



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms
<b>Hearing:</b>	Preliminary Meeting - Part 2
<b>Date:</b>	14 January 2025

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

# TRANSCRIPT\_DOGGERBANK\_PM\_1401202

## 5

00:05

Good morning, everybody. It's now 10 o'clock, and I'd like to welcome you to the resumption of the preliminary meeting for the dog bank, South offshore wind farms before we introduce ourselves. Can I just confirm that everybody can see and hear me clearly? If not, can I ask that you raise a hand in teams or switch your camera on? Okay, on that basis, I'm I think everyone can hear and see me, so I'm going to continue. Can I also confirm with Mrs. Hopewell that the live streaming of that of this event has commenced? Thank you. Please. Could all participants ensure that they are muted unless invited to speak? And please silence all electronic devices. This is the resumption of the preliminary meeting that was opened and adjourned on the Tuesday the 22nd of October, 2024 Welcome to anybody who was not with us on that day, and welcome back to those who were just to remind you this meeting relates to an application for development consent that has been submitted by RWE renewables UK, Dogger bank South West limited and RWE renewables UK, Dogger bank South East Ltd, for two offshore wind farms, Dogger bank south west and Dogger bank south east. Of up to a total of 200 wind turbines associated offshore and onshore infrastructure, including offshore and onshore high voltage electricity cables, onshore and offshore electricity substations, connections to the national grid and ancillary and temporary works. There is information about the project, the application and the examination on the project page of the planning inspectors, national infrastructure website, the web address for which can be found in our rule six letters of the 24th of September, 2024 which is PD 002 and the 17th of December, 2024 which is PD zero 10. I do not intend to repeat the opening remarks from the earlier session, but I would encourage anyone joining us for the first time to read the background notes preliminary meeting set out in Annex B of both of our rule six letters, and to listen to the digital recording of the earlier session of this meeting that is available on the website. I'm now going to go through some introductions. My name is Joe Dowling. I'm a chartered town planner. I'm an examining inspector and employed by the planning inspectorate, and have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member or the panel to examine this application. I'm now going to ask my fellow panel members to introduce themselves.

02:36

Good morning. My name is Claire bilo. I'm an examining inspector, a chartered scientist and a chartered Water and Environmental Manager.

02:45

Hello. My name is Helena abramski. I'm a chartered town planner and an examining inspector.

02:52

Good morning. My name is Laura Shawnee. I'm also a chartered town planner and an examining inspector.

02:59

Good morning. My name is Matt Tandy. I'm a chartered water environmental manager. I'm a civil engineer and an examining inspector. I

03:09

can confirm that all members of the examining authority have made a formal declaration of interests and that there are no known conflicts of interest with regard to us examining this application. Together, we constitute the examining authority or exa for this application, I'm now going to hand over to Mrs. Shawnee, who will deal with the rest of the introduction.

03:29

Thank you. I would also like to introduce our planning Inspectorate colleagues working with us on this examination. You will have all already spoken to and heard from Mrs. Hopewell, who is the case manager for this project, she has replaced Mr. Simon raywood. And I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the examining authority, to give our thanks to Mr. Raywood for all his hard work on support. Together with the Case Officer, Mr. Rameel Burney, they are the case team. If you have any questions or queries, they should be a first point of contact. Again, their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you have received from us on the project page of the national infrastructure website. In addition, I would like to advise you that there are technicians from production, 78 with us today who are attending solely for the purpose of managing the recording and live streaming of the meeting. This meeting is being held on Microsoft Teams platform and is being live streamed. Participants should not use the chat function, as it is not being monitored. Today. Should you wish to make any comment, please switch your camera on and use the Microsoft Teams hand up function and please wait to be invited to speak. If you participate in the meeting, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and live streamed, and that the digital recording will be published. If you do not want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. The planning inspectorates practice is to retain recordings for five years from the Secretary of State, Secretary of State's decision on the development. Send order to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, we would ask that you try your best not to add information to the public record that you wish to be kept private and confidential. If you feel that personal information is necessary, please provide this in a written document that we can redact before publication. The business of today's meeting is to conclude arrangements for the examination of this application. The agenda for today's meeting is set out in Annex A to our rule six, letter of 17th, December 2024 you may find it helpful to have the agenda in front of you and to refer to it as we go through today's business. The applicants have joined us here today, and I'm just going to ask them to introduce themselves now briefly. Thank you.

