

# TRANSCRIPT\_DRAXBECES\_ISH3\_SESSION 2\_22032023

00:44

Good morning, and welcome back to this issue specific hearing on environmental matters. Before we begin, can I just confirm that everyone can hear me clearly?

00:54

And can I also confirm with Mr. Herold that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced.

01:02

And we just asked if anyone is filming that you are considerate of others. As mentioned earlier, as we have had a couple of complaints, we've been made aware that some members of the audience don't wish to be filmed. So can I ask that you don't feel anyone in the back seating area. And also, if anyone doesn't wish to be on the Livestream, the back row of the back seating area is out of camera shot.

01:31

Okay, so we'll move on to Item four on the agenda, which is design landscape and visual considerations.

01:40

I'll start with some questions on the parameters and design of the absorber columns. And then I'll come on to landscape matters.

01:50

So I know the applicants response to the summoning authorities first written question TLV 1.4, that the applicant says the maximum height of the absorber columns is 95 metres is lower than the current boiler house. Is this correct? On the Indicative elevations, the maximum parameters of the absorber columns appear clearly higher than the boiler house.

02:18

Kim doll on behalf of the applicant, I think that's an error. So I think it's an error. Yes, I think the absorber columns will sit proud of the of the boiler house. Okay, thank you. So can you confirm how high the existing boiler house is? Yes, the existing boiler house is 76 metres. I will I will double check that but I'm pretty sure it's 76 metres.

02:41

And would that be above ground level or loT? That's above ground level?

02:52

Sorry, and just to confirm, then the maximum parameters 95 metres, that's also above ground level, isn't it? Yes, yes. Yep.

03:09

And could you also clarify the height of the Indicative model of the absorber columns that's used in the photo montages? Is that

03:20

77.8 metres above ground level as per the Indicative elevations?

03:32

For summers drags, the Indicative model is around that 76 metres, but that was mostly at the time so

03:47

and has the design that those photo montages is based on progressed since these were produced

03:53

or is this still an appropriate indicative representation of of the scheme

03:59

for swimmers Drax, they are still a representation of the scheme. So

04:09

do I understand that the absorber columns are designed to maximise the interface between the solvent and the carbon dioxide in the flue gas flue gas are are the maximum parameters there to accommodate the option of either a taller thinner structure or a shorter wider structure in order to achieve an equivalent contact area between solvent and flue gas or is it anticipated that the absorber columns may be developed in detail designed to both maximum width and height?

04:42

bristlenose Drax again the absorber columns are designed like Sir to optimise that contact time with solvent.

04:52

The feeling is where we are now is where they'll probably go through in detail design. The maximum height was

05:00

See

05:01

if there was additional trays within the column needed for that contact time.

05:09

Okay, so sorry, just to clarify when you say where we are now is where we're progressing detailed design. So that's where you are with the Indicative representation of the sign rather than the maximum. Correct. Okay, thank you.

05:25

Does anyone else have any comments or question on the maximum parameters and how these are representative rep represented in the representative views?

05:41

Okay, moving on to some questions about the design approach of the absorber columns.

05:48

One of the fundamental design principles in the Wedel strategy, which the design framework states remains relevant to the overall appearance and perception of the power station is that the core buildings of the power station were designed this large simple building forms with a distinct horizontal and vertical emphasis. The same framework also references the patron novice scheme explains the structures that make up the proposed scheme on the tracks that will be similar in design and scale. The images provided of the patron over absorber column structures in that same framework appear quite visually complex with extra exposed structural and pipework elements relative to the existing larger structures of the track site which are the large simple forms as per the Weddell strategy. So my question for the applicant is, is there a functional need for these what appears to be the structure on pipe work components to be on display externally

06:53

as it appears to be in the metronome scheme, rather than behind some form of side or planting?

07:02

Resource drags

07:04

the design of the the absorber column is sort of like the Expos you could almost call it like an exoskeleton type.

07:12

You add complications once you start boxing structures in.

07:17

Or things like getting paperwork rooms in because the absorber is split into a number of

07:24

tray elements, which has pipework supplies all the elements, then boxing it in as a solid structure just adds complications and issues with that.

07:36

Okay, so those pipework connections they they need to happen throughout the height of the absorber column. Yeah. Yeah. And so that they that can't be

07:50

kind of close in the structure and then that be

07:55

enclosed.

07:57

That's not current in the in the current design. It's, it's kept separate. So the Expos pipe work on them runs?

08:08

And is there a maintenance requirement as well to be able to get to those components from outside? Yeah, crystal has Drax again. Yeah. So in the maintenance regime, they will go in

08:22

on the periodic maintenance regime and inspect each one of their headers. So there's got to be at clear access there which, again, boxing the structure in would cause maintenance issues going forward?

08:36

And is that maintenance done from from a separate crane type structure rather than? Or is it in built into that the design of the scheme that's still being finalised in design, but it's anticipated that there will be like, like small fixed lifting points along with a structure that we'll be able to lift to each one then levels where the injection points

09:06

essentially, as the examining authority, we need to understand how fixed the appearance of these structures is by the by the functional requirements to be to be sure that the applicants take into account both the functionality and aesthetics as much as as much as possible. So, a further question on that the the intent the in

09:31

React Item D one, the

09:37

the proposed colouring of the of the larger structures is referred to and

09:46

is is there a possibility that certain parts of this exposed structure will not be able to be

09:56

have the same colour applied and a resultant kind of pattern

10:00

She appearance of some components that can

10:05

be painted and some that can't

10:09

restore most drugs again, it's anticipated that the majority of the structure and they the absorber column will be colour coded to match the sort of blending with a, the larger buildings behind or the building behind. So that there's going to be very little that will be patchy as you say. So.

10:32

Okay, thank you.

10:35

Moving on to landscaping impact and mitigation.

10:41

The local authorities have raised concern

10:45

in their local impact report and again in their deadline through submission over the incremental erosion of the original landscape design of the main operational area of the past station site. And that this could be continued with a number of minor adverse landscape visual effects associated with the proposed development. Could the applicant provide their position on whether local plan policies specifically policies, SP 15, SP 18, and SP 19 of the Selby district Core Strategy local plan require mitigation of the minor adverse lands landscape effects?

12:09

Richard grieves and puffed up, so could you just repeat the policy references again for me?

12:14

Sorry, SP, 15, SP 18 and SP 19 of the Selby district core strategy, local plan.

12:23

These are referred to by the local authority in their deadline three submission rep three, hyphen 032.

12:46

Which keeps on piling up to kick off.

12:49

I mean, I think the first important point to note is that,

12:54

as the authorities agree that

12:58

in their submission, that there are new significant

13:05

adverse landscape and visual effects. So as you've correctly pointed out, we're now

13:11

talking about minor adverse effects which are therefore not significant.

