



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) – Session 2
Date:	15 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_ISH1_SESSI ON2_15012025

00:05

The time is now 1146, and I would like to welcome everyone back to this issue specific hearing one for the Dogger bank offshore wind farms, I'm now going to hand to miss a bremsky, who will continue with item five on the agenda.

00:20

Thank you. As currently drafted, schedule 15 of the draft DCO contains generic protective provisions for the benefits of the protection of electricity, gas, water and sewage, undertakers in part one, for the protection of operators of electronic communication, code network operators in part two, and specific provisions for the protection of the environment agency in part three, drainage authorities in part four, and Network Rail in part five. A note from the various representations we have received that there are requests that this schedule should contain bespoke protected provisions for the benefit of statutory undertakers, both onshore and offshore, starting with onshore, we've had relevant representation from network where rail infrastructure under relevant representation. 10, national gas transmission limited and development representation. 17, national grid electricity transmission PLC under relevant representation. 35 northern power grid, Yorkshire limited under relevant representation, 55 the Environment Agency under relevant representation, 15 and Beverley and North Holderness international drainage board under as 123, as Betty Beverly and North Holderness international drainage board are attending this hearing. I will start with them. I understand that the internal drainage board do not have a bespoke protected provision, but have concerns regarding the drafting of Part Four of schedule 15, which is the protected provision for drainage authorities. Can I ask Mr. Simmons, representing Beverly and North Holderness, internet, internal drainage board to briefly set out what their concerns are. Please,

02:06

yes, good morning. Bill Simons from the Beverly and North Holderness internal drainage board, our our concerns of schedule 15, Part four is that, well, what what we're deeply concerned about is that, with the Environment Agency and their protective provisions, trenchless technology is being used to go underneath all of their water courses, which are main river, whereas within our drainage district, the some of The water courses are going to be using trenchless technology, but depending, depending on environmental circumstances, etc, open cuts will be used. Now I'm not going to go into all the technicalities of the difficulties of using open cut and the history that we've had experience and what can happen with that. What we would seek is that the development proposes to use trenchless technology on all crossings, unless otherwise agreed with the internal drainage board. At the moment, it's not that way. So that is our topic of concern at the moment, and we have been clear that we have sought trenchless technology right from the start of the DCO consultation process. Thank you.

03:32

Thank you. And can I ask the applicants to do the wish to respond?

03:39

Rosemary tingle onshore consents manager for the applicant. Thank you to the dreyford for providing the response. And we haven't had the chance to meet yet, so we would like to discuss this with them in a follow up call following this meeting. And we issued a draft response sort of late last week, so I just like to read that out, really, and we can discuss this further with with Bill of sorts, with meeting. So we have been, just to clarify, we have had a number of environmental technical groups where we have had representation with the Danish board, with a previous member who subsequently retired. So we discussed with John about the issue of trenchless crossings versus versus open cut crossings. I think it's our view that there could be some circumstances where open cut might be possible. And there's a number of protections for the drainage authority in various documents that we have. The main one being, that's part of the outline we heard construction practice in section 5.15, which is secured by 119 and we have to agree the methodology with the internal drainage board, and that would be, include the crossing type for all of those crossings that we have as open hub, we wanted to make sure that we have assessed the worst case as part of our environmental statement. However, there is an option in the obstacle crossing register for a HDD or a trenches crossing type, should that not be suitable and isn't something that we could agree as part of the open. Cut. We also had a discussion with with John Tyne just about what the main concerns were about where there have been issues previously, with other projects, with Open Cup and some of the issues cited things to do with adequacy of size of pumps, in ensuring that silt traps are caught, and also working in very well conditioned or unsuitable flood condition. So we have actually included a number of measures in the COVID construction practice prior to submission, just to cover some of those issues off. And so we're hoping that we can discuss this sort of, our approach to this, with with the drainage board, and reach your way forward and appreciating there may have been issues on previous schemes, and making sure that we have ensured included enough measures.

