



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Session 6
Date:	16 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_ISH2_SESSI ON6_16012025

00:05

Good afternoon. The time is now 145 and I would like to welcome everyone back to this issue. Specific hearing for the Dogger bank, offshore wind farms. I'm now going to hand back to Mr. Tandy, who will continue with item 11 on the agenda, which is onshore water environment. Mr. Tandy,

00:25

yes, thank you. I shall start with 11.1, which is related to the scope of the geomorphological survey, and with this specific regard to its spatial extent and included water courses, it probably useful if we could have figure 22 one of the geomorphological survey report, which is a PP 166, on the screen, Please.

00:59

If the applicants are able to do that.

01:09

Yes, we're just bringing that on hand. Thank you.

01:16

Whilst you're doing that, I'll just describe the issue I'm looking to explore. So this figure is based upon the corridor routes which were relevant at the primarily environmental impact report stage. And it's not clear if the onshore development areas outside of the survey extent have subsequently been surveyed. And this will become obvious when we can see the figure on screen. I'd like the applicants to confirm if the areas outside of the survey extent have subsequently been surveyed or not. Sarah,

02:01

you're able to give us a page number within the document where the figures located? Please?

02:06

Yeah, I believe it's page 62 Thank you.

02:20

And the particular area in question you will see is where the red route is outside of the survey. Extent do

02:44

I think Simon would be able to answer that one for you. So,

02:50

yeah, hi, Simon falls well has gone in. Could

02:52

you just clarify

02:56

which sections you're meaning? I can see the green areas are where it was surveyed, and obviously they're more extensive than the red line boundary. That is the case because obviously the project area has been refined down as time has gone on, and the sort of peer boundary when this survey was done, yeah, was more extensive so that those green areas were surveyed. Yeah,

03:22

yeah, that's fine. So, so not far from where you're pointing now, of the cursor, just slightly further south, you can see there's an area which is outside of the survey extent. Am I sort of simply want to know whether that has subsequently now been surveyed or not.

03:41

Um, that doesn't look like there's any water courses there. So if it wasn't in the peer boundary at the time of the survey, No, it wouldn't have been surveyed. But it doesn't look like there's any water courses

03:54

there. Okay, so as the first action point, then, could you come back to the examining authority to confirm there aren't any water courses of interest within the area that doesn't appear to have been surveyed. I

04:05

will just state as well that the figure shows environment EA, main rivers and river water bodies assessed under the water environment regulations, and that was the scope of the survey, because they are that's potential disturbed statutory features, which are main rivers, or the potential to cause deterioration to river water bodies. And as you can see, there are no river water bodies or ear men rivers in that area, so we wouldn't have surveyed that at the time.

04:38

That's fine, and you're sort of leading into where I'm going next, which is, if you could just explain why the survey was limited to 13 major water courses, and then subsequently, were there any water courses which haven't been surveyed? How have they therefore been assessed as part of this?

04:59

Yeah, the. Scope was defined on, as I said, assessing statutory features on the river water bodies. Or it's just worth to point out that all of the water bodies in this area are either artificial or heavily modified, because they're sort of being modified for land drainage or flood defense, and the other sort of ordinary water courses, drains, ditches, what have you that cross the corridor are basically the same sort of features this area is sort of like historically drained. And as you can see by the regular sort of pattern of

channels. There were a lot of channels there, and I'm very confident if you were to survey all of those, it wouldn't really change the baseline, because we're looking at a sort of set of parameters described in the appendix, 20.2 things like floor, sediment, floodplain connectivity, okay, and those features are basically similar for the channels that we surveyed, and those that those sort of small loss riparian ditches that haven't been surveyed.

06:13

Yes, okay, so I understand why. Now you've selected the 13 major water courses it would, though be useful, if not already within the application documentation, to explain how the, I suppose, the lesser water courses, if we want to call them that, how they are or have been assessed, and where that can be fine, where that is within the application documentation,

06:42

that'd be possible

06:45

in terms of the the point we're talking about, which is the scope of the actual survey.

06:53

Yeah, that just goes back to the point I just made, that all of these catchments are very similar. Obviously, assessed in the different impacts. These other channels are assessed where there are trench crossings of ordinary water courses, but just purely for the point we're talking about the scope of the survey. As I said, this is just for statutory features on the river water bodies.

07:30

Yes. Okay, so just to confirm on this point, then the Action Point is one to confirm that there aren't any water bodies of interest or water courses of interest either within the area that hasn't been surveyed. That's the first action point. Then the second action point would be that it'd be useful to the examining authority for the applicants to confirm, if not done so already, within the documentation, the reasons why the 13 major water courses have been selected and that the lesser water courses are have still been assessed within the method that's been already submitted.

08:05

Okay, yes, yes.

08:15

Before I move on, I just like to ask if the local authority wish to add anything at this point, I Grand

08:20

Valley

08:26

East Riding of Yorkshire Council, again, unfortunately, we don't have anybody from our drainage or lead local flood authority available today, so I have nothing that I can add at this point.

