

TRANSCRIPT_DRAXBECES_ISH3_SESSION 1_22032023

00:24

Okay, good morning and welcome, everybody. Before we begin, can I just ask that everyone can hear me clearly?

00:32

But can I just also confer with Mr. Harrell that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced?

00:39

Thank you. For those people who are watching on the live stream, can I just advise you that should we wish to adjourn at any point, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. And as a result at the point which we commence and restart, you do need to refresh your browser page. I'll remind you of this, should we need to adjourn. It's now 10 o'clock and it's time for this hearing. To begin. I would like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing, which is issues specific hearing three on environmental matters in relation to the application made by Drax power limited, who we will refer to as the applicant for an order granting development consent for the Drax, bioenergy with carbon capture and storage project.

01:24

Thank you all for attending this meeting today. My name is Caroline Jones. I'm a chartered town planner and I'm a planning inspector employed by the planning Inspectorate and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for levelling up housing and communities to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm now going to ask my fellow panel members to introduce themselves.

01:46

Good morning. My name is Ben Northover, I'm a chartered architect and have been appointed to be a member of the panel to examine this application.

01:54

So together we both constitute the examining authority for this application and we will be reporting to the Secretary of State with a recommendation as to whether the development consent order should be made.

02:05

The case manager for the project is George Harold and he is being supported here today by a tiller boss, we have spent so Vironment providing support remotely, please don't hesitate to contact a member of the team if you need help, either at today's event or with the technology.

02:21

This is a blended event and it comprises an in person meeting as well as being held on the Microsoft Teams platform. It has been both live streamed and recorded. For those people observing or participating through teams in order to minimise background noise, could we please ask that you stay muted unless you are speaking today. If you are participating virtually and you wish to speak at the relevant point in the proceedings, please just use the hand up function. But please be patient because we might not get to you immediately. But we will invite you to speak at an appropriate time. Alternatively, please turn on your camera so that we can see that you wish to speak.

02:55

And I also remind people that the chat function on teams will not work. So please don't try to use this to ask any questions or post comments. If you don't want me to ask any questions or raise your point at the relevant time, there is an opportunity at the end of the meeting for you to raise and it and the agenda and any other matters.

03:14

Because the digital recordings that we make are retained and published, they do form a public record that can contain your personal information, and to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. The planning inspectors practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's meeting, it is important that you understand that you will be live streamed and you will be recorded. But if you don't wish your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. For those in the room who don't want to be recorded. That is an area out of camera shot.

03:52

If you do feel that personal information is necessary, please provide this in a written document so that we can redact that before publication. Does anyone have any questions with regards to this matter?

04:04

I shall move on. And I'll just deal with a few preliminary matters for those who are attending here in person today. Could everyone please ensure that all devices on mobile phones are switched to silent? I'm not aware of any fire alarm tests or drills today. So in the event that the fire alarm does go off, please exit by the doors at the back. We aim to take a short break today at around 1130 And we'll break for lunch at around 1pm If it appears that we need to continue beyond this time. For those of you are participating virtually, you will need to ensure that your cameras and microphones are turned off during that break.

04:39

I have been informed that we do have people here today who wish to film the event. If any individual or groups wish to use social media report, film or record during today's meeting, or any subsequent hearing, then they are free to do so. But please can you do this responsibly and with proper consideration for other parties? It mustn't be disruptive and the material mustn't

05:00

I'll be misused. Does anyone have any questions on this matter?

05:09

Okay, the meeting today is going to follow the agenda as published on the sixth of March. It would be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you. The agenda is for guidance only and we may add other considerations or issues as we progress today. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made, and all questions asked and responded to. But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritise matters and defer other matters to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the question today, or need more time to get the information, then please just indicate that you need to respond in writing.

05:45

Thank you. I'm now going to hand it over to Mr. Northover to go through introductions.

05:51

I'm now going to ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to introduce yourselves. When I state your organization's name. Could you introduce yourself stating your name who you represent and which agenda item you wish to speak? Please could you also state how you wish to be addressed a Mr. Mrs. Miss on this?

06:10

For the purposes of the recording, it will be enormously beneficial to us if each time you speak throughout the hearing, you could state your name and if you're representing someone whom it is you represent. I'm going to start with the in the room with us. Can I start with the applicant and any of their advisors please?

06:31

Good morning. My name is Richard Griffiths partner at Pinsent, Masons LLP solicitors for the applicant. And to my right is Matthew Fox associates at Pinsent Masons.

06:43

At the table this morning, I have to my immediate right after Mr. Fox, Beth and takut Jones, on top of recipe technical director on air quality. Next to her is Philip Peterson, also from WSOP, technical director on ecology. And next to him is Mr. Stewart Island, from WFP, technical director on ecology. We also have the from the applicant, Mr. Jim Doyle, who's the planning and consensus manager, and Mr. Chris summers, technical manager for operations. We obviously have other experts for the rest of the agenda, which I can go through now, or introduce them at the start of each topic.

07:25

I'll hand it if the if there's people who you anticipate will be speaking, it would be worth introducing them now. Right. So we also have he'll be anticipated be speaking at agenda item.

07:40

For on design, landscape and visual considerations, Mr. Graham Lee, technical director at WSOP. And online virtually, we have Mr. Andrew Williams WSOP, technical director on landscape as well. Then for highways item five on the agenda. We have Mr. Vinnie Holden WSOP, turning technical director for transport, and then on noise and vibration. We have Esteban, almost from the recipe who's associate director on noise. And we also have from WFP Nicola Ashworth, associate director who's a general EIA, who's the general AIA coordinator for the project.

08:23

Like you can we then move on to the organisations which have expressed the wish to speak starting with Sobey District Council

08:36

is that if it's this is actually representing both authorities today. So my name is Kelly Dawson, senior solicitor for North Yorkshire county council. To my immediate right is Jenny Timon, Assistant Principal Planning Officer for Selby District Council. We're also accompanied on today by Jack Hopper, who is a senior environmental health officer for silver District Council and he is available to assist on item number six on the agenda. To my immediate left I'm accompanied by Michael Reynolds, who is senior policy officer for infrastructure for North Yorkshire county council.

09:15

To his left is Julia Casterton, principal ecologist for North Yorkshire county council. So she's here to assist with item three of the agenda.

