

AUDIO_RAMPION2_ISH2_SESSION8_16052 024

Thu, May 16, 2024 5:33PM • 46:53

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

applicant, requirements, works, noise, substation, authority, construction, response, district council, discharging, deadline, relevant, hearing, plan, day, articles, concern, west sussex, approval, examination

00:07

Okay, it's how POS for hearings resumed policy Centre at the rush back. But sure, we're all keen for the hearing to run his call. So I will crack on with Item nine on the agenda, which is the draft development consent order in here

00:38

so aside from Article Five, which we talked about this morning, the additional requirements that you're going to look at on aviation, which we talked about yesterday, on vegetation that we talked about this morning, on requirement 19, which we discussed a few minutes ago, and the improvements to requirements 1216 and 22 in respect to the requests of the southern part which are taking into account. I have a just a few other questions on on the requirements as listed and one or two others fairly quick questions. So if I could start pleased with Article Six, this is maybe a question for you, Mr. Turney. Now, in the South Downs, national parks response, you have required inclusion to this article, the wording, a new paragraph six, about the provisions of Section 11 of the national parks and access to the countryside act 1949. As amended by section 25242453 of the levelling up and regeneration that's apply insofar as they relate to the activities that would reasonably be carried out by the statute Undertaker, just not in entirely clear why you want this addition. And if you could just very briefly explain to me why you feel it's necessary.

02:15

Richard any for sale stands National Park Authority. So I think. I think so the objective, the objective is to make sure that in dealing with the implementation of this scheme, and all the many ways in which that's going to be controlled, that we have captured the enhanced duty which applies both to the sector of status decision making, but will in turn apply to the person who delivers the scheme as a statutory Undertaker. Can I take away from the examination, the question of whether that is a change to Article Six, which we've previously indicated, or whether it might better sit in the matters that we touched on this morning, where we talked about potentially incorporating wording into the relevant requirements for discharge of for approval of lamps and see OCPs? Absolutely better there.

03:28

Okay. I'm quite happy to move on from that one and issue the app that wants to respond to that.

03:36

I think So just briefly, because it may assist Mr. Mr. tourney's deliberations is it will be the applicants position that it will be better dealt with vote or the beefing up of the requirements that were discussed this morning. The order in no way seeks to remove or disapply that duty under Section 11 I have the 1993 1994 Act 1949 Act and so it applies.

04:03

Okay, I'm happy to leave that one. Okay. Now, the next one I want to talk about is

04:22

is a number of articles which I've listed out there on the 28 day time period, there's been given now the applicant has amended article 13 to access to works to 45 days and I think this is being generally well received by the local authorities. However, there are a number of other articles 11 Seven on temporary closures of streets 12 Three On Property rights away 15 five on the power to alter layouts etc streets 79 on The discharge of water and 19 seven on the authority to survey investigate land on shore where the 28 day has been retained. Just a very brief explanation please from the applicant, why they've amended one to 45 days, but not the others, as the had been requested by the local authorities.

05:27

Thank you. So this poor manual for the applicant. This This change was made in response to the content of the local impact report that was submitted by West Sussex County Council. And that's specifically referred to the deemed consent provisions that if they were to be retained in article 13, or longer timeframe, and they suggested 45 days be included, given the multi authority consultation process that will be inherent within that article. In terms of the other articles that you've referred to there. It's the applicant's view that those are approvals which relate to the particular authority alone who is referenced in that article. And so there is not the same multi authority consultation process that might be inherent within article 13. So that's why that period has been retained at 28 days.

06:24

It's not my intention to go to the local authorities, I'll assume that your The views expressed in written form remain. And therefore I shall just as the next day, we shall just make a a recommendation in due course.

06:45

Now, can I turn to articles? 33. Sorry, 3233 3444 and 45? I think. And I think a couple of times now the South Downs National Park, as in response to these articles said that a more robust demonstration, that the documents are secured by the documents suggested would be appropriate. I was wasn't quite sure. I thought clarity please. Mr. Attorney, what specifically? You mean by that? Is it? Is it the drafting of the articles that you have a concern with? Or is it to do with other matters in terms of the documents, commitments, etc? I'm happy to defer that to in writing, if you would, but it would be more helpful if you could just put some more words as to as to the concerns with those articles.