08:41

Okay, I would usually come to you throughout this agenda item, but on the basis you haven't got anyone here and for expediency, if you could just let me know if you want to sort of raise a point on any of these that would be useful. Otherwise, it'll be an opportunity to do so afterwards in writing.

08:58

Yes, I would. I

09:05

Okay, we'll move on to Item 11.2 which is the use of local food risk information and the impact on the functional floodplain.

09:18

The mppf and the associated PPG explain that the impacts from climate change are to be included within a flood risk assessment and in the application of this sequential approach to steer new development to areas within the lowest risk. CHAPTER 20, Section 20 point 4.5, point 2.1, which is within a PP, 163 does not include a reference for an assessment for climate change. Therefore, could the applicants please confirm how this has been taken into consideration the.

10:01

Helena wicks will cover those points.

10:07

Helena wicks on behalf of the applicant, I think that's actually related to the ES chapter. If Can I, can I confirm that's correct, rather than the flood risk assessment? Is that correct?

10:22

Yes. We can go with that,

10:31

in which case that would be Simon to respond on behalf of the chapter. So

10:39

do you mind just repeating the question, please. I thought this is a flood risk question.

10:45

It is a flood risk question, yes, but it does relate to chapter 20 of the environmental statement. So I don't know if you want to decide between yourselves, who's going to answer it before I repeat the

10:59

question, yeah, if it's a chapter, I will try and answer it, and maybe Helen, let's need to so, yeah,

11:07

okay, so the mppf and the associated PPG, explains that the impacts from climate change are to be included within a flood risk assessment and in the application of The sequential approach to steer new development to areas within the lowest risk. CHAPTER 20, Section 20, point 4.5, point 2.1, does not reference climate change. Therefore, can the applicants clarify how this has been taken into consideration? Please,

11:42

do I just like to find the

11:48

just repeat the Pages. Pages 56 to 57 i believe i

12:21

Um So climate change allowances are not explicitly, explicitly referred to in the chapter as they are COVID in the detailed flood risk assessment pages 56 Yeah. That is, yeah. It's not directly referred to in the chapter, but it is COVID in the FRA appendix 21 points.

12:48

So can you confirm, then that that has been, has been considered in the application of the sequential approach for the proposed development? Because that isn't currently stated within the chapter, yeah, I

13:02

will pass that to Helen if you don't mind, because of sequential test, and that kind of stuff is covered by Helena in the FRA if you don't mind.

13:12

Yeah, Helena Ricks, on behalf of the applicant. I think that's the sort of link back across to the document, Appendix, 24 flood risk assessment. A P, p1 68 where we do have a section on both the climate change and where it's relevant to the project, and also the sequential approach that's adopted to the project, where we set out the sequential approach with regard to all elements of the of the project, you know, including landfall, onshore export cable corridor and the onshore converter station areas. I think if we can maybe just step two, Appendix 24 flood risk assessment identifies the flood zones one, two and three, and applies those for the entire project. It's based on the flood zone data set available from the project. And I think one of the points is that paragraph 193 of appendix 24 a PP 168 confirmed at the onshore substation zone, which would be the only one affected long term by climate change. It's the above ground infrastructure is located in flood zone one, and therefore a sequential approach has been applied to that element of the project.

14:23

Yes, thank you. Okay, what I'm interested in is, of course, the everything that is being proposed as part of this development, and ensuring that that has been followed. My point at the moment is, is to whether climate change has been considered in relation to the location of where this development is being proposed, because you referenced their flood zones, one, two and three. But of course, to my understanding, they don't include an allowance for climate change.

14:59

No. Okay, but climate change is applicable. Sorry. Helen wicks, on behalf of the applicant, climate change is applicable to project. Yes, as noted, no, the flood zones don't. But the only, the only part of the project that would be affected long term by climate change is that above ground infrastructure, which is the onshore converter station that has taken into consideration with regard to climate change, that would be relevant to either surface water flows in this consideration, which leads into the drainage strategy or to the fluvial flood risk. Is that does that? Is that clarification?

15:38

It does in part, but what it doesn't do is the examining authority would need to be happy that, as you quite rightly suggested, that the only part that above ground would be the converter station, which is currently identified in flood zone. One. How do we know what? What would it be impacted in the future? Because you currently haven't assessed that against any impact from climate change.

16:09

Yeah, okay, we may need to take that away and provide that in clarification, in writing, but it has been located and in flood zone, one you know, at lowest risk, and measures like, I say, ensure it's not affected by climate change in the future. Yeah. Okay,

16:24

happy to take for you to take ways in action this is to sort of ensure that it's in line with the mppf and the PPG, which, which does make this point, yep.

16:32

And can I come back to say, yes, we believe that the project is in accordance with that by locating the onshore converter station in in flood zone one and then principally flood zones two and three is only where the cable route, which will be buried passes through those other flood zones. We'll

16:53

make it clear in the action.

16:54

Okay, thank you.