09:25

To her left is John Wainwright who is the principal at landscape architect for North Yorkshire county council and he is in attendance to assist with item number four of the agenda. We also have present today but not in the room at this moment in time. Paul Roberts highways engineer who is here to assist in that respect of item number five of the agenda

09:57

Thank you, so not until there's North Yorkshire Hunter

10:00

counsel as well. Great. So then national highways police.

10:07

Good morning

10:14

distinct today

10:17

we're here obviously at the request of the inspectorate, the proposers and we are going to be talking about Item five, if required.

10:31

Thank you. And then biofuel watch.

10:35

Katie Brown speaking on behalf by if you're watching to my left my colleague, Mary Dickinson.

10:51

Now, could I ask if there's anyone else in the room today who wishes to speak today? And if if they let me know now, and again, if you could introduce yourself and let us know on which item, agenda item you wish to speak?

11:07

I'm not seeing any hands. Okay. Thank you. Now, if I could move on to virtual attendees, again, if you could introduce yourself and let us know, on a get on which agenda item you wish to speak. Thank you. So starting with

11:23

Mr. Andrew Williams.

11:29

Hi, there. Good morning. So I'm Andy Williams. I'm here representing the applicant with respect to Agenda Item number four.

11:38

Thank you.

11:42

And then we have

11:46

Mr. Harper, and Mr. Roberts from the

11:51

local councils.

11:54

That's correct. Yep.

12:00

And do we have Mr. Hewitt online as well?

12:05

Yes. Good morning, James. Yes, I'm just here as an observer. Thank you.

12:11

Thank you.

12:14

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

12:18

No, this doesn't preclude you from speaking later, if you wish to respond to any comments made by other parties.

12:26

Are there any other comments anyone wishes to make under this agenda item?

12:33

If not, that concludes this item of the agenda. Thank you. I'll hand now hand it back to Mrs. Jones.

12:39

Thank you, I'm just going to briefly explain the purpose of the hearing this morning. This issue specific hearing is being held at the request of the examining authority who wish to explore a number of matters orally in respect to various environmental matters. The purpose of this hearing is for the examining authority to examine the information submitted both by the applicant but also by any interested parties are affected persons. Such matters today relate to biodiversity, design, landscape and visual considerations, highways, noise and vibration. The discussion will enable you to answer any questions that we may have. And to ensure that we have all the information that we need to make our report to the Secretary of State. The questions that we are going to ask today will be focused on those areas where we consider that we need further information. Or we think that the issues of benefits that benefit from examination or really

13:33

just to remind you that the examination is predominantly a written process. And since the first hearings that we had, we did issue our first set of written questions, and received answers from both the applicant and a range of interested parties. Together with numerous written representations and responses to them at deadlines two and three. This has enabled us to obtain a more detailed understanding of various environmental matters. Therefore, the topics on which today's agenda are limited to those aware where we seek to

14:03

the greater level of understanding and to ask questions of clarification or to seek further information from both the applicant and the interested parties present. You will see from the examination timetable that there is a further round of written questions and opportunities for further hearings to be held. If we decide they are needed, we have had the opportunity to consider all those documents submitted at deadline three on the 10th of March and they're now published in the examination library. We are familiar with what you have already submitted to us so you don't need to repeat it any length anything

that you have already put to us in writing. Submissions do carry equal weight, regardless of the format that they are put to us. If you do refer to any documents today. It would be helpful if you can give us the correct examination Library Reference. Please do try to avoid using acronyms as people here might be watching who are not familiar with them as we are.

14:57

Just before we move on to Item three

15:00

I just want to take this opportunity to note that we have had some late submissions to the examination outside of deadlines.

15:07

This is really unhelpful and does lead to significant delays for the examination for the examining authority weeding the submitted material, but also in the management of work required by us and the case team to prepare for publication and other aspects of the examination. We do expect parties to read the examination timetable, please do note what information is required by which deadline and please prepare and submit those before 2359 On the date that specified additional submissions on deadlines will be accepted at the discretion of the examining authority for late submissions will most likely not be accepted into the examination unless we make an exception.

15:47

Does anyone have anything they wish to raise on what I've just outlined?

15:54

If not, that concludes this item of the agenda. And we will move to Item three, which is biodiversity.

16:05

Can I just start by asking the applicant in the first instance if the

16:10

the updated air quality assessments that Natural England are expecting is that the same information that's been presented in the air quality technical note submitted a deadline to

16:24

Richard Griffiths on behalf of the applicant? Yes, that is correct. That's right. And so they have a they have a copy of that. So naturally Natural England to have a copy of that information and are currently reviewing that information. And we understand there'll be looking to respond at deadline for with our views on that additional information. The applicant is obviously constantly in discussions with them to answer any other questions, but it's their current reviewing that additional information that that is before the examination. That's helpful to know thank you. And I'm now just going to ask the applicant if they could summarise their current position, including any information that you have on your ongoing discussions with Natural England, on the position on your position on both internationally and nationally designated sites on the matters outlined in the agenda. So in the first instance, if we could start with

functionally linked land, and I believe that the outstanding matters relating to that relate to the Humber estuary, SAC, the SPE and Ramsau. And I think this relates to the additional land that came in as part of the change request and Natural England don't consider that there's enough information to rule out the likelihood of significant effects at this moment in time,

17:38

which is grievous on behalf of the applicant that is correct the as you will have seen from the standard common ground with Natural England, Natural England and are agreed that in terms of the off site habitat provision area, they agree that that provision area will not lead to

17:57

effects significant effects on qualifying interests on the national network European sites. So the outstanding addition information that we've now provided to Natural England relates to work number eight, which is the part of the change application which involves the overhead line undergrounding of the overhead line and telecommunications line. Naturally, it has that information and are currently reviewing that information. So we have no update as to where they've got to on that. I would just

18:29

highlight to the planning authority that the as we've highlighted in previous submissions, the applicant has been in discussions with the Undertaker's for the overhead line telecommunications regarding the undergrounding, we've now have a detailed design for the undergrounding and that involves less land requirements required for those works. So we're now

18:54

having done that detailed design, we're just confirming the reduction in land necessary for those works with the statue Undertaker's with a view to potentially own and most likely to submitting a change application to reduce the area of land, which has I'm raising it now because it links into the functioning links land, which, whilst that's not for Natural England, will, once you've had confirmation from the statue Undertaker's will then go before Natural England to help them with their assessment on the functioning league land. So there will be an application most likely coming for you to reduce that land area.

19:32

Thank you, Mr. Griffith. Do you have any timescales when that's likely to come before us?

