potentially Yes, it could be an issue, the safety zones will be applied on I assume on a rolling basis. So when be applied to the whole boundary at the same time, or just just focus on the, on the specific turbine that's being constructed at that time, we would expect some consultation with the local operators to to ensure that the any disruption is minimised.

43:44
So it's not a particular strong concern you have it's just a case of keeping up to date with it and talking these things through as they happen. That's where I think it would be

43:56

more important or most important on that on that western boundary. Fortunately, it's a very, it's quite a short boundary, so there'll be fewer turbines. Yeah.

44:06
To the comeback and the westward for the applicant. I guess the other point to note there is that we will liaise with Trinity house, post consent along with AMC, of course in terms of the construction voyage that will be deployed around the site and any construction safety zones, which are a maximum of 500 metres and on a rolling basis. As Mr. Salter said, we'll be within that construction voyage area, and that construction voyage will take into account impacts on any routes to ensure that they're minimised. And then of course during the operational phase, we're not proposing any permanent safety zones in line with MCA best practice and any maintenance safety zones of 500 metres will be of a temporary nature

44:56
okay now I just want to Talk about the what's called the structure exclusion zone, which sort of doubled up as a navigation corridor. For the MCA is there anything open about what information you've got at the moment that you would require as part of a final layout other than what's shown on the submitted plans, for example, such as the figure sport, chapter 13, which is a BP 086. And the offshore work plans. Also is the MCA content that there would not be a navigational risk or pinch point as vessels leave the corridor into the Dover strait to the south into the English Channel.

45:47
The next holds for the MCA were content at this stage that we've received sufficient information on the corridor. further discussions will take place on the layout plan. And we can discuss the details then on the sea space between the corridor and the shipping, exiting the TSS, I think is 4.7 Miles minimum which we think is sufficient space to to overcome collision regulations or still comply with collision regulations.

46:22
So, from the information you've got now, the work plans, everything was shows where this corridor is going to be your your content at this stage. That's

46:29
right, you're subject to

46:31
anything from applicant.

46:33
Samantha westward for the applicant, just really to carry on from what Mr. Salter said, We undertook extensive consultation, both pre and post PIR which all of these topics were covered, including this separation distance from traffic exiting the Dover, straits TSS. And all feedback was positive.

46:54
Good. I mean, is there any limitation on the size or type of ships that could use this corridor?

47:03
Samantha westward for the applicant? They'd not know. So it would be the master decision as to whether they decided to use that gap or not. So depending on the type of vessel or the weather conditions or the traffic in the area, but it would be there for their decision. Obviously, the corridor would be clearly charted, so they'd have all the information available to hand to make that decision.

47:26
On Do you agree with that salt?

47:28
Nick salt from MCI? Yes, that is correct is the Masters decision.

47:33
Okay, thank you. Moving on to a slightly different issue. Little Hampton Harbour. It lies immediately east of the offshore export cable corridor. as set out in paragraph 107 of the navigational risk assessment, pilotage is compulsory for all merchant vessel and vessels. I think within one nautical mile of the harbour entrance, they have to wait until the pilot is on board. This means that certain products or construction and support vessels would need to receive a pilot before undertaking certain activities within the port's competent harbour authority area, anyway, suggests that there would be a pilot exemption certificate to vessel masters as efficiently as possible as quickly as possible. For the applicant, how necessary is the pilot exemption certificate? And maybe who oversees the process? And maybe how long would it take to receive that?

48:34
It's meant westward for the applicant. So a pilot exemption certificate is a standard function of only port that's operating commercial shipping in and out of it. So no, it's not an essential requirement, the vessels that could still take pilots offered by the port themselves, they don't have to have the PC, I'd have to come back to you as to how much sea time or how many trips into Littlehampton are required for a master to be able to get that pilot exemption certificate. But it is a fairly standard and straightforward, straightforward process, whatever port it is, so I guess the simple answer there is, it's not a must have. But it is something that we could look into if we thought, you know, one of our vessels was going to be using that area a

49:17
lot, because I believe it's quite close to clipping beach. So I mean, even if there was a vessel, which wasn't going into little Hampton harbour, but came within that kind of radius, that the pilot would have to be involved. So

49:32
that would be within little Hamptons control. So if it's within their harbour limits, and in their pilotage area, then yes, either a pilot would need to be on board or a pilot action from certificate would need to be in place. Okay.