13:17

Before we head to the local planning policy, we need to obviously the overarching policy is the national policy statements. And the national policy statements.

13:29

Make it clear in section four point in make it clear that

13:37

most if not all, nationally, significant infrastructure projects are going to have a landscape

13:46

and visual effects. Now here we are talking about non significance impact. So we're going even beyond what the National Policy Statement

13:57

states. So we have to put all that into context.

14:02

In terms of the specific policies in

14:05

question, s 15, seeks to promote sustainable development and encourages developments to consider tree planting new woodlands and hedgerows in landscaping schemes to create habitats. Well, I would argue that you've got the landscape and biodiversity strategy in front of you where there is a landscaping proposal,

14:26

which doesn't does more than consider it requires us to put landscaping into the scheme. We have commitments over retained vegetation, where we, in the detailed design have to remove retained vegetation. There's a commitment to reinstate that if we can't put it back in the exactly same place. We will replant elsewhere and that's secured in the lbs and in the React SBA team

14:53

requires the safeguarding and where possible enhancement of the historic and natural environment including landscape

15:00

A character

15:03

specific references made to connectivity mean this is that the applicability of that policy has to be waived in the context of this as an existing power station site. We're not a greenfield site seeking to put a new new power station, we are constrained by the existing site and under the authorities refer to the gradual erosion. Well, that's not the consequence of this scheme. That's a consequence of since 1960s, through the present day of the evolution of a very important asset

15:36

in this area, that of course, has had to go through planning in majority of cases for

15:42

iterations to the power station which have gone before the authority. So whether you agree or not, there's a gradual erosion. The authority has been part of that process for the last 40 odd years. But the applicant does acknowledge that landscaping is important and hence the the work is put into the design framework. And the LPs, it's got to be acknowledged in the context of the existing power station site. And then SP 19 refers to high quality design that has regard to the local area, incorporating new and existing landscaping.

16:20

Into the design, again, yes, we meet that we've got the lbs that incorporates landscaping and commitment to plant

16:29

and to reinstate, which, of course, is also part of our bng process. So I would say that we do meet those policy tests, working in the confines of an existing power station. If there was anything else, my colleagues would like to add to that.

16:45

Jim doll for dress power, just just coming back to a point you've made before. So you mentioned sort of the structures that were in the Wedel plan. And as Mr. GRIFFIS has said, that the power station has evolved significantly, and the XA has the benefit of having seen the power station. There are a number of structures that are now on site, for example, the biomass domes, which aren't which do not conform with the idea of of straight or horizontal lines. There's a co firing system. There's a number of conveyor systems that

17:16

are currently on site. So as Mr. Griffith says, the power station has evolved significantly since the 1960s. And the proposed scheme is designed to fit into the context of the power station as it stands now.

17:30

Thank you, can I ask the local authority if they have anything they would like to add or expand on their concerns or respond to anything that the applicants just said?

17:51

Hello, John, Wainwright's principal landscape architects, North Yorkshire county council, I think

17:59

I understand and appreciate what the applicant is saying, the difficulty we have is that

18:06

every major application steps the same thing. And every application, in its own way, creates change and creates erosion. And this application is no different. And what we struggle to see in this application is any meaningful landscape mitigation. We've got a landscape and biodiversity mitigation plan. We've got a landscape and biodiversity mitigation strategy. But both of those are focused on reinstatement, the bear is affected by temporary lay down, and biodiversity net gain. There's nothing in either of those documents, either the plan or the strategy, which provides any meaningful landscape, Reaper landscape,

18:55

solid got a design framework document that we've worked together

19:00

with the applicant, some really good principles in there, which explain how good landscape could be applied in any application, including this application. And that's clearly explained in the environmental statement. The purpose of this document, what we can't see is evidence of how those good principles would come folding in a strategy. We got a strategy, but we struggled to see where those good principles explained in the design framework will come through. We appreciate that detailed design could be secured through the dcl. But exactly what that detailed design could be, and how those principles of the design framework would come through.

19:45

is unclear.

19:47

There are

19:49

we accept that the landscape and visual impact assessment doesn't identify significant adverse effects, but equally, there's a noticeable new



20:00

bruv local landscape and visual adverse effects

20:06

predominantly affecting the local area within around Drax the village, local properties roads, and

20:15

there's no real consideration of mitigation for that's nothing we we believe that any application should reduce and mitigate adverse effects were reasonable and possible.

20:27

The design framework explains examples of how good design could be applied. But again, reiterating my point made earlier, there's no evidence or demonstration of how that is coming forward in the landscape and biodiversity strategy.

20:43

I think that's pretty much the point.

20:48

Thank you, just to pick up on on your point of

20:53

the design, the principles in the design framework and how these are secured. So in the Riak, Item D one,

21:04

certain principles are included there, from

21:10

section four of the design framework.

21:15

Is that list of principles

21:19

sufficient enough to secure

21:23

to provide assurance that the design framework principles will be

21:29

applied to the detailed design? Or Or are there further principles that you would wish to see in that list from the design framework?

21:40

A John John Wainwright, principal landscape architect, North Yorkshire county council, I think at this stage, we don't really understand what principles is going to come forward. I think, if we understood how it could be tied to the strategy, the biodiversity strategy

21:54

would be useful. But at this stage, the difficulty we have is understanding what good principles would come forward in the detailed design stage.

22:05

So anything that the upcoming, I'd like to respond on that which gives them half the applicant.

22:12

The Council, in their letter, the ninth of March made it very clear that they do not consider that any new landscaping requirements outside of the otter limits is required, which obviously is sensible, given the lack of significant effects.

22:29

So we're talking about within the past station sites, so we've got to be

22:34

mindful of a working operating power station sites.

22:39

And what we can do now the

22:42

think the applicant has worked very hard through the LPs

22:47

and the design principles to demonstrate how

22:53

areas where it can

22:57

decide infrastructure

22:59

is a meets both the need for good design, but also as the putting out a policy statement first to be sustainable and ensure efficiency. So quite often these things are in conflict, of course, and we're balancing efficiency, sustainability, with

23:16

landscape and visual impacts and good design.

23:20

We've done that carefully applicants on that carefully through the process as outlined in the application.

23:26

And through the lbs. Now what we will commit to do I mentioned this, in the first half session is that we recognise having gone through the React.

23:38

There may be some elements of the design principles section four, that we could draw out more in the rest of environmental commands to highlight that those paragraphs of section four are indeed secured.

23:51

It may not be quite so clear for those of us for those who are not quite so embedded in the application is we are so we are going to take away the rest of environmental commitments, look at the requirements and draw out those commitments in the design principles in those documents and maybe create a signposting documents demonstrate how that when we submit to the authority, the final form lbs that's an the detailed design that we've had regard to those design principles to demonstrate and where we meet those those principles. So what we'll do that for

24:27

will be done on five

24:31

I'm not sure I have anything else further to to add unless, yes. Mr.