19:41

We anticipate

19:43

hopefully when we get confirmation from the statue Undertaker's that will make the application by mid April

19:49

but as that stands that a reduction in land, so that would involve a reduction in in land I would just say though, that the compulsory acquisition where

20:00

coalition's will be invoked, because they, there'll be an increase, not in the red line, there'll be a reduction, the red line, but there'll be a step up in rights being sought to acquisition of a of a right to actually to enable the the, the the work to take place. It's actually the increase in writers actually relating to the highway, so it's not on third party land up the highway and the undergrounding element. So there will be the moment anyway, the proposed acquisition regulations will be invoked. So we have to build that into the timetable. But as I say, it's on the whole, it's reduction in the actual land area, and particularly in relation to the functional link land.

20:44

And obviously, I can't say anything, because it's our discretion as to whether we would accept such a change. But what I would obviously recommend is that you go back to our previous advice, when you notified us of a potential change requests coming the free in the previous time, please do have a look at that. And what we would require as part of that, to make sure that you have the time to do everything that is required of you

21:08

reach agreement on behalf Yeah, because Absolutely. And I mean, it's a positive step forward, because we now we have detailed designs of how the undergrounding of the overhead lines, and the communication line can be done. So the applicants will not work with the Undertaker's in question, to enable the reduction. So that's why we're in terms of the triggering of DCA regulations, post acquisition regulations. That's why we're looking at mid April, from our calculations that will give us sufficient time to deal with the relevant relevant advertisement, and to comply with those regulations in terms of the purpose of this hearing that's not before you. So in terms of the question of the functioning link land. The outstanding issue between us and Natural England relates to work number eight, they have the extra information relating to the current design, and they're currently reviewing that.

21:57

Thank you. I just have Mr. Peter, Peter. Phillip Peterson just has an extra point to make in respect to that. Thank you. Thank you, madam. Philip Peterson WSOP for the applicant. Yeah, it was just a minor clarification. The function in link land query relates to the SBA and the rams are Humber estuary, not the SEC, because it's the bird qualifying interests which are not relevant to the SEC. Thank you.

22:29

Okay, before we move on, does anybody else in the room have anything that they wish to do add with relation to functioning link land?

22:39

Okay, I'll move on to impacts of acid deposition. Correct me if I've got the wrong ones. I've got the lower do and valley SAC and ramsau and then the Barnhill meadows, Brayton. Meadows, DOE and NGS Melbourne and Thornton, NGS triple si in relation to acid deposition, is that correct? Melbourne faults

and things I wouldn't say was directly relevant because we don't believe I've exceedances for that site. Okay. But I think and have raised I think that's just a minor clarification. The cloud okay. Yeah.

23:16

Otherwise, yes, I believe that's the correct list. Yes. That's still under discussion.

23:22

I think in relation to this matter, Natural England have requested updates to the HRA required requiring referencing to site specific considerations and relevant conservation objectives. Does the most recent and HRA include include that?

23:41

Philip Peterson, Ws p for the applicant? Yes, that's correct. So there are a number of updates that have been made in the habitats regulations assessment report itself. And then in addition, there are particularly key sections of assessment and appendices seven and eight to the HRA report. Now, we could use up appendices, appendices seven, and eight.

24:05

If you want the reference number, which refers to the applicant, Appendix seven is wrapped to hyphen 107.

24:13

And appendix eight

24:15

is I thought I had it in my notes. Sorry.

24:22

I'll just get that for you.

24:35

So yes, so appendix seven relates to the River Derwent SAIC, and so additional habitat assessment work that we completed

24:44

in relation to comments and requests from Natural England relating to critical loads and proxy habitats that can be modelled for nitrogen deposition. And appendix eight is analysis of long term soil and habitat monitoring data gathered by Natural England for

25:00

will brighten Meadows triple Si, which is an underpinning triple OSI of the lower dough and valley SOC and also overlaps with the Ramzan boundary.

25:12

So I'm positive that appendix eight is rep three hyphen 009.

25:19

Really helpful. Thank you.

25:23

Is there anything else that you can update us with with regards to any ongoing discussions with Natural England in relation to acid deposition?

25:31

Phillip Peter, some for ws p for the applicant. Just I just highlight that correspondence is still ongoing. And we responded to some we know that they're reviewing the information and we responded, some clarity, some clarification requests that they sent us this morning. So we understand that they are still seeking to come back for deadline for Okay, thank you, which gives us some pop up because I think it's worth highlighting as well that you would, as you have seen from the submissions, made that various

25:59

African has been able to readjust its assessment based on

26:06

reducing essay to emissions and the increasing the temperature of exhaust pollution, which has led to further reductions, those mitigation measures will be secured in the environmental permits. And that has led to SSA reductions in the acid deposition impacts. And so we're now there are two areas of that we're discussing Natural England which is a thorn, more SAIC and the lower Darent Valley SAIC ramps

26:31

to Eris now funded by natural England's views on our position, which is of course, there's no adverse effect on the integrity of those sites. Thank you.

26:44

Rich, because I'm part of Africans. And, and to be clear as well, that we're talking about in prospective all European sites on our own, there are no

26:55

adverse effects on the integrity. We're talking about the two international sites I mentioned.

27:01

Relation to the in combination with other plans and projects. So with those the two areas that are now under discussion, which hopefully will which Greenwood Natural England on shortly, thank you for that.

27:15

I'm sorry,

27:17

Peterson for that we're gonna get and yeah, just to clarify, to clarify for the impacts of the project alone, because we are below the 1% screening threshold that's used in these assessments. So we're stopping the assessment for those sites for the project alone at the screening for likely significant effects stage because we're below that relevant screening criteria. So we, we we don't get to the adverse effect on integrity step we stop at the screening stage, but the outcome is in effect. Okay. Thank you very much.

27:45

Okay, before we move on, does anyone have anything that they would like to add on acid deposition?

27:53

Okay, in that case, I will move on to the impacts of nitrogen deposition. And again, I have the ribbon River Derwent sack, which I guess is the same answer in relation to appendix seven that kind of does that contain the same information? Phillip Peterson for the applicant? Yes, that's correct. So just relates to identifying proxy habitats for nitrogen deposition for the river diamond. Okay. And then in terms of the thorn more sack, again, this was where they naturally will have agree that the contribution is is small.

28:32

But it's already exceeded in in combination. And I think they have concerns that there's a restore conservation objective for air quality at this at this sac. Is that correct?