05:55

Good morning, madam. My name is Julian Boswell. I'm a solicitor and partner with Burgess salmon, representing the applicant, and I'll ask my two colleagues on my left and right to introduce themselves.

06:09

Hi. My name is Thomas Tremlett. I am the senior consents manager for Duncan banks south. Good

06:15

morning. I'm Jen Ashwell. I'm a director at Burgess salmon.

06:22

Thank you. I believe we also have representatives from the east Riding of Yorkshire Council. Can I not ask you to introduce yourselves please?

06:38

I think there might have still ongoing sound issues. I assume you're in the meeting. No, I think we'll just continue then on that basis anyway, can I just check that there's no one else who is intending to participate in this meeting this morning? Please. Could I remind those participating in today's event that, for the benefit of the digital recording, when you speak, you state your name, your organization and the person or persons that you're representing, so our introductions and reintroductions are now complete. But before we move on to the second item of the agenda, does anyone have any questions about the meeting today. No, okay, then I will hand over to Miss abrensky to discuss the draft timetable for the examination.

07:30

Thank you. You will now need to have Annex C of our rule six letter in front of you for item two, and a condensed version of the draft timetable will now be shown on the screen. If I could ask the applicants, can display the draft timetable on the screen, please?

07:51

Thank you. This timetable covers the whole period of the examination. This is for six months to the date of completion, which is the 14th of July, 2025 the draft timetable includes dates for future hearings, site inspections and deadlines for submission of written documents. It also includes the dates on which we propose to issue documents, which are written questions, and the proposed schedule of changes to the draft development consent order. Please note the time for submission on each stated date is 2359 which is one minute to midnight, unless otherwise stated. The timetable is provisional. At the moment, we will be listening to all submissions made here today, and we will also take into account all written submissions made at pre examination, procedural deadline C before finalizing the table the timetable. As you will see from the draft timetable, we have proposed nine deadlines. I don't intend to go through all of these now, but I will highlight some key points before inviting comments following the start of the examination, which occurs after the close of this meeting, we will hold a compulsory acquisition hearing this afternoon, at 2pm this provides an opportunity for the examining authority to explore matters in respect of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession, and for affected persons to put forward their case directly to towards the examining authority. Tomorrow morning, at 10am we will hold an issue specific hearing relating to the applicant, draft development consent order, followed by a further issue, specific hearing on the scope of the proposed development, including construction activities as soon as possible. After this meeting, we will issue our rule eight letter, which will include the finalized timetable deadline. One is currently timetable for Wednesday the 29th of January, 2025 at this deadline, we want to receive full written representations from all interested parties, the initial statements of common ground, as requested in our rule six, letter and comments on the local impact report we are proposing. Reason that we will ask our first set of written questions on the 21st of February 2025 after deadline

two, and if required, an additional set of written questions will be published during the week commencing the 13th of May 2025 an accompanied site inspection would be held if required during the week commencing the seventh of April 2025 whether this is subject to further discussions under item three on the agenda, which is any other business? You will see from the draft timetable that, if required, we have set time aside for further hearings during the week commence in the seventh of April and the second of June. 2020, 2025, the details of these will be decided after we have to after we have considered all submissions, I will now turn to the comments received so far about the draft timetable, starting with the applicants. We received written, written comments on the rule six, letter with reference PDC one, which included the following comments on the timetable, a request for deadline two to be moved to the 14th of February 2025 to allow more time for consideration of the documents submitted at deadline one, to allow the examining authority time to consider the submissions at deadline two, you have also suggested moving the date for publication of first written question to the 28th of February, 2025 to avoid the school Easter holidays, you have suggested moving the second round of hearings forward one week to the week commencing the 31st of March 2025 this would also avoid a potential timetable in clash with the North falls offshore wind farm examination. If this were to happen, you have suggested that deadline four and further written questions would also move forward a week. You also highlighted a concern that the current draft timetable only provides 10 calendar days between the receipt of the second written questions and deadline five, which you consider may be challenging. Is there anything else you wish to add to what I've just outlined?

12:10

Julian Boswell for the applicant, No, madam, nothing in relation to the timetable.

12:16

Okay. Thank you very much. Can I ask the applicants in terms of any future events, do you have a preference as to whether the event is blended or virtual?