05:42

Mr. Bucha, just go back to something that you You said a moment ago. So you said that in terms of the methodologies that is to be agreed with the internal drainage board, did I understand that correctly, there is a

05:51

requirement in the cave of construction practice to agree a method statement for all crossings as to how we would cross, the feeling of current construction type and also depth and, yeah, so if we, if the contractor put forward a method for Open Cup and it was considered unsuitable by the drainage board, there would be an option to decline. And, you know, use a different, different option. But I think our engineering team feel that if the conditions were right, including the right season approach, and it's appropriate for that crossing type, which in many cases, are much smaller than the Environment Agency Lane crossings. You know, we'd like to, you know, have that as an option in our VCA, but I appreciate we haven't had a chance to discuss this with Bill. We'd only previously discussed this with John, who's now,

06:36

okay, Mr. Simmons, Does that satisfy your concerns? We

06:40

would sooner that they were all designated as open cuts, but then it would be subject so sorry. We would sooner that they were all done by trenchless technology. But then subsequently, if you know, if it was then appropriate to then agree to open cut, if it was necessary, but the board's definite favored approach is for trenchless technology. As I said. I don't really want to go into all the issues with it, but we have had bad experiences, and it's quite significant on sort of existing profile banks. And usually say if they start slipping, the usual way to deal with it is to put timber piles in, which really isn't very appropriate, gables running underneath.

07:23

Okay, I think by the sounds of it, you need to go away and have that conversation and get an update and have the discussions about how to proceed best. But I can see that Mrs. Simmons wants to take a precautionary approach towards this. So if I can ask that, you go and have that discussion and then give us an update in terms of the update that you had prepared for the internal drainage board, are you prepared to let us have that a deadline one as well? Yeah, absolutely. We're

07:50

planning on submitting a deadline one, but really wanted the opportunity to discuss with the drainage board before we submitted and make sure that we, like fully understood the situation, but obviously with it being submitted just before Christmas, if we've not managed to find a meeting date yet, so we will, I'm sure we'll be able to find what

08:06

understood. Okay, I just ask that you keep us updated on discussions. Then please both parties, if that's okay. Thank you. Thank you. So before I move on, I note that Beverly North holders, internal drainage board, in their submission as 123, made a number of general points in relation to drainage on the onshore water environment is Item 10 on issue specific hearing to agenda. But I know that the internal drainage Board have not indicated that they intend, intend to attend this hearing. Can I just confirm with the applicants if they are proposing to respond to the internal drainage boards comments in full at deadline one? I'm assuming that is yes, not just on this matter,

08:56

yeah, yes, yep.

08:58

Okay, bearing in mind, bearing this in mind, whilst I recognize that the applicants may not have the relevant specialists here to respond to any general drayage points, given that the internal drainage board are not proposing attending issue specific hearing two, I wonder if there was anything else that you wanted to raise now in relation to your submission that we could possibly deal with now or could be responded To in writing by the applicants if they're not able to hear today. Mr.

09:31

Simmons, sorry. Bill Simons, we that a draft response to all the issues that were raised in our letter is being prepared. Obviously, this was a late submission, but progress has been made on all of them, which is why we didn't feel it was necessary to speak the later meeting. If everybody's happy with that, but obviously, if anything else arises, then we will consider it further. Yeah.

10:00

I noted Thank you. I just wanted to check with my colleague, Mr. Tandy, did you have any questions for the internal drainage board?

10:12

I'm happy to wait to see where we get to with the next round of communications.

10:17

Much appreciated. Thank you.

10:22

So firstly Or secondly, Network Rail, they own land on which that would be subject to compulsory acquisition, temporary possession, but have also raised concerns regarding the protective provisions, and they consider it essential to ensure safe and efficient operation of the railway network that they have protective provisions included on the face of the order which they are. I note from the land rights tracker that you've been actively engaged, that the applicants have been actively engaging on this. And can you provide an update for us? Please,

10:54

Mayor James, on behalf of the applicant, yes, we have been in active discussions with Network Rail, and we've had a few back and forths on on the draft protected provisions. And we'll continue to update the panel as as we go through those negotiations, and we hope to be able to agree an agreed form of protected provisions during the course of the examination.