49:45
So I was thinking if there's a lot of vessels, whether that would cause a resourcing issue, particularly a little Hampton harbour, that sort of thing. It would be good maybe to just get a bit of an idea about the process. And there's sort of time for the process on that one. Yeah, absolutely. We

49:59
can Take that as an action and come back for, as you

50:01
said, construction can still go ahead. Even without it, it just would depend on

50:07
yeah, as I say, the pilot exemption certificate as a function of any port. So and if you're a regular vessel going into a port, then you may apply for pile exemption, as you say, to avoid the resource of having to get a pilot. But if you know if you're just going in there occasionally, then you would just take the local pilot, but yeah, absolutely, we can take that away and come back to you with further information.

50:26
Okay, like snapper. Anything from MCA on that matter? Next, obviously, I've

50:31
seen nothing, nothing to add. Okay. Okay.

50:37
There is mentioned within the IES about potential that additional capacity or facilities may be a new haven port to do with the development, is there an existing facility there at New Haven, which could potentially be used?

50:57
Toby Lee on behalf of the applicant. So for the recipient, one project, they constructed an RNN base at New Haven that is owned by the ramp in one of your wind farm. Potentially, we could look at New Haven or some other ports along the coastline for for doing operations and maintenance work from that decision has not been made on the project yet. And

51:29
would sets the development need to come within the scope of the this insert project? Or are you looking for this to fall outside potentially as a pan Country Planning Act development?

51:43
Ensure it's not included within the application? So yeah, it would be consented through another means?

51:50
And is that facility needed as well, for Orbis construction, and it is about the construction or the ongoing operation that was doing operations on going operation?

52:00
Yeah, so for its construction, it is likely that we will have some sort of operations base nearby, again, at a location which has not been determined yet. Again, there's potential to do that in, in a in a couple of different locations. But yeah, any that is, again, outside of the scope of the CIP.

52:22
So there's been no assessment at this point about potential impacts of any new port facility might have in connection with this development.

52:31
I think there's there's been assessment of it, and we've certainly made within the application, you will find assumptions of where those facilities will be. But with not, to my knowledge, assess specifically putting in temporary or new structures within within any local ports to serve those purposes. And that would be done as a separate application.

52:59
I see on chapter four, for example, 4.8 point 17. It says that it's likely that the existing facilities in New Haven port will be utilised and expanded when necessary. So it was just to get a little bit more information about that. I mean, if you could provide maybe a note on that basis, so we can we can just further understand what might be necessary and and your intentions about that development, then that would be useful, I think. Yep, certainly

53:26
we can we can do a note on that.

53:30
I think that might be it. Does anyone else got any comments to make on the matter of shipping and navigation? Is there anything else that the MCA, for example wants to raise or any concerns that might not have been addressed? So far?

53:52
An excellent MCA No, thank you, sir. So good, most likely been assaulted. Anyone else? Yeah. Anyone online?

54:03
Oh, okay. Thank you very much. Then I'll go to action points, please.

54:09
It's what have you got listed down

54:10

the mail? I've got to go. One was clarification on the process and timing for obtaining a partial exemption certificate Littlehampton and then just a note there on potential lnM the facilities that are New Haven

54:27
yeah, that's all I've got as well thank you.

54:58
I'm sorry, it is me again. So, aviation. I just got a few brief questions too about aviation as much as anything, just a look into progress really, on some of the some of the matters. Okay, is anyone newly want to introduce?

55:25
Thank you. So yes, I'll let Mr. Richard Inglis introduce himself to you. Thank you.