24:40

Lee would like to add a few comments on

24:44

behalf of the applicant just in relation to the planning policies that were mentioned the beginning from Selby Council and also to a certain extent to address the comments by John Wainwright in

25:00

In relation to what is to be expected, and I do recognise that it is not a significant proposal, but it is proportionate in relation to the assessments that have been undertaken. The new hedgerows that are being proposed are going to address some of the the minor adverse effects and certainly will address the issues relating to some issues relating to connectivity. And, equally, that also responds to, in part, some of the principles within the design framework connectivity being a key principle within the design framework. So

25:41

I do recognise it isn't a

25:45

huge example. But it is an example where proposals are addressing and responding to planning policy, and also responding to and delivering upon the design framework and also making clear what our proposals are. And of course, there is the opportunity for

26:06

North Yorkshire county council to

26:10

be involved

26:12

within the detailed design stage, and it is within their gift to review and approve the final landscape design. So it is our expectation that we will deliver a landscape design that meets the requirements of the design framework or addresses some of the key principles, the design framework, and also provides North Yorkshire county council

26:46

assurances that we've taken

26:49

on board the relevant and applicable design framework principles.

26:58

Thank you. So it sounds to me as though the principles in the design framework are welcomed by the local authorities. That's correct.

27:13

And some of those principles are included in the Riak. Item D one, which is then

27:21

which is then security and requirements, referred to end requirements six. So if

27:29

I and and

27:32

the outcome will be looking at what other principles they can include in the rack. So because because I asked that the authorities have a look at the list.

27:43

In item D, one of the Riak of the design principles that have been included

27:50

and advise the examining authority, whether there are other principles that aren't included, which are in this design framework, which you would wish to see included.

28:07

By Richard grievous on behalf of the applicants, it's not just the one to want to highlight in terms of where we secure the some of the principles in section four of the design principles. For example, requirements seven, the lbs secures principles.

28:25

For example,

28:27

where we go to

28:31

G.

28:34

Eight,

28:36

for example, that refers to measures for retention of existing vegetation. And that is a principle

28:46

in 4.2 15, of the of the design of the design framework. So it's not just the one. There are other areas of the registry environmental commitments that does secure those principles. That's why we appreciate that.

29:06

If you're not embedded as much as we are on the on the project that you might struggle to see you read a principle and the framework and where is it secured, we're going to do a signposting document. To demonstrate where the relevant principles in section four are, are tied. Obviously, the framework needs to tie into the proposed scheme. And if it's not clear in the reaction, either update the React or we'll explain how it's secured. So that's why we're making that commitment to explain

29:33

how it all fits together. And just to help the examining authority in terms of where the question started on the local policies, SP 1518 and 19. The application sets out its position or meet on those policies in Appendix B of its planning statement, which is a PP hyphen 032.

29:59

Thank you

30:00

Is

30:02

there any

30:05

any further comment anyone would like to make on design principles and design framework?

30:15

Mrs. Brown

30:18

at Brown on behalf of biofuel watch this is a more general points. But we're deeply concerned that there's an error in the calculation of a building height in which is the fairly easy

30:31

measurement to make or predict. And then we just want to how we can have confidence that there aren't similar errors in other aspects of the application, which are far more mathematically complex, and with much greater degrees of uncertainty. We can

30:53

just reach agreement on part because it's a typographical error.

30:57

The applicant making a typographical error, we all do it.

31:02

The assessment day was based on the you know, obviously the baseline which is the correct height, it's just an unfortunate

31:09

typographical error, which we will rectify.

31:14

Thank you.

31:16

So,

31:18

retained vegetation has been mentioned. So I just want to pick up on that as well. On the existing retained vegetation plan a PP. Hyphen 183. There's an area coloured in solid light green. This is to the north and edge of the woods yard area.

31:38

And it's indicated as area to accommodate carbon dioxide construction compounds.

31:44

And I note that the local authorities have suggested amendments to the wording on this plan. But firstly, I wanted to ask a couple of questions about this area of the applicant.

31:55

In in comparing this plan the the existing retained vegetation plan to the construction lay down areas plan, it doesn't look like the areas for construction lay down and vegetation overlap. Are there other construction activities happening in this area, the solid light green on retained

32:17

retained vegetation plan that could overlap?

32:38

Family did, lb USP on behalf of the applicant, it is our understanding that the current

32:49

vegetation that is earmarked that is identified with the light green is the only vegetation that may be affected by the construct the proposed construction activities in the future. And the reason it's shown as light green because the intention will be to retain as much of that vegetation as possible and or replant that vegetation should it need to be removed to facilitate the construction activities. However, there will be potentially some

33:24

areas within that

33:27

light green hatch on as shown on the drawing that may not be able to be replanted for operational reasons. For example, some pipelines, some access, some overhead pylons or other infrastructure however, the intention is to retain as much of that

33:49

area of agitation as possible. And in relation to the rest of this sort of the dark green

33:58

vegetation to be

34:01

retained, that's the woodland and scrub that sought to be retained. And then the other

34:08

in terms of the the drawing that you have in front view or you've seen, we've clearly marked the vegetation to be retained within the site as well.

34:21

Richard was on behalf of the applicant and that process is secured in G eight of the rest of environmental commitments.

34:29

Where it says through the measures for the retention of existing vegetation are detailed in the outline landscape and biodiversity plan. As of existing immunity planting will be retained wherever practicable, or the loss of such planting is unavoidable. The detailed design will seek to reinstate those landscape elements that are temporarily lost or to incorporate humanity planting measures in keeping with the original aspiration set out within the wider design Weddell strategy for the power station, and that links back to 4.2 point 15 of the design framework.

35:00

So obviously through the lbs approval process, we will have to identify those areas of, of vegetation that whatever we use, and why do we rotate within say what's being retained, or if we can't retain it, we need to explain that, why we can't and why.

35:16

And how we try to avoid removing it. But we've come to the conclusion we can't, and then set out whether it'll be replanted in the same location, or whether we will identify and or whether it has to be, well, we can't be planted for whatever reason is being explained by Mr. Lee. And we'd have to replant something else elsewhere so that the balance of vegetation remains the same. So that is all through the approval process of, of the LPs and the authorities. I think our our colleague, Mr. Williams, has his hand up on the screen with me need to may want to add something to what we've just been saying.

35:55

Either. Thank you. Yeah. So under Williams on behalf of the applicant, it was really just to make the point that where we can retain that vegetation that provides the greatest

36:05

ability to

36:07

keep the original design, but also it provides the best in terms of the mitigation strategy for keeping the construction of the construction area screened during the periods of construction. So as you say, you know, if there's no conflict, then unless there's a another need to remove some of that, with the efforts would be to keep that vegetation in situ is that provides the greatest glory to stability to keep up that sort of low level screening in in situ.