16:59

It may be useful now to have the flood risk assessment on screen, because I will now refer to a few of the sections which it might be useful whilst you're doing that, I'll I'll read out the issue. So the examining authority has been asking for clarity around flood zone. Three, the applicant's response to the rule six, letter PDA, dash zero, 11, explains that it's not always able to derive a delineation between flood zone three A and flood zone 3b however, in the flood risk assessment, if we were to go to paragraph 62 when you can have that on screen the SF it explains that the sfra identifies areas and puts on 3b three A, etc, as well as the risk of flooding from other sources, and provides a comprehensive sort of

summary of the historic flooding information. So the information is available. So I'd like to understand from the applicants why that hasn't been used.

18:03

Helena wicks on behalf of the applicant, as you sort of, as you've alluded to, the flood zones only break down to flood zones 123, from the Environment Agency, we have to differentiate between flood zones three A and 3b with the functional flood plain as the X rays been requesting information is taken from other sources, the East riding Bucha council level one sfra does define the functional flood plain. It's for that for their administrative area. Appendix C of the level one sfra includes a map. It's only available as a PDF. It's quite coarse in its resolution. There is also an online map viewer for the level one sfra, which is available. We have referenced that or check that for information. It is an online viewer, and as such, the data can't be easily downloaded from it. So we've had to do it as a cross check, rather than being able to provide a mapped delineation of it in the in the flood risk assessment. One of the things I probably would reiterate on that is that a review of that functional flood plain layer on the level one sfra viewer online confirmed that it's it's limited to the areas where the onshore export cable corridor would pass through areas. It's not affecting the onshore converter station area or towards landfall. It's through the central section of the cable route.

19:30

Sorry, just before you continue on with that, my point here is, is that the information is available. Yes, it hasn't been presented to the examining authority into the examination so we can't take it into consideration. And we've we've been asking for this delineation so we can understand how the development, if at all, would influence flood zone three be, from what I can understand, from what you've said so far, is that you're struggling to get hold of. Information. So has there been a conversation with the local authority to obtain that?

20:04

Hello, Ricks, on behalf of the applicant, yes, we've put in a data request to both Environment Agency and East Riding of Yorkshire Council. They've provided some information. We can again request this in a digital format that we might be able to use it otherwise we can provide a link to the online viewer and a sort of screenshot of it, I suppose, if that makes sense in our written representation following the hearing. But as the data is not in our control, shall we say it's that's why we're unable to provide it as a sort of figure out ourselves within the flood risk assessment, but it has been reviewed as part of the assessment within the FRA

20:51

just at this point, I'd like to go to the local authority to understand what their position is on being able to share this information. I

21:04

I used riding a future Council. Apologies, it's not one I'm able to answer if I can take away, but would be helpful if you could just confirm, just for my benefit, and to make sure I get it right, the actual information that's been requested, and also if I can then take that away as an action point, if possible. Please.

21:22

Yes. This is related to the level one sfra flood risk zones or flood zones, 3b, three, a, etc. We can confirm exactly what it is within the action point.

21:35

Yes. If I could say that's an action point, please do

21:50

I think the examining authority's concerns here is that there is flood risk information that's available, that's been cited, that hasn't been entered into examination. So in part, it is referred to within the flood risk assessment, but the maps etc aren't there to back that up. And of course, some of this information seems to be a lot better than the Environment Agency mapping, which is being relied upon. And of course, within the mppf and the PPG, the use of local flood risk information is preferred. And in fact, within the flood risk assessment itself, paragraph 43 it makes this point that it the level one sfra information would be used, particularly in the application of the sequential approach and test. So yes, we will put the action points in there for the local authority. But I would also ask the applicants again to go away and do everything it can to obtain this information and submit it into the examination if it's going to be cited within the FRA

23:01

Rosemary tingle, just speaking for the applicant, I think we appreciate your frustration, and we're, you know, we have now identified the information, and we will take it away and have a look at that. But yeah, I think initially we would have always produced the original flood zone mapping, but appreciate there is that secondary level of detail. And yeah, I think this is something we can go away and look at. So, yeah, I think we need to think that we were

23:26

being deliberately difficult on this one. We'll get back to you that's appreciated. You.

23:45

In the the applicant, I suppose, at this point be useful just for me to know the applicant should know that in the absence of identity of you identifying flood zone three be the examining authority may consider areas identified as flood zone three, in its entirety, as the functional floodplain for the purposes of this examination. So with this in mind and referring to the Environment Agency relevant representation, which is our R, 015, this also explains that mitigation for the proposed temporary construction compounds in flood zone three should be in accordance with the level one sfra, the outlying code of construction practice is subsequently being updated and submitted by the applicants, which greatly received, and that includes a consideration of relevant mitigations of the sfra. So not quite going far enough to commit, but we'll, but we'll consider it will be useful to the examining authority, if you could explain what mitigation the level SF, level one, sfra, would require for proposed development in the functional foot plane, and if this is consistent with the mitigation that's being proposed within the application documents. So. I

25:07

was gonna say, Helena, do you want to take that? Otherwise I was just gonna but in but you go ahead.

25:13

No, it's okay. Helen makes on behalf of the applicant. I think the mitigation measures are relatively high level related to best practice of materials in the flood zone, etc. What I would do is we would take an action away and confirm what those mitigation measures are in the level one sfra, and signpost them to you, towards you, towards it. In the where we've included in them, in the oocp, I think, is probably the best.