28:43

Yep, that's correct. Yep. And as Mr. GRIFFIS has said, we are, we're still in discussions and Natural England. But we have put additional information in to the latest iteration of the HRA report, just to clarify further information and to draw out some of the existing the reductions in acid deposition against previous previous historic highs. And we've also added some additional information in relation to their request relating to how we've used species and habitat specific research relating to the effects of nitrogen deposition on plant communities and habitats. And then terms of how those them respond to doses of nitrogen. So there's additional information in this iteration of the HRA report. Okay. That's an HRA. And obviously that relates to the to the two sacks in terms of they have the similar concerns, don't they over Thorne Crowl and Google mu is triple si and the river do and triple si where's that information is that so foreign Crowl and Google malls triple Si. There are no features of the triple OSI that are more sensitive than the features assessed, or the European site the degraded raised bog habitat. So we're looking at the same setup again the same critical load is being used for both sites. So So in essence, our assessment

30:00

would be the same for the information that's contained within the HRA report. But it relates to the Triple S. Yeah, this the features of interest are that there are additional features that are in the triple si designation that are not in the sack qualifying interests. Yeah. But those features are of no greater sensitivity or have lesser sensitivity done the features that we've assessed. Okay. Yes, I see. Okay, thank you, and Natural England, have requested that monitoring is carried out of nitrogen deposition. And they've suggested that this could be secured by way of a

30:34

requirements. Can the applicant tell us whether they think that would be appropriate or if that can be done?

30:45

Okay, Philip Peterson for the applicant. So yeah, we we've noted natural England's request on this, and the applicants through the environmental permit, we'll be completing monitoring of emissions from the main stack, which is, which is something that is already in place for Drax power station, and would would continue

31:07

the parts of natural Lincoln's request that you're perhaps referring to as they've also made reference to monitoring the relevant assessment criteria for acid deposition, nitrogen deposition? Yeah, that's my understanding. Yeah, I think there's this there's two separate, as far as I am understanding what they're saying is they want to separate monitoring and monitoring of the emissions from the stack, which I was gonna come on to in a second anyway. But they also are suggesting monitoring at the individual sites, I think is That's my understanding. Yes. So we've responded, I think on this two or three times now in in various of our responses to written questions. I think 1.27 of our responses to the first written questions, I believe covers this matter in some detail. To the best of our knowledge, there are no available survey techniques or analytical techniques that would allow us to detect the contribution from backs, or from backs and the other plans and projects that we've assessed cumulatively in our in combination assessment. And to in any way reliably separate that from background deposition.

32:17

There's also considerable variation between years between months between days in terms of how deposition plays out, it's very heavily influenced by weather conditions. And it's also in terms of deposition, deposition monitoring, you just can't really, practically do it in this context.

32:39

So it's not that you can't monitor it, it's the fact that you wouldn't be able to monitor it and assign that to something coming from this project, for example, is that is that what you're trying to say?

32:51

Dr. Bassinger, ticket Jones for WSOP for the applicant? No, actually, there is no

32:58

monitor that could be classed as a deposition monitor. Okay, that you could not go out there with a monitor and say this is the deposition that that just does not exist now. It's actually

33:10

have any discussions with Natural England on this matter take taking place. So if this suggesting it, have they then if you I'm presuming you have have told them the same information have have? What's their response to that?

33:25

Obviously, it would be more helpful if they were here in the room with us, but unfortunately, they're not. So

33:30

Philip Peterson was p for the applicant. So we haven't had a direct response from Natural England on that point as yet. But we would imagine that that is included in their deadline for response. So they haven't and we're seeking, we're seeking to have further engagement with them directly on that point. Okay. So they haven't actually said to you, this is how you do it. Now, which groups on path applicants are things worth noting, of course, that that comment, that

33:56

request was made before they'd seen the updated air quality information, which obviously concludes, which as some, we conclude that there won't be any adverse effects. And if they accept that, if they agree with us on that are comfortable, then it may well be they then say actually, because we now comfortable with that assessment, and that the additional information you provided, we don't need that extra monitoring. So I think it's we have to wait for them to reach their conclusions on the additional information, which hopefully you will receive a deadline for. And then it may be that their requests drops away anyway. But obviously you've heard the the our experts here saying that there are two reasons why we can't do it while you haven't got the equipment, but be on our own, we are imperceptible and therefore you won't be able to ascertain what contribution backs we actually have on those European sites. Thank you. I understand your position on that. Thank you.

34:47

Does anybody have anything else they would like to raise on the impacts of nitrogen deposition?

34:54

And OKC Brown for biofuel watch. We're just concerned that there's no mention of

35:00

uncertainty in the, in the modelling. So we'd like to ask

35:05

Natural England to consider uncertainties in the modelling, if we've already got loads that are exceeding critical loads. And there's there's no mention of uncertainty, which where there's an acknowledgement there always is uncertainty. So to look at the potential impacts of those uncertainties, not something we'd like to Natural England to ask the applicant, what he's done was run by uncertainty. Do you mean like worst case scenario? Is that you mean, worst case scenario? Yeah.

35:39

We haven't got Natural England here to respond to you right now. But I will ask the applicant if they would like to respond to that point. Thank you Rich, Grievous on behalf of the applicant.

35:48

We have taken certainty into account. It's inherently built into our modelling.

35:53

And we have responded to biofuels comments on this, that, unfortunately, that part of their response was inadvertently missed in the deadline to submission.

36:03

Deadline, three submissions sorry, that we made. That's why the updated documents that we submitted, maybe, except it was late. We want to pretend it did respond to biofuels comments. And that was the only amendment to that to our comments. There was any update to that document was the additional information in response to biofuels.

36:26

Observations on uncertainty, that information will be submit that documented deadline for see we'll see the applicant on uncertainty, we have taken uncertainty into account.

36:39

Miss Brown, is there anything you would like to come back on?

36:44

Now? Thank you.

36:49

Okay, just moving on to impacts of ammonia. And again, this relates to this form Marsac.

36:56

Has that information been is that again, information that's been provided in the most the latest version of the HRA

37:04

Philip Peterson, Ws p for the applicant? Yes, that's correct. And so just to summarise that information that's in the HRA report. With the revisions to the air quality modelling as set out in air quality, technical note to

37:20

that is there are now no exceedances of the 1% screening threshold significance criteria for ammonia for any site. And that's alone or in combination.

37:34

Thank you.

37:36

technical note, too, is just in case it helps with your notes is wrapped to hyphen 065.