07:52

That I think it's a general point originates very rich attorney for the South Downs National Park Authority as a general point about tying together the various protections. So, obviously, in respect of vegetation removal, which is a number of these, there is control so far as we've got the vegetation retention plans now in the examination. And a question about, you know, obviously, how those will be secured might be a separate point, I think probably we should take it away in light of your comments. And the implication that that, that it might be better dealt with in the in the control documents. It I think it's essentially a point about the interaction between those articles which are framed in fairly broad ways to give the power to carry out removal of vegetation, etc. And the control documents which will cut back the way in which that power can be exercised. So I think we just need to review that to make sure that now the dots are joined.

08:57

Yes, I do appreciate that these examinations do evolve and therefore as a result of what's hurting and seen in evidence that your position may change again, I'm going to assume the Atkins got no response to that as you're looking at requirements generally. Thank you.

09:21

Now, if I could turn to the requirements and I may jump about a little bit here, so do forgive me for that. So if I could start with requirement 29. This is to do with the control of noise during operation. Now this of course is only is only for work number 16 which is the proposed onshore substation. But both bolney parish council in their response to Deadline three rep three 095 and mid Sussex District Council rep three Oh 70 I've given reasons as to why this all show also should include the works at the National Grid substation, which is work number 20. I would like to ask the applicant whether they would consent to adding work number 20. To this given that there is there's there's a similar amount of work to going on at substations

10:31

and the slope on behalf of the applicant. So, I suppose, just to summarise the proposed substation, how you can Dean and the extension to the to the balmy works are very different in their scale operation, the equipment being installed and the noise impacts. And so to clarify the potential for noise generation of the equipment required to the balmy substation extension works is minimal. In So insofar as it's only related to the operation of switchgear, that would be an event. That would only happen in an emergency if the offshore wind farm was isolated from the grid, maybe once a year. The resulting noise emission we've spoken to our electrical engineers would be expected to be over an extremely short duration of around one second, and, and on this basis, we've scoped out the noise from the assessment due to the infrequent and short duration. Any assessment of this in accordance with British Standards would clearly see a negligible effect. And it's on that basis thing that the requirement is considered not applicable to the works and Bomi. What I think we have picked up just looking at the works description is that the works description of Bomi refers to transformers which is at the opening Dean's substation, they're much, much larger pieces of equipment that operate continuously with the associated noise impact. And we'd look at just refining the word at the wording of the works description to refer to smaller instrumentation transformers that do a job more along the lines of metering and measuring rather than the function of the of the onshore substation.

12:36

Thank you Councillor Hanley you do mid south Sussex aren't here so probably falls upon you. You've heard the applicant say that they're very different works and the noise would be relative would be negligible. That does that overcome your concern?

13:05

I read the the applicants response saying that it really is just a click sound I think is how it's described in the design and access statement. Mid Sussex and their written representations to Deadline three. Rep. 3070. Their environmental officer Protection Officer apologies comments. My concern is that their response wording is vague noise generated by proposed development at this location is expected to be minimal. No additional mitigation is necessary. I'm not disputing that they expect it to be minimal. It may well be my concern is what if it isn't. We've had previous noise issues with the original substation a low frequency noise is known to be able to travel over long distances. And they therefore conclude by saying these concerns would be dealt with if work 20 was included in requirement 29. Now as a resident of this area, I would say the additional problem we have with noise is that we have noise already from the National Grid substation from the UK power network substation from the rampion. One substation, and from the silt Buster that ramping one is incorporated into their design to deal with contaminated water coming being discharged from the site. And that is still running, although at the time we were told it was a temporary arrangement. But there's still issues within contamination. So every time any additional work is done in this area. The back the parish council and the residents always tell told it's not going to be much you won't hear it. But actually the cumulative effect nobody ever seems to take that into account. And that's that's really why Barney parish council is standing with mid Sussex and their concerns and saying, Well, why not included and then it's covered

15:00

Not wishing to speak for the applicant, and I will ask them to come back. But they may will put forward to say, Well, yes. Okay, even if they were to consent to some form of control requirements 29 would be too much if you like, because that's a full on noise assessment. What would you say to that? And is this something that you say could be a commitment or something that there would be some sort of noise monitoring undertaken at the National Grid station, to to try and overcome your concern? And I will put that to the applicant in just a moment.