36:41

Thank you, and it's is it the same approach taken to on on the existing vegetation on the existing retained vegetation plan? Is it the same approach to the light green crosshatch area and the light green solid area? Or? Sorry, I'm just I'm struggling to understand what the difference is between

37:01

that area at the north of the woods yard.

37:06

And still under under the mention of

37:11

sorry?

37:18

ramly WSOP. On behalf the applicant? I believe I understand your question that relates to what's the difference between the light green

37:30

hatched area surrounding the wooded yard and the other

37:35

cross hatched area within the site, the crosshatch areas within the site they are to be retained.

37:42

And there is no question over those being retained the light green areas as I mentioned previously,

37:51

they are

37:53

it is an area of trees and shrubs immediately adjacent to the boundary. And it is reasonable to assume that there will be a requirement to push infrastructure through the boundary. And in some locations, that vegetation will not be able to be replanted. So, the light green area shows an area where the majority of vegetation will be retained. There may be some areas to that afford access for either

38:28

people be your access and or infrastructure to go through. But otherwise, the majority of that boundary treatment will be retained and or enhanced as part of the the future development proposals. And which goes down. If I can add to that, by DOD have a commitment that the hatching the crosshatch Green is a firm commitment is that air is going to be retained. And so as the light green, that's where we might need to

39:03

remove. But I will just add in terms of the council's overarching comments with the gradual erosion of the original landscaping is that actually through this application, we are now securing through this development consent order statutory instrument, the retention of that planting should a TCP apply. So we couldn't just be permitted development rights. Of course, the power station as an undertaker has permitted development rights. We couldn't just remove it, the PPD and secondly through a TCP application. We couldn't just remove it through the TCPA if we wanted to build another building, that the only way in the future on that retain landscaping crosshatching. We the applicant could remove it would be to amend the plan

39:46

and apply it to under the developed consent order. So another hurdle for the applicants go through an ordinary tiny Country Planning Act application couldn't remove it.

39:56

The DCA would take precedence. So it's not just about that.

40:00

That's actually an additional benefits of this plan being secured.

40:08

Thank you, I just check if there's anything that the applicant wants to

40:14

comment on related to return to education.

40:18

John Wayne writes for North Yorkshire county council, I think one point worth just pointing out is that that plan shows vegetation to be retained, it doesn't show vegetation to be removed. And there is vegetation in the area of the application, clearly visible on the aerial photographs, which I presume is going to be removed. So in terms of ongoing erosion, that is an example of ongoing erosion in relation to the vegetation that's referred to as coloured light green on the plan.

40:53

It is quite valuable. There's a footpath immediately adjacent to that boundary. And at the moment with the information that's presented, it seems reasonable that we should have a bit more certainty of the lay down area that would ensure that that vegetation is protected. So I think really, that's

41:13

our position opposition in terms of the existing vegetation to be retained along that northern stripe, I think

41:20

we will prefer to see more reassurance that could be retained through the application, rather than indiscriminately removed

41:28

through decisions made on site

41:31

to achieve the temperature down.

41:35

Mr. Griffith Thank you. It's because somehow the audience I mean, it's not indiscriminately removed, we have a process to go through, which is through requirements seven, I've already read out the React the register environmental commitments, G eight, that is that's that secure was 4.2. Point 15. Where we have a commitment crossed the site, in respect of the proposed scheme that we will retain where we can existing vegetations we can't just discriminately remove it, we have to demonstrate, or when we formally submit to the lbs to the castle's for approval, the landscape that is being retained the landscape, which we can't we have to remove, I'm fully expecting that in that application would have to explain why we can't, we have to remove it. And then we'll have to explain whether it can be reinstated after the reason for the removal has been completed, or whether we, or whatever reason, we have to replant it elsewhere and justify that it's in the gift of the authorities in approving the LPs to work with us to

42:36

in our detailed design to ensure they're comfortable that we've done all we can to retain and replant. So it's no discrimination indiscriminately process going on here. It's a clear process of working together to come up with a design that has regard to the scheme and to securing the original concept of the planting. So I take issue with that statement. It is secured in the

43:02

requirements seven adequately scores, the landscape plan and the reasoning as to where we remove or reinstate planting.

43:12

Is, is that area, the woods yard area and the detailed design and effects on vegetation? Is it dependent on the weather work number two a or to be as progressed as to where the content delivery compound is as

43:32

as well? So is there a process in securing the detailed design, whereby

43:39

the detailed design of work number two, whereby the vegetation around the area is

43:46

confirmed and discussed with the local authority prior to approval?

43:52

Which gives them part of the argument? Yes, I've been told that's exactly how it works. So when we work number two, and designing that, in that detailed design process, I mean, requirement six or seven have to work together, we can't do one without the other, the two are going to come forward holistically.

44:10

Hence, it also links into the bng assessment as we discussed this morning. So yes, the that would be worked into that detail to sign

44:19

Okay, thank you

44:21

make an additional point as a reference.

44:25

This was my off the app and it's just in the MLBs commitment in the in GA to the release is in paragraph 3.38 or the lbs and specifically talks at the end of in relation to planting about this design measure will be progressed in accordance with design principles and will being read in consultation with the planning authority

44:46

has already committed to consult and then and then the ultimate approval. So I think it's just important. Emphasis is already in the OBS.

44:55

Okay, thank you.

44:57

The landscape and biodiversity mitigation plan

45:00

The AP 181 shows the landscape for the construction laydown area and the on site habitat provision area. What we've been discussing is the landscape on the power station site.

45:18

Can this plan show that or is or is that is that subject to the detailed design of the other work packages in that area?

45:37

firmly on behalf of the applicant? Yes, it is dependent upon detailed design at this stage. We can't sort of show the specific landscape proposals for the Woodyard at this stage. However, as has been

previously mentioned, through both the requirements and the OH lbs and also the React there is a requirement for us to

46:04

achieve approval

46:06

from the local authority in order to implement the detailed design.

46:14

Thank you

46:17

to the local authority before we move on to the next and the item to the local authorities have any other comments they'd like to make on design landscape official considerations

46:30

are no further comments in this stage. Thank you. Anyone else in the room or online?

46:38

Remley on behalf of the applicant. I just like to add, you know, we've already agreed that we will review the design framework and look to include where appropriate within the Riak other elements but I can say

46:54

with confidence following discussion with Drax that certain elements, there would be no problem at this stage, which include the pellets, the indeed the ticketed soft landscape palettes and the hard landscape palettes at this stage which we can add to it so that there is more assurance on the part of the local authority as to what plants and what part of materials we would be looking to use. I

47:23

do recognise that

47:26

these planting pellets and hot landscape pellets are largely to be expected. But that is just in response to our assertion. And that we would look to include further

47:41

elements of the

47:44

design framework.