37:44

Thank you.

37:47

And again, I think Natural England have suggested monitoring of ammonia at these sites as well as is the answer the same for ammonia as it is for nitrogen deposition?

38:01

Let's take a chance WFP the applicant? You can you can measure ammonia in the in the atmosphere. But you do still it would still be near impossible to identify the contribution that Drax was making to the background levels of ammonia that you're talking about several orders of magnitude lower contribution from Drax than the background would be.

38:30

Is there any way if the aerial emissions are being monitored as part of the environmental permit? Is there any way of linking linking the two together if you were measuring ammonia at individual sites? Is there any way of linking the two so you are monitoring aerial emissions? And if there was an increase from them, for example, and that correlated to an increase up the protected sites would?

38:51

Not? You would you? The best way to do that would be through through modelling as well. But maintain the problem that the levels of uncertainty in the measurements in the ambient air and the contribution from Drax your those variations are too small to be able to detect against each other.

39:12

And I should emphasise that the

39:14

majority of ammonia concentrations in our relate to agricultural emissions and they are themselves subject to huge fluctuations on a day by day basis or a week by week basis and seasonally so detecting anything against that background variation would be impossible. Okay, thank you that's helpful.

39:35

Does anyone else have anything that you wish to raise on impacts of ammonia

39:44

Okay, I think we've probably already covered the proposed mitigation for area emissions but perhaps it's something you could just talk me through if this is think what Natural England have suggested that this is them.

39:57

They weren't monitoring of all pollutants it probably

40:00

Because the last two agenda items of this, of this section, actually.

40:05

But you're telling me that that is going to form part of the environmental permit? Could you just explain that to me and how that's going to work?

40:15

Well, I'll start off and if I get any

40:18

other think anyone was added, and they can in terms of

40:23

the proposed operational mission statement for air emissions, and Natural England have confirmed as you recede in rep, rep hyphen, zero to zero, the draft and a common ground Natural England, they agree that the methods for securing that

40:43

that are monitoring is an environmental permit variation. And that that's how Drax already monitors its pollutants from the through the environmental permitting process. So our position is that we shouldn't duplicate, as you'll be aware from the national policy statements, so that technology, and the requirement to monitor that will be secured in the variation, as it already is in the current environmental permit. So the only area that we are actively discussing with Natural England in terms of monitoring is in relation to the access to protected sites. And as you've already heard our position on that, and we'll continue discussing that with them. Are there anything else that anyone wants to add to my statement? Do you know the details of that monitor? I'm just wondering if it's something that you could submit to us to explain, so that we've got something in writing that sort of tells us how often you do how often the environmental permit will require you to do that? Yes. So Jim Doyle, on behalf of the applicant, so actually has a series of monitors in place, monitoring things like sulphur dioxide emissions, NOx, emissions, particulates, ammonia.

41:55

And that's measured by what are called continuous emissions monitoring systems, or Sims.

42:02

Those systems are monitoring second by second, and Drax submits to the Environment Agency each month, a report which identifies the

42:16

data that's been derived from those Sims. And that's, that's, that's drafted and sent him on agency to demonstrate compliance with the limits which are within within the environmental permit.

42:30

Okay, thank you. And then that will just continue. But the variations you'll just be required. That's correct. monitor any new pollutants that would arise out of the carbon capture? Indeed, okay.

42:43

Let's take a chance W SP, for the applicant. I'm just emphasising that the instruments that Drax use, they're subject to regular calibration as well. And that's in accordance with the requirements for the M certs accreditation for their instruments.

43:00

Thank you. Apologies if that is already in the examination. If I haven't seen it, is that something that either you can tell us where it is? Or if it isn't, if you could submit to us, please reach crews on the applicant, the environmental permit is in the existing environmental permit is submitted into the examination. And I'm just trying to find the reference to it. It's an appendix to one of our submissions. So in terms of the EP infomentor permit, with that requirement with the comment to monitor, you have it before you

43:32

in terms of anything else that we can observe that you may want us to explain how we

43:38

carry it out, as we just verbally thinks that that's the first helpful it was helpful. It's the first I've heard of it. If it is there, I haven't read it but maybe something if you could put in in writing, we can certainly put put something together which will explain how the monitoring is likely. Yeah, thank you.

44:03

Okay, does anybody have anything else they wish to read on them? Oppose mitigation for aerial emissions or monitoring of pollutants?

44:20

Before we move on,

44:23

this, this could potentially be the last hearing that that we have in relation to this topic. At the minute is, naturally we do have an outstanding concern from Natural England that they can't rule out an adverse effect on integrity. And obviously, as I was writing a report, that may leave us in a position if there has been no agreement, obviously, we are required to take a precautionary approach were protected habitats. If we don't make progress on this on Natural England. Where does that leave us in making our recommendation

45:00

Which group is on behalf? The applicants mean, first of all?

45:05

With our communications with Natural England, we're hopeful that we will actually reach agreement with them. But obviously, we haven't got there so analysing the data, and we'll have to wait, their response to that. In anticipation, though, can we totally accept the predicament you might be in if we, if we still are discussing this, and they require further information over the coming months to reach the conclusion, that doesn't help you. So what we're also starting to do preparing the background is a without prejudice derogation case,

45:38

just in case we don't reach agreement with Natural England, that's when purely our precautionary approach, because we fully expect hopefully to reach that agreement with Natural England based on the additional information we have provided to them. But appreciate the time the six month examination process your requirements to write reports and taking the precaution principle into account. So we have started in the background, considering that case, it would be if we did have to submit it because we unfortunately haven't reached agree with Natural England, it would be obviously without prejudice to the applicants position, which you could of course, concludes you agree with. And we would aim to submit that

46:16

Hungary precise time, it always depends on where Natural England land next week on our submissions, but we would aim to submit that in sufficient time, so you can consider it and ask questions on that derogation case and obviously invite the parties to also consider it as well. Yeah, that would be my request that it is submitted a deadline that allows the parties to at least comment on that before the close of the examination,

46:39

which agree with some of the options. Absolutely. And we would commit to that. Hence, we've already

46:44

despite the additional information, which is Natural England, have also just in case,

46:50

they don't respond in time or require more information from us preparing that delegation without prejudice derogation case now. So that if we have to submit it, it's in good time to the examination. Okay. Thank you very much for that.

47:04

I think that's all the questions that I had on internationally and nationally designated sites to James Brown, did you have something you'd like to say?