11:21

Thank you. My next question of, will it be agreed? So, in your understanding, it should be agreed before the end of the examination.

11:26

May or James, on behalf of the applicant, we are trying our best to agree the set of protected provisions. And so that's that is our position. We are continuing discussions, and we hope to be able to agree them during the examination.

11:46

Okay, national gas transmissions limited. Owns two transmission pipelines that would be affected and have requested bespoke protective provisions. The land rights tracker advises that discussions are ongoing between the parties in relation to a form of protective provisions for their benefit, and also notes that they would be, in any event, covered by generic provision. In part one, a note the applicant's

response to the relevant representation states that the applicants are in receipt of the preferred provisions and that these are currently being reviewed and considered. Do you have any update in this regard to this IP

12:22

mail or James for the applicant, yes, we have received their draft set of protected provisions, and we are in active negotiations on these So, as per network Well, we're hoping that we'll be able to agree these protected provisions during the examination, and we will continue to update the panel as those negotiations continue.

12:51

National grid electricity transmissions limited owns two transmission pipelines that would be affected and progressive, bespoke, protected provisions. The land rights tracker advises that discussions are ongoing in relation to a form of protective provisions for their benefit, and that they would, in any event, be covered by the generic provision. In part one, I noticed in the applicant response to relevant representations that the applicants are in receipt of the preferred set of protective provisions, and these were being reviewed and considered. Could I have an update regarding this one? Please?

13:24

Mel James, for the applicant, yes, we have reviewed and provided some comments on these protected provisions. We will continue to actively negotiate with National Grid, and we will continue to update you as we go through the examination.

13:43

And do you understand that they'll be resolved before the close of the examination? Mail

13:47

or James for the applicant, that is our hope. We are actively negotiating, and we will try and resolve any differences as we go through the examination.

14:00

Moving on to Northern power grid. Yorkshire limited they noted in their relevant representation that they were supportive of the proposal, but had concerns about the impact on assets. So requested bespoke protected provisions. The lands right tracker advises that discussions are ongoing between the parties in relation to a form of protected provisions for their benefit, and notes that in any event, they'd be covered by the generic provision. In part one, I note that the applicant's response to the relevant representation stated that they, the applicants, are in receipt of the preferred set of protected provisions and that these are currently being reviewed and considered. Do you have an update on this matter?
Mayor

14:38

James for the applicant? Yes, we are continuing active negotiations on these we're trying to resolve any differences, and we hope that we will be able to agree them during the examination. And we will, of course, keep you updated on the progress of these negotiations.

14:55

Thank you.

14:59

Do. The Environment Agency and their relevant representation stated that they do not usually agree to the disapplication of the provision of the environmental permit regulations for England and Wales, 2016 which relates to permits for flood risk activities, unless its preferred protective provisions are included in the draft DCO which they were not the applicants response, the environment agency's relevant representation stated that you had sent them your preferred protective provisions and that the Environment Agency were waiting to provide comments to you. Do you have any update on this matter?

15:38

Mayor James the applicants, I understand that we haven't yet received any comments on these protected provisions.

15:48

Okay, perhaps if I could ask that you chase that up and liaise with them, unsure

15:57

that I have been chasing them a lot, that I'm not getting any response, I would maybe appreciate action to them to provide them

16:04

okay, yeah, I think that's that's fair. So an action points in environment agency to provide a response regarding the protected provisions which the applicants provided to them.

16:14

Thank you. That would be very helpful.

16:18

Turning to offshore related comments, we received a number of relevant representations from the owners of offshore assets who had concerns about the potential effect at the proposed development on them. This included Kellis North c2 limited with relevant representation. 27 INEOS UK, SNS limited and one DS UK Limited with relevant representation. 26 INEOS UK, SNS limited and Dana petroleum limited with relevant representation. 25 national gas limited transmissions. National gas transmission limited with relevant representation. 17 Net Zero, North Sea storage, limited with relevant representation 42 bhp, built in petroleum GB, limited relevant representation for also to Hornsey project four, limited relevant representation 44 also Hornsey project three, limited with relevant representation 45 breezy, limited soundmark win, limited Sonning and win. Limited Opus win, limited with relevant representation. Five, Fauci one, limited with relevant representation. 23 and the Dogger Bank A, dog Bank B and Dogger Bank C, projocos with relevant representation. Seven of these only national gas transmission limited, have made a formal request for a protected provision, and the applicants tell me

what measures you are proposing to put in place to address these concerns, such as side agreements, or can we expect protective provisions to be put in place in the draft DCO for these interested parties, I've just referred to