47:47

Thank you.

47:49

So moving on to Agenda Item five highways.

47:56

So starting with sorry, so if I can just just pause for a couple of seconds whilst Mr. Holden comes to table He's our transport experts. Apologies.

48:13

Thank you.

48:19

So the first matter I want to

48:23

raise is the passenger car unit assumptions.

48:27

So first of all, because I just asked asked the applicant and or national highways to advise if there's been any progress on agreeing the passenger car unit assumptions to appropriately account for heavy duty vehicles, which grievous on behalf of the applicant? Yes. And in the statement of common ground with national highways that we sought to submit late because we don't reach agreements appreciate wasn't accepted. But that did confirm that the passenger car unit values have been agreed with us and national highways. And so will we submit that socg At deadline that I fall?

49:08

Thank you. And there were there were different guidance documents cited for the different PCU conversion factors.

49:18

And which of those is the correct guidance to today?

49:27

pass over to Mr. Holden to explain explain that Vinnie Holden for the applicant.

49:33

So we've used two guidance documents which are consistent in their PCU assumptions the traffic signs Manual Chapter Six traffic control published by the department transport traffic modelling guidelines version four published by Transport for London.

49:49

Thank you and do national highways agree that these are appropriate?

49:55

Yes, sir.

49:56

Thank you

50:01

Thank you. That was straightforward. So,

50:05

then the next the next thing I want to raise is the monitoring of mitigation measures.

50:12

And so I note in the in the updated construction work travel plan rep to hyphen 030 submitted that deadline to that in table 7.1. The action plan during the first six to 12 months of construction that the travel plan coordinator will agree arrangements with national highways to monitor construction worker traffic.

50:39

I believe in the statement of common in the previous statements of common ground.

50:47

National Highway suggested that agreement on monitoring could be included within the statements of common ground is it is it

50:55

prepares to agree this once construction has started or prior to

51:01

construction.

51:04

So, a key component of the construction worker travel plan is the

51:10

establishment of a travel plan coordinator and a travel plan steering group that includes the local authority and national highways. And it's in that forum that the proposals to monitor measure and agree what is success, successful outcomes for this project can be achieved.

51:28

As you said, the action plan contains a number of monitoring measures that can be undertaken things important to measure the traffic flow conditions at the time of construction, because we all know there's been a reduction in traffic since COVID. And therefore, the situation on site really need to be observed

to understand the impacts that any construction workforce might have during during that construction period.

51:57

But And can the arrangements to monitor that the impacts of construction worker traffic be agreed prior to prior to construction commencing, just to ensure that it is secured rather than what's currently in the construction work travel plan, which is once construction has started?

52:20

Yes, look at the travel plans do you in group has to be set up before construction.

52:25

And that's secured. And I think it's an shedule on a schedule to requirements, items 16.

52:39

So just to clarify this, I think

52:44

we're talking now about the the DCA itself in the central team. So because the construction workshop plan has to be approved before commencement commence measures that are in there, including the working group, and when it starts will then be approved. So everyone will then be happy with when the measures are to be agreed.

53:03

So the measures won't be agreed within the construction work and travel plan, but the construction worker travel plan will

53:10

confirm when those arrangements will be agreed. Is that correct?

53:18

I think the wording is the final construction where a travel plan should be largely

53:25

consistent with the one submitted at the DCO stage. So that framework construction travel management plan has the opportunity to be updated and will be and it will be submitted to both local authority and national highways for approval. And in that we'll be setting up the measures measures for monitoring

53:43

and canals, national highways or whether they're satisfied that the arrangements and monitor construction work travel impact

53:52



is secured at that stage rather than as you has was suggested in the statements of common ground received that

54:00

I believe I'd like to, but it could be done within the statement of grant.

54:06

Certainly Sir Simon Jones for national highways referring you to rep 2007. And it's the shedule two requirements. They're in points 1516 and 19 cover off the construction traffic management plan, the construction worker travel plan and the decommissioning traffic management plan. And it's those which was certainly content now with the applicant to have agreed and the wording that covers exactly what we need it to, which is to look at those with the travel plan coordinated through the steering group prior to the actual commencement of those works, and that will take us forward throughout and as Mr. Holden has just said, that is a living document it will be it's not setting

55:00

stone prior to commencement, it will continue to be reviewed those traffic figures will be monitored throughout the construction periods.

55:10

And if so, adjustments will be necessarily made

55:15

to reduce the impact on the strategic road network, certainly. So there are three points it's 1516 and 19. In rep 2007, sheduled. Two.

55:33

Thank you. And I note from the most recent statements of common ground between the applicant and the local authorities, which is rep three, five and 01 to receive that deadline three that North Yorkshire county council highways are reviewing that updated ctmp and CW TP

55:54

are

55:55

North Yorkshire county council highways able to provide deposition on whether mitigation measures contained within these documents are sufficient.

56:05

Paul Roberts from North Yorkshire highways, yes, with with discussions with the applicant with we're comfortable that they're both both documents are satisfactory. We understand obviously, that it's some stage we will need to speak and discuss before construction starts.

56:31

Would you agree with some parts just to be clear on this? Well, in the taking the construction workers have a plan table 7.1 of that plan,

56:41

sets out the action plan and highlights what is going to be done six months prior to commencement of construction.

56:48

So it sets out a steps, nine steps. The first one being to be liaising with the authorities and key stakeholders. And then to establish first things, which is a clear action plan of what we're going to do prior to commencement within six months prior to commencement, I should say, and as has been said, this document itself has to be approved prior to commencement. So are these before the six

57:12

before six months prior to commencement to ensure that the measures set out in that plan are, are are approved? So the mechanism is there to ensure that the monitoring is in place prior to commencement of construction?

57:26

Okay, thank you. My reasons for asking the questions were that I'd it it appeared that item 24 of that table was where

57:37

when the arrangements to monitor construction traffic would be agreed, and that is

57:46

within six and 12 months

57:50

of construction

57:52

during the construction, so But I understand what's been said today, and that's clarified it for me. So I think that's it I think that's the what was mentioned by national highways is the that's checkpoints throughout the programme, because it's a live document that which is live by the fact that this action plan of falling in the first six and then 12 months. is that are we monitoring it or the monitoring processes, working effectively the wheel that we agreed to have you in place prior to commencement. So I think it's a it's a review mechanism.

58:24

Okay, thank you.

58:26

I'm aware of national highways have comments on the protective provisions, but we'll cover that in the issue specific hearing for on Friday. Is there anything national highways would like to highlight on any other areas where there's

58:41

current disagreements or there's been progress with the applicant on traffic and transport matters?