25:44

Okay, the examining authority will also need to be given some surety that these measures can actually be included within the order limits. And we'll also need to understand how this is going to be secured, because at the moment, there's only going to be the consideration of relevant mitigations. So can we wrap that up into sort of one action point in its entirety? That agreeable,

26:16

yeah, Rose meeting will be on short and 25 that just want to say that we will say I know they're not here, but we discussed it with the Environment Agency and with the leave local flood authority, who couldn't have said today, they were very happy with the proposals being located in flood zone three Well, you know, but we have, we added extra measures. We discussed with them if there were any additional measures that they would need, given that we might be placing temporary instruction compounds within three they were fairly happy with our proposals, but did ask that we provided some more drainage. Made sure that stockpiles didn't provide any blocking of drainage channels. So we added that. And Helena, I can't remember if there are any more, but I'll pass over to you if there's anything more you can add to that. But I just wanted to add that we have discussed this point with the other with the relevant stakeholders.

27:05

Hello, it's on behalf of the applicant. No, they were the main points that they wanted us to include.

27:15

Okay, thank you. I think you've started to move into where I was going next. So the water environment regulations compliance assessment, which is as zero, 75 paragraph 76 This explains the areas at risk of spillage, such as vehicle maintenance areas and hazardous substance stores, there would be Earth bonded, and they would be cited to minimize the risk of hazardous substances entering the drainage system or local water courses. Would any of these sort of bonded areas be within the flood risk extent? And if so, have these been or will they need to be assessed? Do

28:05

Hi, Simon falls on behalf of the applicants in terms of the water environment regulations, assessment, the mitigation measures have been taken into account in terms of flood risk and where any bonded to. Maybe we'd have to take that away as an action, I think, in terms of the sort of the flood risk, potential flood risk, but we have, as was mentioned, we've sort of related to that point about the stockpiles being

placed to allow the proper drainage of surface water. That will be the same fine ease of features like this, but if we can take that away, some action that will be helpful.

29:00

Yes, happy for that to be taken away, if it's helpful. I've got a particular interest in the temporary construction compounds which the Environment Agency and its relevant representation identified as being within flood zone three. So therefore any bonding, any alterations to the land. Of course, there could have an implication for flood risk locally, not withstanding. I, you know, I kind of sort of appreciate that the details will be worked out later, but understanding the implications at this stage and that they've featured in within the flood risk assessment is important. So yes, happy for that to be on the action point.

29:44

Yes, Simon falls for the occultancy. I just say in terms of the water environment regulations assessment, that's sort of, there are questions about flows, but it's not directly looking at sort of changes in flood risk. Um, so that's more of a sort of flood risk assessment question.

30:06

Yes, I'd agree.

30:10

Raise me tingle the applicant. There is also a requirement for in the DCA, I think it's required 16 for the first degree construction management plan. Huge Council. Sorry, a little bit off top my head here, but I think one of the elements of there would include construction drainage. Would include the construction compounds. So we could part of that plan which could cover flood risk measures. But I appreciate that's not detailed in the document, but we could add that detail to make that claim.

30:41

That would be useful. I think it probably goes a little bit further than just providing some form of drainage, particularly for the two construction compounds, which are within flood zone three, if we're going to have Earth bonds, any changes in levels, if they're completely within flood zone three, the opportunity to provide mitigation for that joint construction would appear to be quite limited. But of course, none of this is currently within the documentation submitted

31:13

brave meeting, all for the applicant. I think we'll take this away and now we understand your concern. I think we can take that away and have a look at the detail in the training strategy and the outline code of construction practice, and have a look at the link between the flood risk assessment, just make sure it's covered off now we understand sort of the line of questioning. If that's okay, that's

31:30

great, yeah. And it also links into the previous point around what the level one s fra requires for development within flood zone three. Well, it's within flood zone 3b functional flood plain. But as we've just been discussing, if, if the applicants are unable to submit, to submit flood zone three and a, the

examining authority may consider all the flood zone three to to be flood zone 3b if that makes sense. So that's linked into that question. So

32:03

just one thing I did

32:05

want to add that I think we maybe missed slightly in the previous one is, sorry hell no. Mix, on behalf of the applicant, is that having, whilst the we've noted the two temporary construction compounds are within flood zone three, they would like to note that they are not within the functional flood plain, having checked against the level one s fra delineation of that which we will obviously provide that clarification to the XA following this, but those two are in three A, not 3b

32:36

Thank you, like I say, once the information submitted into the examination, we can consider it. I'll move on. Thank you. Moving on to 11 three, then, which is the overview of temporary water course crossings, including how these have been assessed. Es, chapter 20, A, P, p1, 63, paragraph, 103, explains. It may be necessary to install temporary structures to allow haul road access over water courses where direct access is not readily available from both sides. This may potentially be required on water courses which are otherwise going to be crossed using HDD. Could you confirm that these structures have been included within the assessment?