18:06

Mayor James for the applicant. Currently we do not think it's appropriate to include protected provisions in the DCO when we think negotiating private agreements with these parties will be sufficient to address the concerns raised.

18:26

Does that include national gas transmission limited

18:30

Mayor James the applicant? No, we are in separate discussions with national gas on a form of protected provisions, as I noted earlier that

18:40

and that's in regard to the offshore assets as well. James, the

18:45

applicant, sorry, no, that's only in relation to the onshore interactions.

18:51

Okay. And in terms of the private agreements, how far are they progressed and are they likely to be resolved by the end of the examination

19:01

as well for the applicants, madam, I believe this item is due to come up this afternoon of item 2.3 on crossing and proximity agreements. Would it be better for us to provide that update? Then,

19:14

yes, no, that's fine. We can do that. Then, okay, thank you. The examining authority will expect both the applicants and the relevant statutory bodies to do their utmost to reach agreement on these matters before the close of the examination. However, if agreement has not been reached, then the examining authority requests that at deadline seven, provisionally timetable for the 26th of June, 2025 that the relevant statutory party submits into the examination their preferred drafting for the protected provisions with a detailed explanation as to why these would be necessary. The examining authority would then ask the applicants to review this drafting and to submit a section one, two. 7138, case setting out how the DCO, as drafted, would ensure that the statutory undertakers would be adequately protected at deadline. Eight, provisionally timetabled on the third of July, 2025, can I just ask if anybody has any final comments on the protected provisions? Thank you. I'm now going to hand over to Miss Dowling to deal with the next item on the agenda.

20:25

Thank you very much. So the next item on the agenda is Item six, which is schedule 18, compensation measures. Schedule 18 of the draft development consent order deals with securing the proposed habitats, regulation, assessment, compensation measures. It includes measures to compensate for sand bank loss, which is part one, Kitty weight compensation measures part two, and gilemut and raise a bell if required, compensation measures in part three, a lot of the technical detail will be discussed at the later hearings and in written questions on these matters. But at this stage in life, in relation to the draft development consent order, I'm just seeking a brief update on the progress for agreeing compensation measures and the timescales for getting these agreed. Namely, Is it achievable within the time available in the examination?

21:16

Julian possible for the app? So the app and, um, we have something prepared, which we have got to, hopefully a manageable level of brevity, but I have a fear that it's bit longer than you have in mind. Do you want to? There are obviously three measures. Do you want to deal with them in one go, as it were? Would you like to deal with them in turn?

21:55

Should I just get going and see how it goes? I suggest

21:59

you get going and we see how it goes, we can always stop you and ask any questions that we may have.

22:05

So Julian bottle with the accident. So the first measure is the dog and bank sac benefit compensation. That submission, so I'm setting the scene and but also addressing the DCO point, I understand we're sort of tracking about at submission in alignment with the Crown estates, ground for compensation plan a PP, 060, primary and secondary measures identified in the applicants. Project level, Dogger bank compensation plan AP 059, are only suitable to be delivered by Defra in consultation with other relevant stakeholders, and therefore not in the control of the applicants. The measures in question, which are the primary, not secondary measures, which is all that's going to go forward are the designation of a new protected site or extension of an existing site to protect annex one sandbag habitat outside of the existing MTA network. So importantly, desnes guidance outlining how developers can rely on these MRF in advance of being operational is due to be published alongside a ministerial statement from Defra confirming that strategic compensation will adequately account for predictive impacts ahead of the 2030, Net Zero target. Now we've been being promised this for a while. Now. We keep being told it's imminent, then we're told it's really imminent, then it's really, really imminent, and so, but so we are, we are awaiting that important guidance and ministerial statement so the applicants understand that it's depart intention that the ministerial statement can provide security and clarity for both developers And des ahead of the marine recovery fund being operational, through consultation with both desnes, got some dates, but I won't put them out, and therefore the applicants understand that the timeline for implementation of the marine Recovery Fund is to be operational in autumn 2025 consultation on how The fund will function will commence in early 2025 so in terms of the DCO drafting, we expect to review that upon receipts of the guidance and ministerial statement. But would highlight that from from the