15:40

Do you mean on an ongoing basis throughout the operation of the

15:43

during the construction, I would have thought during during the works that they would be doing to the national grid substation, they would undertake some sort of noise monitoring,

15:50

during construction. Yes, that is something that again, Barney has has asked for, because during the rampion, one construction programme, noise monitors were placed on the boundary of local properties to monitor noise because there were complaints from residents. It is you've worked the area, it is a rural

area, but there are residential properties. And because of the undulate undulating nature of the the area, and the fact that the rampion, one substation and the National Grid substation are actually on slight sort of prominence is in the area. And therefore, the mitigation planning that's in place to try and help with noise and the visual impact is lost to some extent, particularly in the winter. So it was, you know, rampion, did offer noise monitoring in two or three places around during construction. And that was, I think, beneficial, it gave, because obviously, as a residence, we think, Oh, that's very loud. But in fact, in terms of actual breaching what is acceptable in terms of, of noise levels, it showed to the residents that in fact, they there was no breach. It was sort of scientific evidence for want of a better description. So yes, in construction, that would be very helpful.

17:06

Thank you. Is that something that you could incorporate somewhere into the either into a commitment or that there would be noise monitoring undertaken at the National Grid substation during construction?

17:24

Andy, slow on behalf of the applicant? I think this is just just to make the distinction is we're talking with respect to the construction noise. With regards to the monitoring there, I think, and we're talking about the operational noise with respect to the operation of the switchgear. So we have the submitted the alloy noise and vibration management plan at that only three, in order to address issues during construction. And with regards operation. I mean, we can consider a commitment. But I think, you know, as we've stated due to the duration of of that effect, and we're talking around sort of an operation that leads to a second of noise emission that there's it's unlikely to, to pick it up in terms of suppose also the emergence that the game operates in an emergency. So there's not much in terms of mitigation that you could, they almost

18:28

I think feel needs to be just a demonstration of that if you like. So it could be a year of monitoring, perhaps or something like that, and during Operation just to demonstrate that the noise is negligible as you as you set out, and therefore would lay them in Sussex point that, you know, what if it's not,

18:48

and we can take that away, I do have a colleague on online who's the detailed noise expert who we could who we could bring him on that or we can take it away and come back. I'm happy

19:00

for you to take it away, I think right? I think they just need to consider okay.

19:15

Okay, can I move on to requirement 33? Oh, sorry.

19:23

Mr. Harris. Sorry, sir. It was just a very, extremely brief point about the I'm just trying to find a moment to jump in. And articles 11 715 Five a 19 720 a day issue. Well, it's the 28th and the 48 day 45 Day issue. Those articles to have that deemed consent national highways, not were not prepared to have

deemed consent on matters concerning the SRN. However, I'm assuming you're happy for us to deal with that through the national highways protection provision Thank

20:00

you. Yes. Thank you. And we'll be discussing protected regions tomorrow, the compulsory acquisition hearing. So thank you, sir. Okay, so if I can just go on to requirements 33 These the skills and employment strategy. This also is in connection with the outline skills and employment strategy. Where Horsham District Council has suggested that that this should be throughout the duration of the development, I think, rather than just applying to the construction phase, is that correct?

20:47

That's Matthew Porter, ocean District Council. And the drafting we submitted on response to written questions was really just a tightening up to make sure they get the approval of the LPA. And obviously, there are hopefully going to be programme of employment strategy to extend beyond construction. So he's relevant to have the construction in 33 to just keep it as approved, implemented as approved,

21:18

because you say in table 5.1 of that document, the outline skills and employment strategy that points three and six which to do with apprenticeships and engagement in education, etc, our longer term, and that's why you want that change. Is you have the requirements to handle it. Can you are you able to tell me which what you want changed with it? Is it the must be implemented throughout throughout the duration of the development? Is that is that in rather than throughout the construction of the relevant stage?

21:54

Well, I mean, hopefully the outcome will be that the employment strategy includes all stages plus beyond development, so actually doesn't even need to refer to particular development stage at all, we can just be must be implemented as approved,

22:11

is approved.

22:13

Okay, the other one was a 33. One where we're substantially restruck through so it's in accordance with and then insert and approved by relevant planning authority. Just tightens it up a little, sorry,

22:29

can I just go through that then no stage at the authorised development excluding onshore site preparation works, is to commence until a skills and employment strategy

22:39

and strike through substantial doing Yes, I was going

22:42

to ask on that, because you haven't used substantially anywhere else in the in the requirements, you have it everywhere, everywhere else you've used just in accordance with the outline skills and employer strategy that has been provided to the relevant planning authority. And then the second part would say the Stage or Stage specific skills and employment strategy must be implemented as approved. To what you wanted to say it could

23:07

potentially make it even tighter for to free one by has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.