12:27

We have assumed that the second set of hearings is in person, and we would prefer that there is at least one set of hearings that is in person.

12:39

Can I just ask why

12:42

I think they're well, we think they're more effective. And my personal opinion is that it would, it would be slightly surreal to not be meeting at least once. Okay? It also allows local people. It also allows local people an opportunity to appear in person.

13:02

Okay? Thank you very much. We note your preference however. We may choose to hold events virtually, depending on other responses. Thank you. Moving on to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, we note that you have not made any comments on the draft timetable, is there anything which you wish to raise in relation to the timetable?

13:32

May still be experiencing sound issues, we can come back to the council at a later Agenda Item number if they do wish to raise comments. And I don't believe we have anybody. Ah, and send you the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Did you have any comments that you wanted to make on the timetable, please? I

14:04

I think the council made us aware of ongoing technical issues when shit appears are still taking place. Okay, thank you. Miss Fauci well, and I don't believe that any of the participants part of the meeting in terms of making other comments. So thank you very much for your comments. We have also had written comments and some requests from four amendments to the timetable from the marine management organization, or MMO with PDC eight and Natural England with a reference PDC nine, the MMO raised concerns about timetable timetabling meetings immediately after this meeting and suggested that they should be rearranged when there was either a change in position or further discussion is required. They also requested that where possible, deadlines should not be set on a Monday in. Both the MMO and Natural England raised a similar concern to the applicants regarding the proposed time between deadline one and deadline two. Excuse me, Natural England have very concerns in deadlines. In relation to deadlines, 123478, and nine, and their ability to meet these deadlines, given the volume of information that they need to consider and their involvement with a significant number of other offshore wind farm examinations which have similar deadline to those proposed for this examination, does anyone who has participated today want to say anything in relation to the comments from these two organizations.

15:50

Thank you. And does anyone else have any other comments in regards to the draft timetable? I Okay, just in regards to, obviously, the applicants switched on their camera. Yes, Mr. Boswell,

16:12

conscious that we've only just put in the change requests, but it would be helpful to understand when you're expecting to make your decisions in relation to the sort of programming in of the change requests into the overall program. Okay,

16:31

thank you. We will come on to the the change request. Thank you. And just regarding East Riding of Yorkshire Council, if they do want to make any comments on the timetable, we would be happy to accept those comments. Via an email. As I'm sure you are all aware, there are many competing aspects when drafting a timetable, including several internal deadlines for the inspectorate, which also need to be built into the timetable, such as the publication of notifications. As such, it is a difficult task to draft a timetable which everyone is 100% happy with. We will, however, take all of the comments made here today and at the pre examination procedural deadline into account when producing our rule eight letter with the final timetable. But ultimately, it is up to us, as the examining authority, to decide the final timetable. The only matter I'm going to respond early today to is the request from the MMO to rearrange the issue specific hearings timetabled for tomorrow and Thursday, whilst the examining

authority note this request, given the limitations of a six month time period for examination and the delay caused by adjourning the start of the examination, the examining authority have a number of matters which they consider would benefit from an early oral examination, and therefore we do not propose to rearrange these hearings. Before I finish, I'd just like to highlight the importance of ensuring that information is submitted within the set deadlines. It is essential that these deadlines are met to make a fair and efficient examination, we will only accept late submissions in exceptional circumstances, because late submissions restrict the ability of other parties to respond. Because of this, it's worth noting that if you do submit something late, there's always the chance that it may not be accepted. It is also worth noting that we will not be able to accept any submissions after the completion of the examination on the 14th of July 2025 is there anything else that anyone would like to raise about the timetable before I hand over to Ms bello to deal with the next agenda item i Thank you.

18:49

Thank you, Mr. Bramsky, as you will see from the agenda, the examining authority would like to discuss the accompanied site inspection. The examining authority would also like to briefly discuss the change requests that were submitted on the 10th of January, 2025 but before we do, can I ask if there is anything anyone else wants to raise under this item on the agenda?

19:18

I cannot see any hands raised, so I will continue. Oh, I can see the applicant's camera has turned on.