developed, from a developer's perspective, given that we have no control over the steps of Defra will be taking, we think it's essential that the project is not constrained by the timing of that of that delivery. So whatever form that plays out is that sort of number one issue of concern. The applicants intend to review the project level, and once these items are published and if change request one they. Is accepted as this will reduce the project's impact on the Dogger bank. SAC, and then finally, in relation to quantum, the applicants have submitted a document entitled review of evidence on recovery of sand back habitat following habitat damage as 025, which addresses several comments raised by Natural England in their relevant reps are 039, by providing site specific evidence on habitat recovery within the Dogger bank SAC and providing evidence towards Dogger bank sales proposals for compensation content currently outlined in the compensation plan, appreciate. Okay, if

25:39

I could just stop you there. Mr. Boswell, now that you've Thank you, now that you've actually started, I realize that potentially, most of this is actually going to be covered, potentially again this afternoon. So to to minimize duplication, just bear with one moment I'm just going to have a conversation with my colleague, because it may be that we just skip this item the agenda and get the answers this afternoon, because I don't want to duplicate things if we don't need to,

26:07

there's nothing or birds up to do, I realize we've

26:21

dealt with the one thing. To deal with this afternoon. So if you could just very quickly provide an update with regards to the two remaining compensation measures, bearing in mind that obviously what we're looking at it is from a DCO drafting perspective, although I realize it's quite difficult that the two are intrinsically linked in potential with regards to what the compensation measures themselves are. Thank you.

26:47

Julian Boswell, for the applicant, is there going to be at the moment we it wasn't obvious that there was a hook for this topic in the agenda items this afternoon that we're very happy to cover, to cover it. So can I make a suggestion? I can do a really brutal pick out of the DCO bits of what I had got prepared. But I think we were fairly keen to give you the whole summary at some, you know, today, and just to sort of bring you up to date, as it were, but if there, if there can be found a slot within this afternoon's issue, specific hearing for that to be provided, which is, I think, what you're indicating you had in mind, anyway, then we would, we would be, you know, we would, we would support that. You just

27:41

bear with me one moment, just going to moment Just going to converse with one of

28:02

my colleagues. You okay, just because we've got a lot to get through this afternoon, there are many other matters on the agenda. I know that benthic matters will be dealt with again this afternoon. But if you could just very quickly bring us up to date with regards to the two elements in regards to birds

compensation, which are obviously not on the agenda, and then following what how this afternoon plays out, there's obviously the opportunity at the end of it to raise anything you may want to in regards to this matter onto any other business. But I think one of the reasons just to provide an explanation as to why sort of the bird elements had been avoided onto this afternoon's agenda is obviously we were waiting a lot of information back from Natural England, and it felt a bit premature to potentially discuss those matters at hearings, and that we would potentially be better to deal with them through written questions. In any event, because Natural England have indicated that they weren't proposing to attend any of the hearings. So with that in mind, if you just very like to like very if you would like to very briefly, just cover the points that you wanted to make in regards to the two remaining compensation measures that would be grateful thank