47:13

Yeah, Katie Brown for bio thought, if you watch apologies, or possibly should have mentioned this under the nitrogen section, it was a question for Natural England from the rep 3021 questions. And they've made them a comment.

47:33

It's in relation to the AMI modelling and nitrogen deposition. And they say assuming the Environment Agency has no major concerns with the specifics of the modelling. So we wanted to ask Natural England if they could ask the Environment Agency whether that is the case that they don't have any concerns with the modelling. And whether they followed the environment agency's golden rule that screening model results must be higher than the detailed modelling results. And the details modelling results must be validated for VET representative situations.

48:08

And whether the ADMS five modelling of eight Amys and nitrosamines have been validated representative situations, and if not why they've not been validated before the application was submitted. And we'll put that in writing. Thanks.

48:26

Thank you that would be most helpful with the applicant like to respond to any of those points before we move on.

48:36

Ridge groups on behalf the applicants, we've responded to

48:40

that in our bath, your watch representation, which we'll come a deadline for, and the socg with natural draft socg with environmental agency, refers to them agreeing in principle to the approach that we've adopted in the assessment. And the ADMS. A Marine chemistry module is an accepted way of assessing

48:59

assessing reactions. So I say we've responded in writing to to bar if you're watching, you'll see that a deadline for

49:08

Thank you.

49:12

Screw some help. If it helps the permit. We found the reference to it. The vomiter permit is at rep to iPhone 066. But we've noticed an action to explain how we then

49:28

comply with that permit in terms of aerial emissions. That'd be helpful. Thank you.

49:37

Okay, I'm going to move on to protected species. This is just the short one really just asking again for an update. I think Natural England states in their deadline to submission that they are aware that further

budget surveys have been carried out but then I think in your deadline three submission you state that there are no further budget surveys.

49:58

Phillip Peterson W

50:00

SP for the applicant? Yep, that's correct. We have spoken to naturally and on that point and just clarified our joint understanding just to confirm to them that we haven't been completing any additional surveys and that we're operating on the baseline, as submitted into the Prudential appendix. So not many people have seen it, but at the survey information that was submitted with the application, okay, so hopefully get an update from Natural England on that matter at their deadline for them. Yes, I understand from conversations with them, that they would be confirming that. Okay, that's all I had actually on, on that, on that matter. Does anybody else have anything they they wish to raise on protected species? Yes. Ms. Brown? Yeah. Katie Brown for biofuel watch. Yeah, just on the issue of badgers. Obviously, there's this day of a data isn't released. But the does, it's not sufficient to say that they'll comply with

50:53

you know,

50:55

relocate and there needs to be specified, where they're going to be relocated to, and that this habitat is suitable, and a clear plan for this to take place outside of the breeding season. They are a protected species. And it's not enough to just say that they'll there'll be moved.

51:17

The applicant like to respond on that perhaps it would be helpful if you could let us know on any licences that you may need to,

51:27

to have granted for this as well.

51:30

So Philip Peterson, WFP, for the applicant. So at the present time, our survey data, combined with our understanding, I'm sure, I'm not going to refer to site specific locations, because you know, you don't Germany report public locations of badges sets in, in public forums.

51:49

But our survey information combined with our current expectations for site clearance and understanding with the in terms of the audit limits, are that we wouldn't be completing any activities that would require a licence to be obtained.

52:06

So that's on the basis of where the sets are now, and where works will be undertaken.

52:14

Now, it's common sense that in, in some instances, wild animals will move around. That is what they do, unfortunately, sometimes.

52:25

And that's why licencing mechanisms do exist in the event that a new set is established subsequently to the examination, that would then need to be licenced could need to be obtained under those circumstances, in order to allow a set to be closed, if that was unavoidable and absolutely necessary.

52:46

And what measures have you got within the within the application to to monitor that as you're, as you are constructing the project, so Phillip Peterson for the applicant again, so the pre construction surveys that are specified, and the timings of which in our agreed with Natural England,

53:06

they would allow us to reconfirm the status of badges prior to site clearance, vegetation clearance, construction works commencing, and then that would update the baseline to allow us to make a decision on whether a licence wasn't needed. From experience, I would say it was relatively unlikely based on where sets are now. But from experience, I would also say that you cannot absolutely entirely predict the behaviour of wild animals. And that is that is just a function of ecology,

53:33

which give us some party applicants and it's secured. These timing, the timing of these pre commencement pre construction batch surveys are secured through a register of environmental commitments. The Riak, which is at item, a reference ID, e three,

53:51

which identifies when the timings which is at least seven months in advance of site clearance, and then a further survey will be completed one week prior to site clearance. As Mr. Pearson said that's been agreed with Natural England. And then that in turn is secured. That commitment is secured in the as set out in the Riak in requirement 14, which is the construction environmental management plan.

54:22

Thank you. Let's move on. Does that answer some of your questions?

54:26

Yeah.

54:28

Thank you.

54:32

Okay, does anybody else have anything they wish to raise in relation to protected species?

54:39

Okay, in which case, I will move on to

54:44

biodiversity net gain, and I just wondered if the applicant could just briefly summarise the key changes in the most recent submitted

54:55

by diverse net gain which are now referred to as the NG bng assessment.

55:04

Philip Peterson WSOP for the applicant. So there's a small number of key changes to the latest iteration of the bng report.

55:16

The first one I would highlight is that we now refer to the detail of how we're anticipating achieving 10% biodiversity net gain for rivers and streams.

55:26

We've been in discussion with the caldron called rivers trust in relation to supporting habitat enhancement works on the blackbrook that they are intending to carry out. That would enable us to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain in relation to rivers and streams, which, which is, as has been the main thing we've been investigating in recent months in relation to bng.

55:49

The other main change I'd point to is following the government's response to the consultation on biodiversity net gain, and specifically in relation to end sips and the development consent or the process. We've lined the modelling in the latest iteration of the bng reports, the calculations, and that now aligns in terms of how we've treated the habitat provision area. So the onsite habitat provision area that is within the order limits that had previously been included in the off site, part of the biodiversity metric. And that has now been included in the on site, part of the biodiversity metric, which aligns with the consultation response and aligns with natural England's advice.

56:33

Great, thank you answered quite a few of my questions I have written down here in terms of the river, the river bng, I think naturally, deadline two, will concern that sort of neither scenario achieve net gain, has that now been corrected in the latest version?