33:29

Yeah, the the temporary crossings come into the assessments in impact one direct disturbance of surface water bodies, and these, they modify the magnitude of impact depending on which scenario you're looking at. So for if you had to say five to nine trenched water course crossings, for the isolation and concurrent scenario, which is four years, the impact would be low, but for the same number of crossings in the sequential scenario, which is six years, it would be medium, because the temporary crossings are in place for longer six years, so they're disturbing natural processes for six years as opposed to four years. So it increases the magnitude of impact. Yeah,

34:19

okay, I think I just need to probably reiterate what I'm asking for then. So this is the temporary structures for the whole road accesses where otherwise that water course would have HDD. And just to give you some background as to why I'm looking at this, I believe there are 70 haul road crossings, plus another three trenched ones that have been submitted. However, table 2013 only appears to assess 61 so I think there is a discrepancy for experience. UNC, and I'm going to assume you probably want to take this away to

35:04

check those sort of numbers. Yeah, we'd have to take that away.

35:09

Okay, and of course, if there is, and if it's decided there is a higher number, of course, that will then need to be reflected in the assessment, basically the magnitude, oh,

35:23

sorry, it's time falls, but often, if so, some of those are main rivers

35:29

we've committed. So that's not the case. It's not okay.

35:32

Yeah, we'll take it with

35:40

I just at this point, I'll just double check back with the local authority. You have nothing more to add. I know I said I would keep moving through

35:52

Grand Valley, Easter afternoon, Future Council. No, I'm making notes, but nothing at this point, it raised.

35:57

Okay. Thank you. I'll move on to 11.4 which is the principles of the drainage strategy, land drainage surface water management plan, in the latest revision of the outline drainage strategy, paragraphs eight and 65 and that is in as zero, 98 it explains that detailed land drainage scheme and surface water scheme would be developed Should consent be granted, having regard to other project related mitigation and compensation measures. Can you evidence that there would be sufficient space within the order limits for the drainage features to be implemented?

36:38

I'm brave meeting for the the equipment, onshore consent manager, do you? Are you referring to that sense drainage,

36:48

in terms of the drainage, referring to all the drainage which you make reference to within the chapter. So that is drainage strategy, land drainage and surface water management plan. You, you, you make reference to all of those as providing some drainage features to address some related issues. And I'll just we, the examiner authority, would like to understand how all of that is going to be fitted into the order limits, considering all the other compensation and construction activities that are going to be in the same place. Potentially,

37:19

is it worth us just running through the different types of drainage that the strategy covers, that we help a little bit with the different types. So the outline drainage management strategy covers the land drainage and also surface water and also so I think we start with the top one. It covers the land drainage in terms

of the drains underneath the ground, that sort of drain field drainage, and that I, you know, I'll pass over to my colleague Anthony in a second, just to provide a little bit more detail on that that involves a number of interceptor drains that are within the red line boundary. So that covers sort of land drainage. Then the second part of the scheme covers the second part of the outline drainage strategy, then covers more of the drainage from the operational the operational converter stations, which my colleague Chris can provide a little bit more detail on. And then I think finally, the other part is the service water management plan, which then covers the construction drainage. I think I can probably, I'm just sort of coordinating these overall here. But I think overall, I think it bears that all of that bit within the red line boundary, would you like just a little bit more detail on any particular element of that? And then it was directed to the right

38:27

person. I think I understand what the different parts are trying to do and what they're for, although I appreciate you just clarifying that, then what I what the examining authority is looking for, is some surety that that all of these features that may be needed can be fitted within the order limits. Now it may be that that's going to be easier for the expediency today to come back in writing to us.

38:53

I mean, I think yes the answer is yes, they it can be, but yes, we can come back with further details. But everything that we propose in the outline drainage strategy is within the red line boundary, the order limits.

39:12

Okay, if we could now have Appendix A of the outline drainage strategy on screen, please. That's as zero, 98 so eight.

39:38

I think we missed your

39:40

question. Strategy also,

39:43

okay, were you just requesting the drainage strategy? Strategies to be shared? Yep, yes, please.

39:51

Appendix A,

39:57

which is on page 31 i.

40:21

I think we may need to zoom out slightly.

40:32

What I'm looking for is for the drainage strategy around the converter station and the particularly around the access road. So it appear that that access road is going to drain into some roadside ditches, and then they appear to then discharge in two separate locations into water courses one and three. I think that's what that figure is trying to show us. You. However, in paragraph 67 it explains the discharge will be into water courses one and two. So firstly, I'd like you to clarify exactly where they are going to be discharged to. But also secondly, the existing topography would suggest that the land is drained into three water courses, one through to three. So again, I would like the applicants to explain how the proposed development is not going to increase flood risk elsewhere if it is changing the discharge locations from the three water courses down to two.

41:45

Chris Ned, and would you be able to answer this one? If possible?