23:18

Smile, is that something you can you can amend?

23:21

Will concert will certainly consider it sir. I'm aware that there are some sort of particular issues around how that skills and employment strategy is to be compiled and implemented now. So we'll take it away and give it some thought in in in that context, but the point of the District Council is certainly understood, if it assists, do have a member of the applicant team online who can explain how that skills and employment strategy works and how it will evolve. But I don't really know whether that's something that that you would wish to understand and get into. Or, alternatively, we could we could take that away. And when we respond on the potential to amend the requirement include more details at that point.

24:02

I think that would be helpful. Yes. To myself and our Horsham District Council. Okay. But it would seem to me that the changes requested are all doable.

24:15

That video did certainly as far as my understanding of applying beyond simply the construction pays. I don't think we have an issue with that. That's how it it's kind of it's the it's the it's the process of approval and its content and how we agree what is to be provided, which is dependent upon future events equipment.

24:38

So if it was implemented as approved, as as Horsham have suggested that that would that would, why wouldn't it be the document that it sets out in

24:49

the woods? That's absolutely correct. My my issue, which I wish to take away and discuss with the team is over the principle of approval in this particular context, but we'll make representations to you Hang on, whether we're able to go forward on that basis that the next deadline.

25:05

Thank you. Okay.

25:18

Okay, now I just want to cover off this issue for West Sussex County Council, I think this is for you, Miss Harrower? Yes, Well done for sticking with us. Now, you've made several representations about not what I think not wanting to be the discharging authority. But as far as I'm aware, you're only the discharging authority where you are the highways authority, where this requires the approval of the highways authority, which is requirements 1516 20 and 21, and 24. And in the case of requirements 1718, where you're the lead local flood authority. So what what is the concern of you being the discharging authority in those cases when you are the relevant planning authority?

26:15

Thank you. So Amy, how

26:16

are my Sussex

26:18

County Council? Sorry, I think the point is about consistency about where we are a console T two requirements, 822 and 32, but a discharging authority for the ones that you've just mentioned. So consistency within the draft DCO, but also consistency with other made windfarm DC O's. And I know, the applicant is given a response to DCO 126. Do your question sort of furthering that point, I think at default, we would want to provide to you a list of made DTOs where the relevant county council with those functions for those made VCOs were consulted on those equivalent, relevant requirements as a consistency point that we'd like to just make again, that

27:04

that's fine. I mean, I'm not I don't necessarily need to have a list of DCs where it is, I mean, if you want to provide that, that's fine. But are you so if we so in requirement eight, for example, where the consultation with is only with West Sussex Fire and Rescue, you would like that to be with yourselves as well? Is that correct? No, we have

27:28

the with that one set to be rescued. That's absolutely fine. Yeah. Okay.

27:33

And requirement nine is just with the relevant planning authority, which is mid Sussex requirements. I'm just gonna go through them very quick. is just the relevant planning authorities. Landscaping the same but also the consultations with a with Natural England, Historic England. You're happy with that biodiversity net gain, again, with the relevant planning authorities and Natural England, we discussed 1516, you're quite happy to be the discharging authority there because you are the Highway Authority. I

28:08

think the point we're making so is that we would want to be a console T to that as the relevant planning authority. I think in other main DC those those examples go to the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highways authority.

28:22

Right, but you are the sorry, the convener, okay. Right. Okay, fine. I'll give that we're

28:29

happy to broaden this point in writing at a default to make the point the equivalent of where

28:33

requirements where there are highways issues that require clearing. So in requirements 15 highways access outside the South Downs, National Park, requirements, 16 highways access within the South Downs National Park, the operational drainage management, the public right of way, the code, the open access land and the construction traffic management plan. You would rather it would be the relevant planning authorities that we would be the consultative dancer, and you'd be the console tea. Okay. All right. I do have Thank you, Mr. Herrera. Mr. Mallen? Do have your responses to that. I don't. Do you want to come back on that? I wasn't. I think you've heard what you said in writing. I think that's just something I have to in

29:21

light. Indeed, sir. I think we refer to previous examples of other made DCS and that in writing. So I don't think I've got anything more to say on that. It's simply a case of making the application to what we see as the relevant body.

29:35

Yeah, I think I will, in the fullness of time when I come to make my recommendation on this particular bit of the DCO. I shall look in detail at the requirement and then decide who should be the or recommend who should be the the body.