56:54

Philip Peterson again, for the applicant? Yes, in terms of in terms of what it would achieve in terms of the habitat interventions and what they would deliver, yet we've had dance input from Natural England via their discretionary Advice Service, confirming that, yes. Okay.

57:14

I'll skip past the next point. You've already answered my question, because it was to do with the the on site weather, the weather, how you'd use that. So you've answered that. Thank you. And in terms of how bng is secured, and it's proposed within the the bng assessment, that that's updated with information obtained during the detailed design stage posts consent, at a point to be agreed with the local planning authorities, I think once the phasing is known,

57:43

and that would include revisiting areas of currently predicted permanent or temporary loss.

57:50

Then the outline landscape biodiversity strategy that also says that the final bng assessment would form part of that. Which which way round? Is it going to come in how's it secured,

58:03

but you gave us on behalf of the applicant. So

58:08

bng, this application is secured in two places effectively. One is the landscape part diversity strategy, which is under quirements, seven. And then also the section one is the draft section 106 agreements that we're currently negotiating with the local authority. So in the draft, and the timing point is covered off in the section 106 agreement to the current draft.

58:34

So I'll just go through the provisions are to help the understanding. So in chapter one of the draft section 106 agreements that is submitted into the examination,

58:46

the applicant must update to the net gain assessment to take account of the detailed design and submit that for approval. And when we do that, is we agree that timing following the council's approval of the phasing plan, which is required under requirement to so once you've agreed the phasing plan, the applicant and the Council must agree when we update the biodiversity net gain assessments

59:12

required under one to six agreements, and then we submit that assessment to the Council for approval. And that has to the the paragraph in the 106 says the timing is that also has to have regard for the landscape of biodiversity strategy under requirement seven of the developed consent order. So effectively.

59:31

Between us, we will agree the phasing plan and requirements who was agreed. Once that's agreed, we then discuss when the right time is for the net gain assessment to be done, which obviously has to have regard to the detailed design progress and the landscape and biodiversity strategy. So that's the

net gain assessment can take all that into account to give you the final outcome of the percentage net gain.

59:53

Then the paragraph, paragraph three of Szeged one the one to six then requires us to deliver

1:00:00

The net gain assessment of at least 10% 10%. So you have the 10% secured in the section 106 agreement.

1:00:10

And then they then it goes through where that on the off side habitat provision area, the the onsite habitat provision area. And then it also refers to the

1:00:23

reverse biodiversity net gain as well. And we have to demonstrate in that mission with the net gain assessment, how we're going to secure that net gain, and how we're going to monitor it, and that it's going to be secured for 30 years. So we anticipate alongside our net gain assessment, we'll be delivering to the authorities, evidence of the commercial arrangements that are in place to secure that 30 year management and maintenance of the of the bng.

1:00:51

And the 106 Karazhan, to talk about when the bng is actually delivered. And there are two triggers, depending on the location, the bng. And it's either got to be delivered prior to commencement, or prior to the end of the construction period.

1:01:07

Then the so that's that's the mechanism currently the draft 106. So we're still negotiating with the authorities. But that's a pretty advanced draft where we are. And then under requirement seven of the order, the landscape and biodiversity strategy does include the bng for the on site, habitat, division area and the off site habitat. provisionary, of course, it doesn't cover the rivers bng, because that's outside the trucks ownership. But that in turn is secured by the 106.

1:01:34

Hopefully, that makes sense. There's quite a lot of information there. And I'm just wondering whether there needs to be perhaps an update to the outline, landscaping biodiversity strategy to reflect some of the workers. I think, since the latest iteration of that, it's been quite a lot happened, I think, on this matter, and I'm not quite sure whether it quite ties up with it. I just wondered if there's, it needs a slight update to reflect all of this work that that you've done since?

1:02:07

Yes, we which gives the applicant we Yes, we can commit to doing that. And I suggest Jetline five,

1:02:13

will also be updating the bind bng

1:02:18

assessment as well, to a further iteration of that.

1:02:22

And

1:02:25

we're likely to do that for deadline, five as well. Metric four, is about to be released. I think this on this week on Friday. So we would want to presumably be asked by naturally going to take that into account. So we won't do it for deadline for we'll wait for the metric and and and update it if you can by deadline five. Thank you

1:02:55

Okay, does anybody else have anything that they wish to add on and bng?

1:03:03

Okay.

1:03:09

Okay, just want to move on now to mitigation that's secured in the outline landscape and biodiversity strategy and the register of environmental actions and commitments.

1:03:21

There has been

1:03:23

an update to the wording used in requirement seven of the draft DSU. And that now states that no fees of the authorised development or part of number work I've numbered works, five, six, and eight elements until a strategy for that phase has been submitted but slightly different to the wording that we had before could the applicant just provide us with an explanation of this change and how they see that working in practice?

1:03:50

Mr. Fox on behalf of the applicant, so the idea of the amendments was to kind of link it to the phasing strategies approved under requirement two. So then both we and the local authorities will know what we're thinking in terms of the phasing. And therefore the strategies kind of aligned with that.

1:04:08

Works five, six and eight are a bit separate, because they are quite specific types of works and say, for example, the construction laydown area, it would make sense for there to be a specific strategy for dealing with what's happening on that. Whereas as opposed to the kind of core site where the other works happening, say it was in response to the feedback we had in the last hearings and underwritten

submissions from the local planning authority, but still maintaining the position that, as we said at the last hearings, that there is a possibility that it will come in parts as you your construction methodology, and phasing becomes more known.

1:04:45

It wouldn't be okay. So they've just been one strategy for everything it would update. Okay. And in terms I think the last time when we were discussing this, the way it was worded,

1:04:55

could have meant that we had potentially eight strategies submitted just because of the way had been

1:05:00

Been worded with the changing wording? Does this mean we could still have that number of strategies? Or probably less or potentially more?

1:05:09

Not not more, likely less, because the point is once you know the phasing, you'd be able to then strategize the phasing of your strategy.

1:05:17

Okay. Does the council have anything that you would like to say with the, to the amendments made to this requirement?

1:05:29

It also, for North Yorkshire county council, our preference is still maintained that we would have preferred to see that come through in one strategy.

1:05:38

But we don't object if it did come forward.

1:05:43

Over several, but that that would be our preference.

1:05:48

Okay.

1:05:50

I would add for me, I still have a few concerns about the way it's worded and some of the documents that we have. So if we could just sort of perhaps go through some of these documents, and you can explain to me how it will work in practice.