58:48

Thank you, Sir Simon Jones for national highways.

58:51

We're content now to have resolved all outstanding issues in the statement of common ground. I do appreciate that. With that having taken time it has come late to the examination or authority it may not have yet been put on the

59:08

on the document library. I don't think it has been uploaded or accepted as yet. So the only matter outstanding is those of the protected provisions and as you say, sir, Friday is the day for the discussion around those. Okay, thank you. Anyone else have any comments on traffic and transport matters? Online?

59:29

I'm not seeing any hands. So moving on to item six on the agenda noise and vibration.

59:35

So residual residual noise impacts on residential receptors sorry so we can just swap the musical chairs again and

59:45

transport can be swapped out with noise

59:47

ologists

59:59

thank you so okay.

1:00:00

So we'll start with residual noise impacts on residential receptors. This there appears to be a difference of opinion in the answers to

1:00:10

examining authorities questions

1:00:13

env 1.6 between the counsellors and the applicant in relation to the nighttime, operational noise impacts on residential receptors are six. That's to Forest Grove Barlow and our 14

1:00:28

which is low farm, it'd be helpful for me to walk through the issue, step by step. So firstly, the measured nighttime background sound level. So la 90 measurement at these locations is 28 decibels.

1:00:46

The measurement location used LT four is in the same location as receptor six, but it's also used for receptor 14 is LT for an appropriate measurement location for defining the noise levels that receptor 14

1:01:04

is still an almost always be for the applicant. Just we believe that that is actually representative of the same area.

1:01:12

Okay, thank you and local authority agree with that.

1:01:21

Kelly Dawson, North Yorkshire county council, we appear to have lost our senior environmental health officer off the call. Oh, it looks like he's just managing to reconnect. Now.

1:01:32

It may be that we just need to repeat the question for his benefit. We're just trying to ascertain that he can now hear us but it would be most appropriately placed to answer that question for you, sir.

1:01:44

Mr. Harper, I'll just repeat the question. So it was just a point of clarification whether

1:01:50

coins LT four is an appropriate measurement location for defining the measured noise levels that aren't at receptor 14.

1:01:59

Because it's used for both receptor six and receptor 14, it's in the same location as receptor six.

1:02:07

Yeah, apologies. I'd have to go back to the monitoring locations on that one and come back to you. Thank you.

1:02:18

So, the rating level of the specific sound for the proposed development that LA our TR at these locations is 34 decibels for a road to six and 35 for a street 14 And this is then secured in requirements 17 This represents moderate magnitude of impact as per table.

1:02:43

Some points of interest chapter seven.

1:02:46

In defining the level of significance effect from that impact are the factors that can be taken into consideration for

1:02:56

or the contextual considerations defined in guidance or in British Standards.

1:03:05

As to an almost USP for the applicant,

1:03:08

in line with clause 11 of BS 440, we undertook an assessment for the contextual considerations, so that included change in ambient noise levels. So we concluded that the noise levels arising for the operational facts could be at least 10 DB 10 decibels lower than the 15 Min levels. We also looked at the absolute noise levels, specifically internal noise levels in accordance with section 7.7 of beauty standards a 233. And the conclusion was very similar. So at least 10 dB below the guidelines in the table in that standard A which only works are carried out and assessment for the background noise levels.

1:03:51

To conclude that the background noise levels are we are using a broad assessment is a reasonably worst case assessment. Part of that is that there are existing noise monitoring stations as part of the existing environmental commitments for the operation of trucks. And we analyse data for two years and they were hired on what we actually included in the assessment.

1:04:26

And so, I know that in the local authorities response to question and the 1.6 it's recommended that the rating levels are reduced to 33 decibels is this because even with the contextual considerations that have been put forward by the action that the local authority consider the rating levels, secured in requirements 17 to result in a significant effect.

1:04:58

Jacopo Marlin to hell sub accounts

1:05:00

So, yeah, essentially that there's no requirements around our guidance around contextual considerations

1:05:10

to share what the applicant say in there on what what considerations have been put forward, there are limitations to that the certainly with the comparison with vs eight, two, double three, and the existing Ambien background levels the

1:05:32

it's quite different compared to in La Kill to La 90

1:05:37

Essentially you're not protecting the quieter hours, the evenings and the weekends to an average.

1:05:44

But yeah, essentially there are no guidance documents around contextual consideration. The the issues around the

1:05:53

exceedance is

1:05:56

with the considerable contextual considerations, the rate and levels

1:06:05

stipulated within requirements 17 of the dcl you've got a couple of occasions as we've discussed on the four receptors, where you've got exceedances of plus six and plus seven dB, which, over existing background sound levels. So that is a an indication of adverse noise impacts.

1:06:30

What our issue with the contextual considerations is that we've not really had an opportunity to scrutinise the

1:06:40

acoustic design, which without reassurance and etc, that we're going to get that at a later stage, which is fine. But that is quite a key consideration for when you when you're considering what the impact is, because there's always something you can be doing to design to reduce the impact. So it's difficult to accept adverse impacts that to receptors, without a full understanding of what the design is whether or not you could choose different fixed plant, for example, I can orient it nice sauces in a different location to reduce that so.

1:07:19

And the the intention is always to get the impact down as much as possible, minimise, mitigate. So we're essentially being asked to requirements 17 to accept an adverse impact to receptors.

1:07:35

When certainly I believe that mark would probably be done at the detailed design stage. So it's, it's a way of addressing that. And,

1:07:46

for example, we could do that feel taken out the

1:07:50

the limits within requirements 17 and agree in them later. There's no need really to,

1:07:59

to have that in the dcl. We can we can address that later, when we've got the detailed design.

1:08:10

So, my understanding is that the applicant is saying that they the limits included in requirements 17 represent a non significant effect because of the contextual considerations.

1:08:28

And you mentioned there's no guidance around what can contextual considerations should be

1:08:36

could be included. But the Do you have

1:08:42

a position on on what can what can be included as contextual considerations.

1:08:50

Gacaca environments house other counsel, yes. acoustic design is a contextual consideration. That's not there, because we don't know that. Yeah, and there's a lot of uncertainty around that we won't get that information till there today.

1:09:04

Relying on the the points that have been put forward in isolation is is

1:09:11

quite difficult. Because the, for reasons explained the parameters are not like for like so you're comparing a 16 hour average, for example, 16 hour noise average with possibly a short term noise impact that might occur on on an evening when it's much quieter.

1:09:34

Is it not the case that

1:09:38

that the noise limits are assessed as to what constitutes a certain African's effect

1:09:46

and included in requirements 17 And then the the, the demonstration of goods acoustic design is done through the discharging of that requirement

1:09:58

rather than

1:10:00

The design I I'm trying to understand how how the design forms part of the contextual considerations in determining whether a noise level is a significant effect.