29:55

This was actually brought to Horsham District Council. Sorry, just on the dividing up of a discharge priorities and how you eventually decide to go. I just want a general point about deemed consent and also the timescales for the discharge. I can do a lot of intention by the applicant to reserve lots of technical details at design stage. And obviously, that has a resource in implication for us, particularly as there's now a suggestion that we as HCC resist charge priority for requirements like 17. But we would have to go out to multiple consultations. And from what we've had back from the applicant, so far, in trying to address that point we've made in return reps haven't actually had little or limited sort of cost recovery responses. So mild out of the the applicant would take that on board as we continue through the examination.

31:02

Thank you. answers. Okay. So addition, in addition to the agenda, I just have a few other say very minor questions if you just bear with me, in respect to the requirements.

31:38

Okay, these are relatively minor, Mr. Male requirement 20, the public rights of way paragraph to think the South Downs national park have asked for the word authority to be added to the fourth line down.

32:01

Speech says to be approved in writing by the South Downs National Park, I think you need to end authority after that which they've identified. Thank you. In respect of requirements 21. I didn't see here any measures for the Open Access land management plan that the measures to be carried out in accordance? Is that? Have I missed that? Or is that does that not need to be there? Or does it need to be there and there's no stage of the authorised development within an area of access. And I know it really all out. is located is commenced until an open access land management plan for area has been submitted to and approved by the Highway Authority dot dot dot. But there isn't anything to say that the measures within should be carried out in accordance, does it need to have that?

33:10

We can certainly make that clear. So I didn't say the word matters. You can be any objection?

33:14

And on requirements 27 and 28. This is just a clarification point. So here is the deal with operational phase maintenance. This is just for plans to be submitted to the relevant planning authority. There's no approval process here. This is you just sending an operational maintenance plan to the relevant planning authorities? No, no. There's no approvals process needed there. I just wanted to ask that. Is there an invitation for local authorities or the relevant planning authorities to make comment on them? Or is not not what it's for is if for example, a relevant planning authority wants to write to you and say we have some concerns with this or something like that is is is that take can that be taken into consideration? Or is that not the intended purpose?

34:27

I think I'll take that one away. So if I can clarify because clearly that's a purpose of how that plan evolves prior to its submission and what what consultation may take place in the lead up to that being provided.

34:39

That's very helpful. Thank you. And finally, I just wanted to ask a downside to two more things. The new requirement that you've put in construction communication plan, which is now a requirement 34 Obviously, we don't have an outline document before us to know how on how this will actually work. And so just to keep matters short on this, I'm particularly honestly concerned, I have questions about how this will work on the ground. We, I think some of the representations that we've had from interested parties throughout this process. I've, I think, seek assurances along the way as to exactly how this is going to be constructed, and particularly whether there's someone that they can contact. And so I draw your attention 34 To be an accessible inquiry and complaints procedure I was going to ask you about what is that? And how does that work? Now, you may not be able to answer me here and now. But can I either suggest that an outline document is submitted in so we can see how this process works, or at

least give some thought to a liaison officer being appointed, which you mentioned several times, Southampton pipeline, London pipeline, which you'll probably know I was the lead on that. And they did have a liaison officer with that. And I think it was very well received by the public who there had someone to speak to someone's phone up. And just generally ask what's happening. But again, I'm happy to leave this with you. But I'm not clear quite how that construction communication plan works. So I'd either like an outline, or at least for you to perhaps beef it up with perhaps they commit a commitment to appointing a liaison officer, who will effectively be the point of contact for the public to

37:03

speak to Sunday. So we'll consider that and confirm position at deadline for

37:11

Thank you. That's sorry, Matthew Porter was just trying to be very quick, because I want to wrap up, I was just going to suggest under 34 A, when it says reached communities, perhaps booked in advance of the construction work starting because I think that's key to get in the communication and liaison before things happen on the ground.

37:40

That's something to consider.

37:43

But we would like an outline application because we've put that obviously in reps as well. Okay, thank you. Yes, I

37:55

will admit, I've not read requirement that T four. But in rampion. One, what they what we had was a liaison officer within the team, who set up a local Liaison Group for the substation area which included resit, I was the rest actually represented two of the residents at that stage, but also the for impacted parish councils. And we met regularly and had agendas, which so we were involved as part of the design process of the substation, and some of the detail that that sort of followed after the DCO had been made. And we were able to input local information. And then once construction started the same point of contact at rampion used to send weekly updates to the parish councils, which were then posted and and sort of sent out to local residents. So there was and there was also always a ramping representative on site. And we everybody had his mobile number. So if there was a problem with noise or anything like that, then we were able to contact somebody and it worked very well. This is a two way communication worked very well there.