41:56

Yes, Chris nedon or the applicant. So your question was that the drawing is showing drainage from the access road connecting to border courses. Sorry, I'm just trying to look at the references on the map there water courses, one, two and three. So in the towards the north, where the access road comes off the main roads and heads south, those areas would discharge to watercourse three. And to south of water course three. There is a section of the access road there that heads north back towards water course three, and there is a section of it that heads south

43:14

towards water course two. And and then there are elements of the land drainage around the converter station that that discharge to

43:32

what, of course, one. So there is perhaps an issue of the wording there where some of the,

43:47

I think the access road immediately north of the converter station area is, I think discharging through to water course one, and I think it joins the converter station to the drainage, as shown on that plan, you can go away and check that that would be useful, yes, make sure it is consistent with the wording in paragraph 67 around which water courses are being proposed to discharge to. And I would also like if it is, if I'm correct in saying that the water that the existing topography basically enables the existing land to discharge to all three water courses, and now that's not going to be the case if the development were to go Ahead, how that's going to not increase COVID scale square,

44:51

yeah, I think we can take that away and just make sure everything is consistent. And, yeah.

45:00

The access road drainage is specifically excluded in the hydraulic calculations for the converter station, which are provided in Appendix B to evidence the proposed development would not adversely affect

the risk of flooding elsewhere. It would be helpful to the examining authority if the applicants could update appendices A and B to include the access road. This should identify the maximum rate of discharge and the equivalent to the pre development condition and the required extent a number of such features required. Can we agree an action on that

45:34

GIS just to be casual

45:37

for the applicant? I'll be checked, Chris, but I assume that's something that we we could do, very same

45:47

sentence for the applicant, and certainly something we can link and look, look at,

45:54

thank you, and then just briefly before we move off Here, just continuing to look at the figure on screen, there are a couple of notes which explains that the suitability of the water course for receiving the discharge is to be confirmed on site. Could the applicants explain how this will be determined and agreed, and if it, if they are determined that they're not suitable. What would the discharge locations be otherwise?

46:30

Rose meeting both the applicant. Unless Chris can answer this one immediately, I think Bob might have to take away and come back to you on if that's I don't know if you want to add anything.

46:45

No one away. If that's okay.

46:51

Well, I am interested in the development as you've been developing the drainage or the site, I would assume you've probably been looking at the hierarchy for managing surface water, and therefore would have considered options. And therefore you've, you've decided on wanting to discharge to water causes. So I sort of hope today you might have been able to explain what other options there are. But if you, if you're going to tell me you can't,

47:18

um, Rosemary tinkle with the app again. I mean, Chris, is it worth just going to obviously, the whole principle that you've put together is designed on the hierarchy and kind of consideration of suds. So obviously you have put forward a proposal for discharge into that river and associated rate that you've assumed, although it does say it needs to be checked, you have assumed the rate of discharge would be suitable for water cause of that size. I mean, if you wanted to add any more to that, but,

47:48

yeah, we are, we are assuming that the water course is suitable for, for the for this discharge, given that there are, you know, the surrounding land does, does drain into there, and it's, it's a, it's a water course that collects the surrounding catchment. So that is the the option that's been selected there. We have looked at this, the the suds hierarchy, and and in terms of other options that you know, there's options for reusing water, which, which will be limited on a project of this type. Another option is to infiltrate, to ground the

48:39

site investigation on that is, is is ongoing,

48:44

so that aspect is subject to those results, although I think the desktop studies have suggested that that's is unlikely to be an option. Yeah, so the next priority would be to a water course. There are road drains associated with the the nearby highway, which has been considered, but this the water course has been taken as a priority over that, and a final alternative would be to a combined sewer. However, there are none in the area, so the con, on the basis of this, we've considered that the water course would be suitable for a discharge.

49:42

Okay? Thank you. I think what I'm looking for, really, is we, you need to confirm that the water courses are going to be suitable, and if you can't, what's going to determine whether they are, and if it's determined that they're not, what is your reserve option? The. The examining authority needs to be clear that the proposed development is able to manage the risk from flooding and it isn't going to increase it elsewhere. At the moment, that doesn't appear to be what's been presented, but on that basis, we'll put that as an action pointing

50:18

we have also had quite a lot of detailed discussions on this, and this proposal was shared with the lead local flood authority and the Environment Agency prior to submission. So they have seen this. We had some back and forth in terms of discharge rates and ensuring that they were at the appropriate rate. I'm sorry, I don't know all the technical details, but the appropriate they did. They did provide sort of details on the technicalities, because you might be able to help me here on exactly what rate they approve. But they looked at that, and they did ask questions around whether we consider climate change, etc, in relation to flooding. So they were all fairly happy with that. Obviously, you haven't seen our statements of common ground yet, but the agreement of the outline drainage strategy is included there as a line at feedback, just just to give you a bit of background of discussions we have had with E stakeholders.

51:07

Okay, noted. Okay. That concludes my questions for the onshore water environment, and on the basis that local authority doesn't have anything else it wishes to add before I move on, I we're not waving our hand, so I shall move on. I'll now pass over to Miss Shawnee for item 12.