55:34
I'm Richard Inglis. I'm an aviation consultant working on behalf of the applicant. I've been in aviation since I did my apprenticeship many years ago and all aspects. So while I've not used workflow procedures designer, which will be relevant in a minute, I often work with them and understand the basic principles and can put it in context or you hopefully, okay,

55:57
thanks very much welcome. And so firstly, regarding civil aviation, we'll start there. The relevant representation from the National Air Traffic Services or NATs, raised a holding objection due to the potential effects of the wind turbines proposed on the primary radar installation at Pease Pottage near Gatwick net state that they're working with the applicant. But can the applicant provide detail or progress towards a mitigation solution?

56:27
Which is on behalf of the applicant? Yes, my understanding is that there is a technical solution that NASA prepared to implement. It's just down to the commercial arrangements, which I can't comment on. But one of my colleagues might be able to give you the latest position.

56:49
I think says it was the most I can't give you the precise position at this point. But but there there is a dialogue established with naps in order to progress those matters. So

56:58
the technical solution has been identified is that agreed by both parties.

57:06
Richard Inglis on behalf of the applicant, essentially it's down to nuts to define the technical solution. Occasionally third parties offer up other ideas. But in this occasion, fortunately, nats have a clear

technical solution. It's just a matter of you know, the commercial arrangements to cover the cost of implementing it. So Sabita commercial agreement is not proceeding any any difficulty at all with that. So

57:30
it's actually come from that the technical solution and yet applicant has basically agreed that to

57:36
correct and that's have things like overlapping radar cover. So yes, things they can do to mitigate the loss or the impact on on the on the radar in question. Okay.

57:50
So we've got commercial arrangement that still needs to be done, and I understand you're not gonna want to talk about the details of that. But in terms of progress is there is there an anticipated time when that agreement could be finalised and therefore the holding objects will be removed from that?

58:13
Bill? My offer the applicant? Certainly there will be an expectation that it will be finalised during the course of the examination and that and that objection could be removed in due course.

58:26
Are we are we talking about sort of in the next couple of deadlines? Are we talking maybe by the end I mean I don't know is it is the ball in their court so to speak

58:35
a little bit Sarah and I'll never make promises on behalf of hats as to when we might get to get to the point. So I'm reluctant to provide you with a deadline by which it will be withdrawn.

58:51
Okay. But as far as we know, there's no particular holdup or issue and things are progressing.

58:58
Not that I'm aware of. Okay, some familiar with the usual processor.

59:02
That's fine. Thanks very much.

59:12
Now call the Shoreham airport but I think is now called Brighton City Airport. This is approximately 17 kilometres north of the proposed rampion. To array there is a runway on a north south axis. There are instrument flight procedures or RFPs set for the approach from either the north or south to the airport. The examining authority understands that if the turbines were 325 metres in height, this would infringe on the IFP for the approach from the south. They would need to be a minimum of 1000 feet above the wind turbines. The examiner authority also note that without mitigation the potential impact on safe operations at Brighton City Airport is considered to be major significant in the ES chapter 14 So my

questions on this matter of firstly, has there been direct communications between the applicant and Brighton City Airport. And the Civil Aviation Authority, I believe also involved with these things.