29:10

you. Julian Boswell, yes, and then we can put in the fuller version of this, of which this will end up working by lines. So the second measure is, is Kitty wake we're not, we're not currently proposing to change the DCO drafting. We think we're still operating within what was originally envisaged. And we the short point is that we think we are making good progress in identifying a suitable site, and currently expect that we will have been able to do so by the end of the examination. We are also exploring the possibility in discussions with all. Relation to the site that they weren't taking forward, that we might potentially take over. And the final point was just a reminder that the public interest is protected, the Eco is drafted, and I'm worth all the risk is on us. We're working within an established framework of the strategic compensation plan. We're delivering that at a project level. It's an accepted form of measure. There's every reason to believe it's accepted that the quantum, regardless of where the quantum end up, that it can be can be delivered, and the public interest is protected. So that brings us on to the final one, which is given what and razor bill. So a quick reminder that razor bill, as I'm sure you appreciate, is saying without prejudice, position given what is a conceded position. Again, at the moment, we're not proposing to review, or don't see the need to revise the DCO drafting for Gila Mott and raise a bill. We are we're continuing to pursue a multi stranded approach, is what other developers have done, because the unexpected can happen. That very much did happen in the context of cheap Island, where we thought we were going down a positive track, and then then that came into a halt. But we have two other sites that we are progressing which are viewable, which is, I think essentially all of the detail is actually already in front of you, but there'll be a summary in what we include in the post hearing summary in relation to two other project led sites. And then the final site is the silly piles where we dogmax out very much wanted to do a project level proposal, or was prepared to do a project level proposal, if sheep Island, by the way, which it did. But as things have panned out, in discussion with the Wildlife Trust and others, we are now moving, we are we are necessarily shifting to a different approach, because those parties only want to participate in a strategic approach, and so that could ultimately be the the through The MRF, there is very active exploration undertaking being pursued at the moment through the offshore wind industry council, OEC, through a state funded program called the offshore wind evidence and change program. And there's an agreed statement from OEC that I was going to read out, but I'm not going to read out, but essentially it says that they are actively and we are part of this looking at whether there is an interim mechanism that could be put in place to deliver a strategic rat eradication program to benefit hawks on the silly islands of which dog of acts out would be one of the projects that would benefit from that. And so that is obviously, well, that is an on all of these things are ongoing. By the end of the examination, we can't be sure where we're going to get to by the

end of examination, as sure you appreciate, but we are targeting whether it may be possible to have secured project level position that would deliver everything that we say needs to be delivered, and in any event, there will have been. So we're hopeful in relation to that, but we have to see how it plays out, and then at the same time, we will continue to support, contribute to the development of the strategic compensation option that I have, that I've mentioned, that that Oli is taking forward with engagement with Wildlife Trust and other stakeholders. That's as brief as I can be. Thank

34:16

you very much. Your brevity is appreciated so effectively from what you're saying, from a DCA perspective, compensation measure one is fairly in your mind, is probably going to remain as drafting, very little change to it going forward. But compensation measures two and three are still in discussion, and there may be some change to the development consent order drafting as we go through the examination.

34:44

I think it's actually, if we're talking about the order in the DCO, yeah, it's the essay is the SAC drafting the first part one of the schedule 18, that that that may well change.

34:59

Okay, so. Bank loss that would potentially change, yes, because

35:02

we are there was always a moving target as to how this was going to play out, whether the government was going to accept that it would take responsibility. There was a period of time under the last government when the Secretary of State was indicating that she didn't support this approach that that thankfully changed so then that we've got the mechanism of the strategic level plan, how that's being delivered at a project level by somebody that can't actually deliver it, because they're not different. So we've just been parking that and waiting to see how things evolve once we've got the ministerial statement and the guidance we are that that will be an appropriate point to revisit that and say, right, well, do we now shift onto some different wording and engage with with Defra, in particular in relation to that, and that's where we expect that to play out going forwards.

35:57

Okay, thank you. I think that helps. And as I say, as you've mentioned, it would be useful if you can submit what you're posting to read out in full to the examination at deadline one. I'm just going to check my colleague if there's anything that they want to raise on this matter. No, in which case, I'll move on to item seven, which is schedule 19, documents to be certified. It's actually a really simple reason why this is on today's agenda, as currently drafted, it's just a little bit challenging to read to identify the documents, and I recognize that it is a work in progress, as many of the documents will need to be updated during the course of the examination. As I've mentioned a couple of times this morning, I always try to look at things from the perspective things from the perspective of somebody trying to discharge requirements or conditions later down the line, or needing to look at application documents. And just, I reckon they just need to be able to easily identify the outline document or the part of the environmental statement that they need to use. So I just potentially suggests that you look at schedule