51:33

Yes, okay, excuse me. Okay, so we're moving on now to onshore ecology and starting with the first item on the agenda, I just wanted to try to do this as quickly as possible, to just cover some of the extent of the proposed hedgerows and trees removal. And I just have a first general question, really. So in terms of the various locations, which obviously shown on the trees and hedgerows, trees preservation and hedgerows plan. And it shows, obviously, the removal of important hedgerows and trees to allow for the construction of the project. And just for context, in paragraph 106 of Yes, chapter 18, which is PDC, 002, and 003, it details the maximum width of hedgerows required to be removed for the onshore export cable corridor, the whole road crossings and the construction access point and the location of the hedgerows. And obviously the maximum area for removal is shown on the TPO and hedgerows plan, which is as zero, 26 I note in the ES the maximum hetero removal for haul roads is stated to be five meters. However, there are various locations where the TPO and hedgerows plan show significant removal in excess of the maximum width stated. So I just wanted to ask as a general question, could you clarify if visibility space would be provided for haul road crossings, and consequently whether the proposed removal width of five meters of hedgerows for haul road crossings would be correct? So

53:23

meeting your onshore consent form from the applicant. And I just wanted to clarify with the hedgerow TPO plan. Obviously we you quite rightly point out that we have got the 24 meetings and 34 and paragraph 106, on the TPO headroom, because we weren't exactly sure where that gap was going to be in the headroom. You did include a larger extent on the headroom. The full extent of the headroom was included on the farm. I just wanted to clarify that point firstly. So I guess the plan looks like there's more hedgerow being removed than in actual fact, there is in some cases, and that will also be the same case or the access point to the visibility displays, and we weren't sure exactly where they would be, so an entire headroom might be marked up on the TPO plan, whereas, obviously we will just be limiting it to that five meters. I'm not sure if that's fully answered your question, have I? Have I? Liz,

54:16

yeah, I understand where you coming from. But how is it then secured that only the five meters would be removed? How would it prevent from having the entire hedgerow being removed?

54:31

For the applicant, clear, the main point of highlighting the whole hedgerow is to give you freedom to actually choose. But there might be some micro cycling site, so you might select areas that already gaps existing, such as gates, to provide access to the fields. So we'll be targeting those. And I think just for the whole idea of the plan was just to highlight the location of the hedge row. Was not the extent of the clearance, but the clearance would be limited to what's being stated in the ES chapter. That

55:09

would be limited to the area that is shown on the TPO and heteros plan, limited to the area that is stated in the as but also limited to the area that is shown on the DPO and head trade plan in the wider extent, but in terms of the meter that is being removed, that is what is shown in the ES

55:31

Rosemary tingle. Yes, I think that's what I was trying to explain at the first because obviously there's a large, larger area shown on the plan, and then the actual width of 24 or 34 meters or five meters lava road that you know, they are the maximum areas that we would remove from that section, if that makes sense. And

55:50

could you just clarify again, where that is exactly secured?

55:56

Oh, and so it's included in the chapter. It's also included in the ecological management plan, which has its requirement. It's not, it's not specifically written into the DCO, but it's in the ecological management plan, which is required from 12. That's helpful. I can find a paragraph number for the ecological management plan, for the note the same numbers that in the chapter?

56:24

And so just to come back to my earlier question, are there visibility displays proposed for the whole road crossings? I'm not entirely sure that was fully answered.

56:36

Sam Taylor for the afternoon. I'm the transport planner right scanning, DHP. So all of the construction accesses have been developed, and crossings, I should say, have been developed such that they are they have appropriate visibility displays where we feel that there is a potential need to interact with the hedgerow to provide that visibility spray, we have included that the possibility for the removal of that hedgerow. That's not to say the whole hedgerow would be required to be removed. There will be situations where possible that hedgerow could be trimmed back copies to achieve that visibility, we've given ourselves that flexibility to to section of headroom. There are areas where many of those crossings don't require removal of headroom because there is a wide highway version the visibility display is provided along the verge. There equally are sections where the hedgerow is closer to the edge of the highway, and there's potential, therefore, to trim that hedgerow back, potentially to remove it, just in terms of secured as well. The design of the accesses and crossings is secured by the outline construction traffic management plan, but also the access requirement showing believers access here 15th, which would need to be approved by the Highland East riding of the Yorkshire county council as well. So part of the design of any access within crossings East riding the orchard Council will be consulted on not only the design, but equally, any headroom locations as well, because they are the planning authority is required to discharge that requirement.

58:37

That helps?

58:40

Yes, so just to that, I understand this correctly in terms of the hedgerow and trees removal is the ES, then in terms of the ecological chapter, and the width of the hedgerow removal for whole road crossings is that might be a little bit misleading in terms of what it says about five meter removal, if there's the potential that there might be more removed as part of that

59:08

Leonardo COVID for the applicants, the visibility displays they have been included in the it was case scenario. So the figure in the chapter represents include the visibility displays.