19:24

Julian Boswell for the applicant. Not quite sure what the best sort of heading for this is, but in relation to issue specific hearing to this week, we're conscious that there are 15 different topics spread over a day and a half, and we would welcome either now or at the start of the hearing, in addition to the point that's been raised about the split between onshore and offshore, whether there's going to be some kind of indication of the. The time that you're allocating for each each topic, because we've got a very considerable number of people sort of lined up. In total, probably over 30 people, three zero people, and sort of keen for everybody to get there, to get their their opportunity.

20:22

Thank you. We will come to that at the end of this agenda item then thank you. Accompanied site inspections are only required when it is necessary to inspect a site in the company of an interested party, for example, where access to private land would be required. We have not received any requests from any interested parties to undertake an accompanied site inspection. In the rule six, letter PD 10, annexe procedural decision five, the examining authority requested that the applicants review whether there were any locations that they wanted us to visit as part of an accompanied site inspection, and if so, to produce an itinerary for that inspection. In response, the applicants have identified that they would like us to visit Buck farm, to carry out a walk over of the heavy anti aircraft gun site and produce an itinerary As requested, PDC 006 the examining authority have also identified that they wish to visit the heavy anti aircraft gun site. But as it is on private land, we were not able to do so as part of the unaccompanied site inspections that we undertook in September 2024 to allow the greatest flexibility and to minimize the attendees and therefore the associated costs, the examining authority would like to carry out this inspection on an access required basis. This is where the access is provided to enable

the examining authority to inspect the site, but without the need to be accompanied. Would this be acceptable to the applicants?

22:13

Julian, also the applicant? Yes, it would be acceptable to the applicants.

22:18

Thank you. We will amend the examination timetable to reflect this, and we will publish a note on the project page of the national infrastructure website detailing when the inspection was undertaken and what was observed. So moving on to the change requests. On the 10th of February 2025 the applicant submitted two change requests. The change requests consisted of proposed changes to the offshore and intertidal area change request one, and to the onshore substation zone change request two. The examining authority has 28 days from submission of the requests to confirm if they are able to be accepted into the examination due to the timing of this submission, the examining authority has not had an opportunity to review the submissions in any detail, and is therefore not in a position to confirm whether the requests are accepted. As a result, the hearings timetabled for this week will proceed on the basis of the application as submitted. However, the examining authority recognizes that the applicants may wish to refer to the change requests and the implications for the examination in response to questions asked at this week's hearings, the examining authority wish to make it clear that any discussions on the proposed changes will be on a without prejudice basis, and are not an indication that the examining authority have accepted the changes. In order to minimize documentation, the examining authority would normally seek to combine the rule eight letter with a procedural decision on the change requests. However, due to the hearings this week that may not be possible, and in any event, the examining authority considers that early confirmation of the examination timetable is desirable. As a result, we are not currently proposing to deal with the change requests in the rule eight letter to support the change requests, the applicants have submitted some new documents to illustrate the impacts of the proposed changes which are not intended to replace the equivalent documents that form part of the accepted DCO application. They are Appendix A, fish and shellfish ecology, environmental statement update. Appendix B, marine mammal environmental statement update and Appendix C, marine mammal report to inform appropriate assessment, update the examining authority would like to understand. Firstly, if these documents update the environmental statement and report to inform appropriate assessment, why are they not becoming part of these documents? The. I could ask that of the applicant please.

25:09

Jen Ashwell, for the applicant, so the if well, you won't have had a chance to review it yet, but the draft DCO that was submitted to support the change request has been updated so that the definition of environmental statement refers to the supporting documents that were submitted with the change request, so that therefore any reference to the environmental statement within the draft DCO will incorporate those updated changes. And it's therefore thought not to be necessary to update the original environmental statement.

25:49

Okay, thank you.



25:57

So the examining authority notes that in appendix A of the change requests cover letter. There are a significant number of further documents which you are proposing to submit if the change requests are accepted. To fully understand the implications for the examination timetable, the examining authority has a number of questions for the applicants. Firstly, can the applicants explain if the work to update these documents has already been done, and if it has, why were these documents not updated and submitted with the change request last Friday? And if not, how have you come to the certain conclusions of no change in significance in relation to those aspects of the EIA and the HRA? Do?