15 of the horns you for DCO to what I mean, it's just more that's split into three tables, where the first table is documents forming part of the environmental statement. The second table is examination documents forming part of the environmental statement. And the third table is other documents, and they are in a more regularized table format, with actual lines between the columns. So it's really mainly just a formatting issue that I wanted to raise with regards to schedule 19 at this point in time. So it's just something that I'd like the applicant to take away and have a look at, if they wouldn't mind doing so,

37:41

yeah, natural for the applicants. Yes, that's fine, madam. Just to update you, we are having some real issues with the SI drafting tool at the moment in terms of getting lines into tables. Okay, put them in, they keep disappearing, but that will make sure that that is definitely resolved by the end of examination. So this table is definitely meant to have lines, yeah?

37:59

So maybe in the word copy of the document, it can all be nice and neat and in a table, and we'll look at how it can be dealt with with statute in just a minute. But I'll leave that with the case team and see if they can come back to you with any advice as to how that they could you can protect potentially use that template better. I'm then going to move on to Item eight, which is consent licenses and other agreements, including any trans boundary matters, the applicants have actually provided a document to other consents and licenses at a P, P, 228, which sense that sets out the other consents and licenses that they will need to obtain in order to enable a proposed development to proceed if the order is made. These are split into onshore and offshore consents, and I note that they all either required post consent, or they form part of the DCA process in parallel, such as the appropriate assessment and the HRA. Therefore, I assume that the applicant isn't providing proposing to provide an update, because there's nothing to update me on,

38:54

then as well for the applicant, I suppose the the only matter that I was going to update your matter is in relation to the on short consents the applicants have been engaging with Natural England on the subject of protected species licenses, and are seeking to get licenses of no impediment, which may be issued during the course of examination. So

39:16

yes, licenses of no impediment should be included in this so because then obviously it's a clear register of other consents. So if they are, if you are seeking those, if they can be added into the register and then updated as and when you get those, that would be the letters of no impediment. Rather, would be helpful.

39:33

Please, yes, you corrected me about every letters of no impediment. We can add that to the lessons that are already in that brilliant

39:41

and then, just in terms of agreements, what I just wanted to ask is, are any section 106 agreements proposed? A note, for example, Historic England have made some requests, requests regarding gun emplacement at Buck farm, or in relation to any of your site highway works where section 106 agreements can often be used. So I'm just wanting to know if, at the moment, if there's any intention or we should be aware of any section 106 agreements that might be heading our way

40:07

as well the applicants name, I don't we're not progressing any section 186 agreement.

40:13

Thank you. Can I just check if there's anything anyone else wants to raise with regard on this matter? Can't see any hands raised, so I'm now going to pass back to Mrs. Below, to deal with the final items on the agenda.

40:30

Thank you. So on item nine, any other business? We have not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business that is relevant to this hearing. But before we close, can I ask if there are any other matters that any party wishes to raise? I cannot see any hands up. So moving on to item nine, action points. And close of meeting, given the number of the action points, rather than go through these in detail, now, they will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure website in the next day or two. So moving on to item 10. If there are no other items that are relevant to this hearing, may I remind you that the timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline. One, which is the 29th of January, 2025 may I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectorates website as soon as practicable after the hearing. I would also like to remind people that the next event for this application will be issue specific hearing two, on the scope of the proposed development, including construction activities. This will be held at 2pm this afternoon. The agenda for this hearing is available on the project page of the national infrastructure website. This is a virtual event, and registration for this will commence at 145 if you if you have been registered to attend this meeting, you will need to use the link that you have been provided with as reusing this link for the 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 on the project page of the planning inspectorates national infrastructure website. If anyone has any questions regarding this, then please contact the case team after this meeting. Before we close, we would like to thank all of today's participants for their time and assistance. During the course of this hearing, we shall consider all of your responses carefully. The time is now 1228, and this issue specific hearing on the draft development consent order for the proposed dog bank South offshore wind farms is now closed the.