1:00:14
Breaching lists on behalf of the applicant, there has been conversations with the airports. The CAA produced the regulations, and it's the airport's obligation to implement the necessary safeguarding. The CAA rarely get directly involved in a particular application, they take it from Have you got the correct procedures in your safety management system to deal with it, and they'll conduct audits, etc. So it's primarily the airport that have the responsibility and accountability for maintaining safe operations. I think the state you made slightly, can be taken the wrong way, because the airport would always keep it safe. So they would get it, there's no way they would operate the instrument fly procedures in the presence of these turbines. So they would withdraw the procedures, which obviously has an impact on their business. So yes, they will always keep it safe. Moving on a little bit, the dissolution again, for this one is fairly clear. The the implication for the airport is that the, what they call the minima, which is essentially the decision point for a pilot to either either land or go around and try again, would be raised. And that can be really critical for airports that subject to lots of bad weather and thought, in particular. And it can have even a change in that decision height of 100 feet can make a significant difference to to the airport, because aircraft will divert, ultimately, they lose the business. Nevertheless, on this occasion, the airport are willing to accept a higher minimum on both ends. And with that will come the need to redesign the procedure. Because effectively it's a new procedure. So, again, a bit akin to these in that situation, I think in principle, we've got a good way forward. It just requires the commercial agreements to to implement it. I will add that the timescales for doing instrument flight procedure changes can be of years, not months. So I had mentioned that because the CA is a bit restricted on its resources at the moment. So as you interact with them, which you have to do during the process, and wait for final approval, it can take a matter of two, three or even four years. So I think everyone in the African side is aware of that, and they will be managing that risk.

1:02:52
Yes. So yes, it's quite interesting, because I was wondering, who is it that sort of moves the IFP changes forward? It sounds like it's primarily between the applicant and the airport, and then the CAA just make sure that, sign it off, check that audit it basically, and make sure they're happy with it. So it seems like subject to a commercial agreement. There is an agreement agreement to these changes with the airport, but it's the CAA which will take the time to get them to agree at that you need the agreement to do that. Is that correct?

1:03:30
Richard Inglis on behalf of the applicant, yeah, yes, that's essentially correct. The H airport appoints an IFP design company or even person, that company has to be approved by the CAA has to be licenced. And then it's listed who you can go to to do this work. So they will work on the changes. And you're correct. The CAE common regulatory audit, the company has to make sure they're following their design manual procedures. And when the procedures are ready, they get submitted for review to the CA. It's not unusual to have a few comments and yet you have to address and then it goes back to them for final approval. And once that's done, it's a case of the date for implementation. So it's a fairly well established process.

1:04:22
As I've ever been situations, though, where CAA have not agreed with the revise RFPs and causes significant delays, for example,

1:04:37
which willingness on behalf of the applicant, the delays actually getting the response from the CA rather than the quantity of changes and the time it takes to implement them. You you have a fairly long period of silence because they have responsibilities for all UK airports and their regulatory team is somewhat light at the moment. In fact, they're advertising to try and fix that problem to the benefit of not just this project, obviously, but everybody, and we hope they succeed. I

1:05:11
can imagine they're very busy. Yes. And but it seems clear from that, then that it's unlikely that this is going to find a resolution within the examination period. Because we, that process isn't far enough along the tracks, you haven't been involved as yet I take

1:05:30
English on behalf of the applicant. That's correct. So having pointed out that risk, the airport's also willing to, if there was a reasonably short period of getting things sorted, they can issue what's called a no Tam, which is a notice to Airmen, which is a temporary advisory that there is an obstruction there, and they will take the necessary action so that the pilots are fully cognizant of what's going on. So for example, if you're putting a crane up that penetrates one of these protected surfaces, because there's no real alternative, then you can you can issue these no tans while the cranes in operation. So it's not a long term fix. But the Apple said, if necessary, we can do that as well. So I think there's going to be quite a lot of collaboration with, but

1:06:21
you wouldn't want to use something like that for an actual turbine itself more than maybe the construction equipment,

1:06:26
you could do it for either. Because at the end of the day, it's a physical structure that whether it's a turbine or a crane, it's it's not

1:06:35
it doesn't have to be a temporary structure. This is for this would be you could even use them in

1:06:39
the short term. I mean, the CA wouldn't like to use it if you didn't have something that was near completion. But I think they would they would accept you know, waiting for a few more months using a no tam is is permitted. Okay, thank

1:06:53

you, is the likely revision of the minimum safe altitude around the airport a separate process to the IFP change of talking, I've seen about the, the MSA, which I think covers a wider area, just wondering what the differences may be, but a clarification,

1:07:12
we should enlist on behalf of the applicant. So we talked about instrument flight procedures, but obviously, they have to integrate with the wider airspace. So when they do the design, they will look at all these factors. But we're not anticipating any problems other than the need to raise the terminal arrivals altitude for both ends by 102 100 feet, respectively. We always do it in hundreds of feet. So it gets rounded up. So you kind of do the maths and then take the the nearest 100, which is why it's an exact figure.