26:46

Um Jen as well for the applicants. So in response to the first point, um, some work has begun to update some of those documents, but none of it had been completed by the point that the change request application was submitted last week, the applicants are quite conscious of not undertaking work that may ultimately prove to be abortive if, for example, the change request is not accepted and therefore has not updated the full suite of documents listed in appendix A as of yet. That's the reason why they haven't gone in yet. However, the applicants have done a thorough review of all the application documents in order to compile the list of documents that it believes would be updated as a result of the change request with the supporting documents that were put in with the change request. Each environmental topic has been thoroughly reviewed, and any potential changes are outlined in those supporting documents the applicant believes that it has done the necessary review in order to be able to reach the conclusions that it has on significance of effect.

28:13

Okay, thank you for that response. So for completeness, can I ask you to confirm if the only change in EIA significance, as a consequence of the change requests, is from significant to not significant.

28:29

Dan ashwa for the applicants, yes, that's correct, and that's only in relation to one particular environmental topic, and one particular matter within that topic, which is the impact on marine mammals.

28:43

Thank you. So are the applicants comfortable that such a change does not engage the EIA regulations, despite there being a change in likely significant effects,

28:55

then at all for the applicants? Yes, we are comfortable the wording of the guidance relates to new or different likely significant effects. We are not of the view that a downgrading of significant to non significant is either a new significant effect or a different significant effect to those that were previously assessed.

29:21

Thank you. Do any of the documents include information that the examining authority might find of assistance in deciding whether or not to accept the change requests?

29:39

Jen as well for the applicants. I think I haven't got the just going well, we don't have examination library references for these documents yet, but there are two main documents that were submitted with each change request, so one for change request one and one for Change Request two. They are the sort of. The main documents which went in for each change request, which outline details of each change request, they also outline the consultation that's been undertaken by the applicants, and any consultation responses, all of which have been largely positive. And I think any detail that the examining authority would need is probably within those two documents.

30:28

Okay, thank you. So finally, if the change requests are accepted, when do you intend to submit the rest of the documents?

30:41

Jen as well for the applicants, we've been discussing this internally, and we believe that deadline three, I mean, obviously, depending on when we get the decision from you, but deadline three would work timing wise, in terms of getting all those documents ready for submission.

31:02

Okay? Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. I'd now like to turn to the item that you raised for this under issue specific two. So I'll turn to ms Dowling.

31:20

Thank you very much. Mrs. Bina, yes, you asked if we can provide any more certainty as to the amount of time to be allocated to each of those topic areas to enable you to give your specialists an indication of when they may need to be available to attend the hearing, as you are already aware, because we've already confirmed it to you, we are proposing to try and split deal with all the offshore matters on Wednesday afternoon and then all the onshore matters on Thursday morning. However, that is obviously based on our ability to get through everything that we need to do. So we have a variety of questions that we wish to ask, and we have already highlighted some that may be able to be swapped over to written questions. If we're running out of time, we will try what and do what we can to try and give you a vague indication of time frames for when people will need to be available, when topics will be dealt with. But to be honest, it's very much dependent on the replies that we receive and the amount of detail that we need to go into, I can advise you that in terms of people attending that hearing, we've had an indication, if, with regards to the offshore matters that I can only remember their short name, but basically Nabarro, who are going to be representing the other dog or bank offshore wind farms are proposing to attend to speak on item one, which is weight loss. And with regards to the onshore matters, we have no one apart from yourselves and the applicants and the council attending. So if that helps give you an idea of maybe the times that may be given to those projects, but to those topic items. But at this stage, I can't provide any more detail, but we will review it after this meeting and see if we can give you some more firmer details. Is that? All right? Mr. Boswell.

33:20

Julian Boswell for the applicant. Yes, that that was helpful. Could I just make sure I understood what the very final point that you made there, you indicated that Navarro were going to be representing the Dogger bank projects for the for the weight loss item. Did I understand you to say that no one else is appearing at the or is registered to appear on other offshore topics,

33:44

yes. As far as, oh, I'm just going to double check with Mrs. Hopewell, if Yeah, that's correct at the moment, in terms of people responding to us, as you yourself did at procedural deadline C, indicating which hearings they wanted to attend. At the moment, the only people we have attending on Wednesday afternoon, on a borrow on behalf of the other dog banks with regards to weight loss. Okay, thank you. And then I just sorry, I've just been advised the maritime and Coast Guard agency may be turning up. Is that right? Yeah, so the maritime and Coast Guard agency have advised us that they may well also be attending.