39:13

Yes, I think I agree. So, yes, I think I'll leave that with you, Mr. Male, to consider either submitting an outline plan and if you do, I appreciate that might not be to Deadline five or certainly to look at beefing that up to the measures is discussed. Thank you very much. Can I now just go on the action points these, this item?

39:41

Thank you, sir. Firstly in relation to Article Six. Mr. Turney is going to consider his position over whether an amendment to that article is required. And then I think again, the South Downs National Park in relation to articles 33 3444 For 45, we're going to consider how their concerns related to the computer the various control plans and associated requirements. The applicant is going to consider how it might address potential noise concerns around the bolney substation, given the nature of the work proposed, sorry, the operational stuff kit that's proposed there. In relation to requirement 33, and the skills and employment strategy. The points that were raised by Horsham District Council are noted, and the applicant will consider those and respond at deadline for that they were then and various amendments that we discussed at the end. So including to requirement 20. The reference to the South Downs National Park Authority 21. For the acts, I think it's the Open Access land management plan to be implemented as approved. And further consideration as to how people might input to various plans for which there was not approval under requirements 1331. And then lastly, there in relation to requirement 34. consideration to liaison officer or otherwise an outline plan. And in general, how that communication plan might be requirement might be beefed up.

41:38

Thank you. Thank you very much indeed. Everything Yeah. Good. Thank you very much. And just for just to round it off, I will return to discussions on the restrictive covenants on Tuesday, the 21st of May as part of the compulsory acquisition hearing, just because I want to bring in the affected persons as well. And protected provisions. We will discuss tomorrow, just for another update. So just to round that off. Okay, thank you very much. I'm going to move on then to item 10. Where we've got I think, just a few updates required. Mr. Solomon.

42:28

Thank you, Mr. Allen. So just a few updates in relation to our Condi. Firstly, in relation to our condemned manner. The applicants response to West Sussex County Council, in their day to submission suggested that the viewpoint photography have been completed. So can we just confirm when the actual additional viewpoints will be submitted on that is that deadline part?

42:57

And so on behalf of the applicant? Yes, that's correct. Great,

43:01

thank you. And then just in relation to Brighton and Hove City Council's answer to ESA being questions one, he 1.7 with reference to the magnitude of change in effect upon Eastcliff conservation area. And the bandstand just wanted to confirm that the applicant will be responding to that on a deadline for

43:31

Yes, that's correct. Yeah.

43:33

Right. That's That's it.

43:39

Okay. Does anybody have any matter they want to raise before I draw this hearing to a close? No one in the room? Online. Okay. If there's no other relevant business, I'll remind you that the timetable for the examination requires the parties provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline for which is Monday, the third of June. I can also close on the fact that there will be questions going out as part as a rule 17 Next week primarily to Natural England as a result of these hearings today. Can I also remind you that that that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectors website as soon as practicable following this closer this hearing just leads me to on behalf of the examining authority. I want to thank all the parties involved the applicant, local authorities, statutory bodies, interested parties and others for their participation at these hearings. They are long days appreciate there's a lot of material that needs to be covered. And I think that many of our initial questions and clarify points. Okay. verification points will have been answered. So thank you very much for that. Should there be any further questions to be asked? We will do this outside of Natural England as I just mentioned, written questions which further written questions which will be on Tuesday the 18th of June. With responses due on deadline five, Tuesday, the ninth of July, Tuesday, the 18th to June will also be the publication of the E x as changes to the DCO. And the release there will be published on those dates as well. So once again, can I also say that to the next event is the compulsory acquisition hearing, which starts tomorrow at 930 in this room, and then continues on Tuesday, the 21st of May in the Leonardo hotel, I believe we've got to switch venues. So and the agenda for that has been published, and no doubt. We'll hope to see you all then. So once again, thank you very much for attending today. We'll consider all of your responses carefully. And it will inform the examining authorities decision, as I say whether it's a right to issue further questions. So thank you very much. The time has just gone. Quarter past five I believe I win the sweepstake and this hearing is now closed. Thank you