1:07:46
Yeah, cuz I think the MSA is something I believe another two or maybe 2200 feet at the moment for 25. Yeah, more to come our radius. So that then you would the quadrant of that, that the flight that might need to be raised as well. For the area,

1:08:00
I refer to the design procedures manual earlier. And that's it's a pretty robust document. So they will go through all of this. The work done so far is just a look at what the likely safeguarding issues are. We're not anticipating any, any others. But the rigour that you'll go through for the formal design is much more, and you have to check your data. And yeah, there's a there's a whole lot of extra stuff that's done rather than

1:08:29
the MSA on the instrument flow procedure is all part of the same process. Yes,

1:08:33
it'll probably get reviewed together and documented.

1:08:38
And again, asset CIA at the end of that is, so

1:08:41
the instrument flight procedure design design that will document everything, they will look at the data sources they've used, check the integrity of the data sources. And they will bundle that information up and that will go to the CA for approval, the initial safeguarding check is done much the same way. But you're not as quite as rigorous with the checking of the data and the need to provide the data, you still consider it. But in the final application, you have to follow the robust procedures manual that's signed off by the CAA and checked regularly. Okay,

1:09:23

thank you. And lastly, is there. I mean, we're talking about the turbine height of 325 metres, of course, it could be substantially less than that. Is there a height where the procedures wouldn't have to change? Correct within that range? So

1:09:39
the applicant has an option to reduce the obstruction, in this case turbines, in which case there'll be no need to adjust the flight procedures. So I think it's until you're 100% Sure the turbines and are looking to my left and my right and then the The one you're going to purchase, you'll get the exact height. So I think at the moment, what we've done is looked at the worst case scenario for in terms of heights. Once the applicant firms up what their plans are, this will be revisited. And if they if they did the RFPs, then they'll proceed with those. Obviously, if it's below the levels that need any changes, then it goes away anyway.

1:10:26
But of interest, you know what height that would be that you wouldn't need to ask

1:10:30
to check the paper, but I can. Is it 279 metres above mean sea level? Okay.

1:10:44
Fine, thank you very much. That's the end of my questions on Brighton City Airport. Just one question on defence aviation. I haven't really seen much in the way of correspondence from the Ministry of Defence so far. Has it been any direct communications between the applicant and mot recently on on those points?

1:11:06
ritually this on behalf of the applicant? I'm not aware of any but I will double check and we'll advise you, I think initially there was the danger zone, Danger Zone issue. And we the footprint was adjusted to accommodate that. So we are anticipating any problems. But I will just take an action to check on that. Yeah,

1:11:25
it will be useful, maybe as an update with a message to friends just to see if there's anything come down the line for us.

1:11:31
Indeed. All right.

1:11:32
Okay.

1:11:33
Anyone else got any questions to do with aviation? Civil Law depends. Now on online Okay, can I move to action points, please.

1:11:48
Okay, so I think we just had that one last action. Yeah, it was just that one last action. So so that's an update on the position as regards the MO D, which will will provide the two courts. I don't think it's too much of an issue but we'll clarify.

1:12:02
Thank you. Thank you well.

1:12:12
Okay, I think it's probably beneficiary take a short break at this point before moving on. But just for the confirmation on the on the agenda, we will deal with item 16. Obviously, after the break, we've got plenty of time to do it. And that will mean that we will not sit tomorrow and I will remind the parties. Those online here again towards my closing remarks that we will not be sitting tomorrow so we will deal with item 16 an AOP Today we'll take a short break I think can we just be back about quarter by quarter past three please