1:10:18

Yeah, so as we mentioned the design, so if you've got some some noise emitting fixed plant that's causing the

1:10:27

adverse impacts when other adverse impacts to the assessment. So we've got adverse impacts.

1:10:34

There's there's, we don't know. Yeah, because of the lack of detail, but it might be different

1:10:43

equipment with low noise levels that might be aware to our into the nice sauces. So we're utilising some science, natural screening.

1:10:52

There's, there's ways that you, you should be able to minimise and mitigate, to have an Andrew sort of have no adverse impacts, which is what we'd like to see, rather than accepting the adverse impacts, because once it's farms, part of the DCR through requirements 70. And it's not really negotiable.

1:11:15

At that point.

1:11:20

Is there anything any comments that the applicant would like to make on this on determining the significance of the fact and what should be secured three parties? Yeah. So on almost ISP, for the applicant efforts, we'll just say there is some guidance about context of what elements should be considered. So dicey, a bit is sort of over two and also in a in a technical group, by the Association of consultant a technical note in 2020 2020.

1:11:52

Also, just to say that mitigation measures were presented in the multiple environmental statement, specifically on paragraph seven, point 5.53. A, so it was mentioned that the an example of the mitigation measures that can be delivered as part of the scheme, and those are the ones that were



tested for the yes results. Also to mention that, that is in line with the overarching national policy statement for energy, both the current version and draft measure as well.

1:12:23

Looking at engineering layout and administrative mitigation measures.

1:12:29

Okay, thank you. Could the applicant submit extracts of the guidance that there is on determining contextual considerations that would be helpful and if that could be done at deadline for?

1:12:52

Is there anything else that Mr. Harper that you'd like to add to what you said, I think

1:12:59

I am interested to see what the guidance on contextual considerations is and does say about

1:13:06

what can be considered.

1:13:09

And in determining those nice note fact? Yes.

1:13:15

Yeah, Jack up a southern counsellor violence health. I'd just like to add

1:13:20

the

1:13:21

the So regardless of what contextual considerations are put forward, there's always the element of acoustic design. So

1:13:33

it seems like we would start the applicants accepting the adverse impact, but rather than try to address the adverse impact,

1:13:45

through offset that filled the contextual considerations, which, for me, the the acoustic layout is forms part of that. So it certainly be preferred to be able to look further down the line as to whether or not everything's been done to reduce that impact, rather than because once it's in the DCR, you've essentially got the you you're accepting the adverse impact.

1:14:15

Thank you.

1:14:17

Mr. GRIFFIS sweaty lighter. Thank you. I agree with some health outcomes.

1:14:22

In requirement 17 requires the applicant to put forward its noise Mitigation Scheme, which we'll see that that details how the design of

1:14:34

numbered work one two or three has

1:14:39

been mitigated and the acoustic design, you had to put that forward to the authority

1:14:46

them to approve and that design has to ensure that the the ratings in table one and requirements 17 will not be exceeded. So we're not accepting that we're just going

1:15:00

to design it to that level where there's a level that the IES has come out with, that's what we're securing for the detailed design, we will then demonstrate,

1:15:09

hopefully lower than that that's lower than that with the acoustic design.

1:15:13

But as a as a backstop, it's we won't exceed those rating levels. But I mean, again, through the approval process, and through our demonstration of sighting orientation has been mentioned by Mr. Hopper, we will demonstrate what that where, where we think we will be with the rating level, then, of course, as the monitoring of that, and no doubt if there, again, through that approval process, your authority can raise questions and ask them for further justification. We can't do that now for

1:15:45

the detailed design isn't there, but certainly, that's as part of discharge requirements 17. That's the intention to through that through that design process. Of course it links into when we do the 17 would want to look at that through the detailed design of requirements six as well. So it's all going to work work together in that way.

1:16:06

Okay, thank you, does anyone else have any comment to make on

1:16:12

residual impact on residential receptors.

1:16:18

So,

1:16:20

moving on to construction corps working hours, can the applicant provides justification for the proposed Saturday working hours, G five of Riak proposes 7am to 2:30pm.

1:16:34

Whereas, for example, the tracks repower DCO has seven till one on Saturday and key B three DCO has eight till one on Saturday

1:16:47

originally was on behalf of the applicant.

1:16:52

The conclusions of the noise assessment, if a construction has concluded there are no

1:17:00

significant effects through the construction hours that we have proposed and therefore have assessed. And therefore,

1:17:08

we see no justification, just simply because another order or project as different Saturday working hours that we should follow that at its base is restriction has to be based on impact, the impact is there are no significant effects or noise. And therefore we consider seven to 7am to 2:30 on a Saturday to be acceptable.

1:17:30

And of course, you can always go the other way by saying if you truncate the construction hours and the construction programme will be longer and therefore construction impacts.

1:17:41

To the extent the irony will also be longer. So as I say the restriction has been based on impacts, there are no impacts, and therefore we see that time period to be acceptable.

1:17:55

Thank you. Is there any comment that the local authority would like to make on this? That that'd be Mr. Harper?

1:18:06

Yeah, Jack Harper Silva Council of amateur health.

1:18:11

This we've been raising this throughout the application process.

1:18:17

The standard construction working hours, for as far as we're concerned would be Monday to Friday, eight till six, Saturday, eight till one.

1:18:31

I'm not, although I appreciate what the applicant saying there there is the construction impacts being assessed, and there's no significant impacts. What we're talking about here is the the the lower level, if you like the immediate impacts of starting work every day for several years, however long the construction phase is at 7am. And that is

1:18:59

consensus, I guess there's going to be some impact.

1:19:03

The fact that there's been assessed

1:19:06

in accordance with the relevant standard.

1:19:10

There are some issues with that methodology in this in the criteria sense it's good for

1:19:16

it's a good mechanism to assess the the higher impact stuff and what's happening between the eight

1:19:28

but I guess to see, to have some sort of

1:19:33

appreciation for impact on the on the length of construction by changing the operation construction hours from a 7am start to an 8am start, that's that's really all we're asking for, because that's 7am is pretty early. As far as we're concerned. It's considering the likely

1:19:53

length of the construction phase. We would like it start from any term rather than 7am

1:20:02

Thank you. Is there anything you'd like to add further to what you've already said? No, you've heard opposition. I mean, I'd also add that obviously, it's not a standard project. It's an insert. And secondly, it's an operational power station site. So you have to look at it look at it in the in the context as well. But it's nothing further to add, we consider our proposal to be

1:20:23

acceptable in terms of impact.

1:20:28

Okay, thank you. I'll move on to

1:20:33

permitted preliminary works. And just to clarify a point in the local authorities comment on responses to comments on the applicants responses to examining authorities written questions.