1:06:01

I think g8 of the register of environmental actions and commitments, which I'm now going to say react, because that is a mouthful.

1:06:12

That stays as strategy would be developed at each stage. So it says there'd be a strategy at pre construction, construction and operation. Does that then conflict with the wording in requirements seven? Or does it mean something different?

1:06:30

Just focus on behalf of the applicant. If you're looking there at the fourth column, in the reorg.

1:06:37

Just bear with me while I get that on my screen.

1:06:45

That's it.

1:06:50

I think at the end of the first paragraph and anything else? Yes, I think we we,

1:06:56

as we'll come to it later, later items in the agenda are going to be doing a review of the Riak to make sure that there is complete consistency. That the fourth column the reason I mentioned that was just because generally through the React, it's supposed to be just kind of a general indication of at what stage it's relevant in a general sense. Yep. But I do notice that first paragraph

1:07:18

says that, we will probably remove that, like this. So there is consistency with the requirement. Okay. Thank you.

1:07:35

And obviously, the outline landscape biodiversity strategy contains

1:07:39

quite a lot of mitigation for different parts of the scheme, how would the council have any certainty? Or how would they know when to expect the schemes for those particular items to come come forward?

1:07:53

Or should some of those should some of them be linked more specifically, within the outline strategy to particular works, I think at the moment, and then the latest update of it, the only the only mitigation that's linked to work is related to the change request, whereas the rest of the way can't read the rest of the

1:08:12

proposal aren't linked to any work. So what I'm trying to find is, how would they how would the council know? Or when would they expect those particular mitigation measures to be coming in? So there's two

aspects to that. So first of all, it's to kind of my mind that it is both landscape and biodiversity here. So it's, there's been things need to be seen together, obviously, some aspects of the strategy perform both functions.

1:08:39

The second aspect is that the requirement does require an implementation timetable. And that would kind of develop as as it came forward. And the third aspect, I said two, and three, is is this linkage to requirement? T. If we know how we're going to be phasing the works, and the strategy is aligned with that phasing, then they'll know that

1:08:59

those aspects that relate to those later phases will come alongside it. Yeah.

1:09:04

And the implementation timetable?

1:09:07

How would that work, then in practice, because if you're submitting the strategy, then in parts,

1:09:14

they wouldn't be at the minute there's no draft implementation, timetable is part of the outline. So again, they still have no certainty as to when those works will be coming forward, or at least an idea of when those works will be coming forward. Should there be an overarching implementation timetable for all of the strategies which give us on top of that begins, we will now start to get into detailed design. And we haven't appointed the contractor of how we're going to bring forward each component of the project. So it's too early to come up with a timetable. That's why we put into requirements seven and implementation timetable. So we fully envisage that as part of our approval process with the authority that we will set out in the in the strategy. So phase one of the strategy for phase one, the project would clearly make it clear how each element of the landscape and each elements of biodiversity will come

1:10:00

Would alongside the work numbers that are relevant to that face. And if we don't provide that sufficient detail the local authority through the mechanism in the order can say we need further information to explain how you're going to implement. And when you're going to say, you're going to when you're going to store that landscape when you're going to store the biodiversity. How can we link it to a particular work number, they can request that information if we don't provide it through the approval process? So it's in their court as well, to see if there was enough information to make that determination. But certainly Marin intention by drafting implementation timetable, we will make that link to, to the work numbers relevant to that face, or phases, depending on how the contractor determines to build backs. So I think the drafting is clear, and as I say the local authority have the ability to stay where they require more information to make that linkage at the time of determination. But I think it's unreasonable now to request us to present timetable together, when we haven't got a contractor on board. That tells us when each component is going to be built, when can we put landscaping and when completed biodiversity? Okay, thank you for that. I think, I think within this strategy, there are some

obvious works which do links for example, I'm going to use this just one example translocating, the the orchids, for example, that is very obviously linked to particular works, and you're going to have to move them aren't you before you do certain works. And I'm just wondering if the the Outland strategy could be updated so that it relates more to the way the requirement is written, because at the moment, the strategy just refers to the submission of a strategy as in a singular strategy. And the way the reax worded, that also indicates that there'll be a strategy. And I just wondered if you're going to do some updates to the outline strategy, or deadline five, whether it could be a little bit more obvious than that strategy, that the intention is for this to come in in parts,

1:11:59

which agree with some policy arguments, we could turn to the example the orchid

1:12:03

that's being relocated to the offsite provision area, and we cannot commence under the section one a six agreement, paragraph six, any works, the offsite provision area must not like

1:12:16

the project must not commence until the offsite provision has been delivered on the off site provision area. So there's clarity there that in respect of the translocation of that example, that has to be done before any, any phase of the project can actually commence. It's not secured in the one to six agreement.

1:12:34

As as Mr. Fox already said, we will I mean, I take the point that

1:12:38

what is each stage mean, that doesn't align with the requirements. So we will align the React wording with the requirement. And we will review the Elbit outline lbs and the react accordingly, to see where we can tighten up the language to make it tie better together to ensure that when you read the requirements when you read the one to six, and when you read the register of commitments, that there are no

1:13:03

outline words that might create confusion. I think it's I think it would be helpful in the way that you've explained it to us today in terms of how you see the phasing work. And I think if that was within the outline, landscape biodiversity strategy, that would be helpful. I think, I think probably what where we've got to is a lot of work has been done since the last iteration of that strategy. And perhaps it could just be tied in a little bit better now. You know, you've got the 106, for example, and how you see the requirement working, I think it could all be tied together to make a little bit more sense.

1:13:35

Yes, we're happy to take that away. We've got we we've taken actions to update the lbs and the registry. And we're allowing will take were viewed holistically for deadline five. Right. Thank you. Is there anything which the council would

1:13:57

like to say on this matter?

1:14:00

Now? Okay, thank you. Is there anybody else in the room? Who would like to raise any issues on this item of the agenda?

1:14:09

Nope.

1:14:12

Okay, is there anything that

1:14:16

would wish to say as a final matter on this before we move on?

1:14:20

Nothing from the app. Thank you.

1:14:23

Okay. Thank you, in which case, I will hand over to Mr. Northover to take a break. Yeah, we'll make

1:14:37

it seems like a good point to take a break actually. So

1:14:42

the times now, quarter past 11. So if we, if we return at 35 past 11. And if I could just remind those watching the live stream that you'll need to refresh your browser before we restart. Okay, thank you.