34:17

And then onshore, I think you said that it was only East Riding of Yorkshire Council That's correct. Okay, no, I think what you've said is helpful. Thank you. No problem. Thank you. So sorry, there is one supplementary

34:33

Okay,

34:36

you've obviously issued your list of supplementary agenda questions, which is very helpful, and we just wanted to check whether you're planning to go through those at the hearings, or whether the intention is for those questions to not be raised at hearings and instead to be deferred to Deadline one in writing, just to confirm our

34:55

intention is that we will provide an opportunity at the beginning. Of those hearings, each hearing where a supplementary agenda has been published. And so in this case, it's just issue specific hearing to for anyone to mention anything that they want to raise orally, and then we'll review that and see if that can be incorporated into this hearing. But otherwise, if people don't raise something that they want to actually discuss at the hearing, then we would just Yes, defer to it in writing at deadline one. So there is an there will be an opportunity, for example, on Wednesday afternoon, to say, you know, in a supplementary agenda, this has been raised, and we'd like to actually discuss that, rather than just respond in writing, or we're seeking a clarification on this question. Okay, thank you. That's very helpful. Okay, I'm just, before I move to close this meeting, I'm just going to pass back to Mrs. Biló, who wants to ask another question. Thank

35:47

you. Ms, darling. I'd just like to just clarify one of your responses on the change request. So I asked whether any of the documents would include information that might be of assistance in deciding whether or not to accept the change request, you responded in terms of the documents that have already been submitted. What about the documents that have not yet been submitted? Would any of those documents, or any of those documents likely to contain any information which may be of assistance to the examining authority so

36:30

um Jen as well for the applicants, no, we don't believe that any of the documents that would be updated as a result of the Change Request acceptance would be helpful in terms of determining whether or not to accept the change request in the first place. A lot of those documents, we have explained in the change request how they would be updated or why they would need to be updated, and for example, with the works plans extracts from those are already included within the documents that have been submitted say that the examining authority, key examining authority, can already see what the changes to those documents would be in case that affects your decision whether or not to accept the application.

37:14

Okay, thank you. That's clear. I have one final question, would any of the documents that it had either been already been submitted or yet to be submitted. Need to be secured through the DCO.

37:26

Jen as well, for the applicants, a lot of them are already secured through the DCO, so it would be a case of updating those documents that are that are already secured. I don't think there would be any new documents that would need additional security through the DCO, but if there were, then they would have been incorporated within the draft DCO that had already been submitted with the change request

37:49

Tom Trump bank South I think part of our thinking was also that we didn't want to submit a lot of these documents that would be updated in DCO in the examination anyway. Didn't want any presumptions about the change being accepted, and therefore we're conscious not to submit all of them when the change may not be accepted and cause confusion for stakeholders.

38:10

Okay, thank you. So before I hand over to Ms Dowling, can I ask if there is anything else anyone would like to raise under any other business

38:24

I cannot see any hands raised. Okay, I will now hand over to Ms Dowling, thank you. Thank

38:32

you very much. So that completes our business for today. We trust that the agenda has been covered, and we believe that we have provided an opportunity for all those who notified us of their desire to comment to do so, the recording of the live stream and a note of the preliminary meeting will be added to the project page of the planning inspectorates national infrastructure website. As soon as possible,

after this meeting, the examination will now commence, and it must be completed with a max within a maximum six months. We look forward to working with you all during this period. I'd like to take this opportunity to, as set out in the rule six letter, to confirm that the reserve period for this meeting, which was set aside at 1pm this afternoon, will not be required. I'd also like to remind people that the first hearing in the examination will be a compulsory acquisition hearing, which will start at 2pm this afternoon. The agenda for this hearing is available on the prior available on the project page of the national infrastructure website. This is a virtual event, and registration will commence at 145 if you had registered to attend this meeting, you will need to use the link that you've been provided with as reusing the link for this meeting will not work. If you are proposing to watch the live stream, then you will need to use the relevant link that can be found. Can be found on the project web page of the national infrastructure planning inspectorates, national infrastructure website. If anyone has any questions regarding this, then can they please contact the case team after this meeting, we are aiming to publish our rule eight letter to confirm the examination. And timetable and the arrangements of the examination as soon as possible at this meeting, and hopefully no later than Friday the 17th of January 2025, so the time is now 1040 and this preliminary meeting for the Dogger banks South offshore wind farms is now closed. Thank you. Applause.