1:20:46

And there's a comment made in relation to requirement 15. I just wanted to clarify Is it it due to noise concerns that temporary means of enclosure and Site Security are requested to be included in the list of permitted preliminary works that would be excluded from taking place prior to the camp?

1:21:05

Would that be Mr. Harper.

1:21:10

Yet jackup Silva Council of arms health think this relates to the construction compounds.

1:21:18

The other permitted permitted preliminary works

1:21:22

as far as we're concerned compounds, a notorious source of noise complaint for us. They're often located quite close to highway infrastructure for convenience, which usually means a located near dwellings we've gone through we've had any

1:21:43

layout plans or anything as to where compounds are expected to be.

1:21:49

Brothers, the seller needs some consideration, because if you know,

1:21:55

within a residential environment or near a residential environment compared to the

1:22:00

the space that's available, possibly to the applicant,

1:22:05

I feel strongly that it certainly does need some consideration. So even if it's just that element,

1:22:11

just the layout are a plan as to where the compound is going to be. And whether or not

1:22:19

some screening or acoustic mitigation is considered appropriate, depending on the length of the construction phase. Because once the compounds there, it's it's it's a it's a reasonable, it becomes a reasonable nice sauce, because it's a part in the construction phase. And it's difficult to deal with in retrospect from a statutory nuisance point of view. So we would

1:22:47

like to agree where the construction compounds are in advance if there's a mechanism to do that, that'd be great.

1:22:56

So if I could just ask the applicant is that would that be the construction lay down areas plan that's been submitted into the examination that shows

1:23:08

would you give us on behalf? Yes, in terms of where the lay down areas will be? But also, I think we should clarify. Comment 14 Because it says that no part of the authorised development is to commence brackets, including permitted luminary works comprising and there's a list that says above ground site preparation for temporary facilities for the use of contractors. So the construction lay down areas are caught by requirement 14. So we can't do the chemistry can't create a construction lay down area without having a camp in place. What isn't in that list is the is direct reference to temporary means of enclosure, but why should that be caught by the camp, if the construction laydown area requires acoustic enclosure, then that will be part of the camp, and therefore before we can instal the construction laydown area you have to have that acoustic fencing. So I think the concern of the authorities is covered by the drafting of requirement 14 already.

1:24:12

Okay, thank you.

1:24:16

Does anyone have any comments today we'd like to make on noise and vibration before we move on to the next agenda item.

1:24:29

Okay, so I'll hand over to Mrs. Jones for

1:24:37

Thank you, Mr. northa. Just Just before we do move on to

1:24:41

Agenda Item seven. Just wanted to point out to those people who were concerned about being filmed earlier this morning. We have had confirmation that no faces of anybody that were sitting in the audience have been filmed.

1:24:56

But if anybody does have any issues, then my suggestion

1:25:00

wouldn't be that you speak to the gentleman that has been here this morning filming.

1:25:06

And there may be possibilities of of being pixelated out, for example, I don't know, but maybe speak to that gentleman if you have any issues. With that.

1:25:16

Moving on to issues and actions.

1:25:22

Just a few actions from this morning's hearing. I have one for the applicant, which is a response to the biofuel watch observations on uncertainty regarding nitrogen deposition and comments on AMI modelling. I think you said you were going to submit that for deadline for

1:25:43

That's correct.

1:25:45

The second one for the applicant

1:25:48

to submit some information setting out how monitoring isn't currently under undertaken and how the environmental permit is complied with with regards to aerial emissions and deadline for I've got that. Yes. Okay. Yes, that's correct. And third one for the applicant is an update to the outline landscape and biodiversity strategy, and the react to ensure that the wording all ties in and correctly reflects wording in requirements seven BMG under Section 106. I've got deadline five for that. Correct.

1:26:24

Again,

1:26:25

an update to the bng assessment taking into account metric four, I put a deadline five for that one as well.

1:26:33

Yes, that's my five. Thank you.

1:26:37

Again, Mr. Northover, you might need to correct me if I've got this one incorrect, I think by deadline five, some landscaping principles review of the design framework and to look at the React to improve. So it's the the applicant to up they've said they will update the reactor and to include further design principles from the design framework. Sorry, I agree with some follow up same comments that was mentioned as action, whatever number,

1:27:10

my mind is action two and three, but I think you're indifferent auditor.

1:27:14

So we will update the we'll review the Riak. We'll review the requirements. And we'll review the landscape.

1:27:23

Biodiversity strategy, as a holistically and do any necessary updating or acquired or create a signposting document to explain where the design principles are caught by the React called the requirements. So that's kind of I think the two two actions are the same is a common approach. So now that that's my deadline five, I will I will combine them and combine them Serbia will do an update, landscape biodiversity strategy will update the React we've already noticed. It could be clear in places. So happy to have on the action list update LPs, for deadline five, update, react deadline five, whether we submit a signposting document will depend on our review. So I wouldn't put that as an option. But we may or may not submit one, depending on what on the outcome. Okay. And then there was also an action for the local authority to confirm if there's any design principles currently within the design framework that are not in the React

1:28:22

what what they are and what they would like to see included in the React from the design framework.

1:28:30

Okay, I've got another one for the local planning authority

1:28:34

is to let us know whether the monitoring location or receptor 14, whether that was an appropriate location, and that deadline for and then finally, an action,

1:28:47

the action for the local authority to confirm any design principles that anything there was a deadline for that. It would make sense that was the deadline for because then as we're updating the lbs and react for deadline, five, we could take into account principles that they think should be incorporated. And if we disagree, we can obviously then explain why they're not incorporated. So if we can make that request that would help help us.



1:29:15

Yes, that

1:29:17

makes sense to us. So that it's that okay, for the local authority. Yes. Okay.

1:29:24

Okay, and finally, an action point for both the local planning authority and applicant and that is to submit into the examination guidance on contextual considerations. And I have deadline for for that as well.

1:29:37

That's correct. Thank you.

1:29:45

Okay, I'll hand over to Mr. Northam over for item eight.

1:29:50

Okay, so item eight is any other any other matters? I have had no other matters notified to me under this agenda item that people wish to raise at this meeting.

1:30:00

Are there any items in relation to the environmental matters covered today or other relevant matters that anyone wishes to raise after what they've heard today?

1:30:14

I'm not seeing any one in the room, anyone online.

1:30:21

In that case, I'll hand over to Mrs. Jones to close the meeting.

1:30:26

Thank you. Thanks everybody today for contributing so fully and usefully to this meeting, we will consider all submissions made carefully. The next hearings in this examination are the compulsory acquisition hearing one which is due to begin at 10am Tomorrow here in this room, and then issue specific hearing for which is into the draft DCO, which will begin at 10am. On Friday, also in this room, the time is now 105. And issue specific hearing three for the Drax bioenergy with carbon capture and storage project is now closed. Thank you