59:27

Okay, thank

59:29

you. Phrase waiting for the applicant. I've also noticed in paragraph 106 we do actually say where the hedgerow interacts with construction access points an average of 25 meters, 12.5 meters from the center point will be for access and visibility space, and where possible would be limited to pruning. So it is included in that paragraph 106, just explaining that element. Then,

59:49

yeah, I think that was a bit more in terms of the access roads, which I understand. I'm more concerned with the whole road crossings. And I think coming to my next. Question really about might be worth just having the TPO and hedgerows plan open, if that's okay. On page five, obviously, a whole road crossing is proposed at the landfall to go over Cliff road. And the extent of hedgerow removal this is quite significant, and I'm just trying to understand, I understand that that is the maximum required, potentially, but it just doesn't, I just don't understand. So if you could explain the extent at this point, that would be really helpful. And I think that then makes a bit more sense in terms of, it's not an access road at this location. It's a it's a whole road crossing, only

1:00:55

raised meeting over the applicant. Could you just confirm it's this? Like, which page? Page

1:00:59

five? Sorry. And the hetero is identified as H, triple 01, I,

1:01:28

that's it, yeah, so

1:01:32

obviously the access road is further to the south, and then obviously there's only a haul road crossing proposed from The temporary construction compound to the landfill site. So I couldn't understand from the information provided so far the extent of hedgerow that is proposed to be removed to the north of Cliff road. So if I just get an explanation on that, please.

1:02:02

SAMSA, Taylor, for the applicants the it's one of these where the we've included the possibility to remove the extent of that hedgerow for that area until you have a detailed topographical survey of that hedgerows. Hard to be precise in terms of the amount of hedgerow that would be, that could be trimmed, and the amount of hedgerow that would need to be removed. So we've included that

possibility for removal in there, but that would be, that would be developed post consent as part of the requirement 15, which is the outline with the access management plan, could be part of the construction traffic management plan. So as part of that, you would develop designs of showing the visibility display for that crossing working with and then have detailed surveys of the hedgerow to understand how much of that can be kept and how much can be trimmed, how much would need to be removed. But at this stage, we need to include that possibility for the removal. There's also, yeah, it's just, there's the weekly alternative proposals that could be put forward that could include user traffic signals so that if the extent of that hedgerow, you produce that through temporary traffic signals. And there's an option as well to allow less hedgerow to be removed. At the moment, obviously, this is an outlined site stage. Would include that more extent. And

1:03:46

I think madam, we would just add to that that this is a very much a matter for detailed design. Obviously, we've got the requirement in the DCO in order that the relevant planning authority can and that the highways authority can sign off on the detailed design of all these highway accesses.

1:04:07

Yes, I fully understand in terms of highway access, but there is no access at this location, so the access is obviously further to the south. There's only a whole road crossing. So I'm just trying to understand the extent when there's no access proposed at this location. Is it because of existing traffic coming through Cliff road? Is it? Yes. So maybe, maybe, maybe easier to just take back as an action point to just clarify the extent proposed for removal there, just to make it a bit clearer for me, really,

1:04:45

the all

1:04:47

road is intended to cross across that road, so construction traffic will cross from one side to the other. So it's imperative that the construction the drivers have is. Ability on dumm traffic that they can cross safely from one side to the other. Hence why. So a access is treated in the same way as a crossing. The driver is required to be able to see oncoming traffic and make sure there are gaps in the traffic. Hence why we're looking to provide that in terms of visible, extensive visibility splays, there are some, hopefully some helpful drawings provided within the transport assessment, which I don't reference on the boring moment. But in there is drawing 100 which shows that this whole road crossing seat one. And as part of that, the extent of the words of worst case visibility displays. And from that, it's sort of see that the visibility display starts off at a set distance of 2.4 meters back from the edge of the highway, and then it tapers in to join the edge of the highway. So hopefully, that sort of speaks to my point, in terms of the extent of head road to be removed reduces along that distance. It's hard to say at this stage how much that will be until we have a detailed topography service. This is a matter for detailed design, which is will be developed post consent with East riding Bucha Council as both planning and Highway Authority.

1:06:31

Okay, thank you.

1:06:33

Sorry, just to finalize the transport assessment is as 019,

1:06:41

yes. Okay,

1:06:44

I just have one follow up question to one other location, if that's okay, and fully understand what you've just mentioned. In terms of this is not the detailed design, and obviously this is the maximum extent, but just in terms of the location at the beef Ford and Dunnington road local wildlife side,

1:07:06

which is on page seven. Yes, thank you. I just wanted to quickly understand in Table 1814, of East chap es, chapter 18,

1:07:23

it states that HDD or other tarantulas technique cannot be employed at this location as an access road is required, and then the hedge TV and hedgerows plan shows quite extensive removal of import hedgerows. Could I just ask if you clarify, because I, I do think that this proposed, none of this location, sorry, it's the other Dunnington lane.

1:07:55

A good bit for the applicant. Yeah, I think that's one site that will be directly affected by by the projects, because correctly said that patchless processing techniques not possible that location.

1:08:13

It's page eight. Apologies, yeah,

1:08:21

and we're posing to identify the location to be cleared on site and the range statement we agreed that would be discussed with the this finding of Yorkshire Council, with input of the Wildlife Trust, if required. So wide.

1:08:46

Okay, thank

1:08:49

one of the only sites that will be directed

1:08:51

so that will be discussed further with East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Is that correct? Yes, okay, yeah. Can I just ask then on that if the council has any comments with regard to this, or were you in agreement? Or did you want to mention

1:09:11

anything? No. Jennifer will introduce riding Yorkshire Council, the local wildlife site element sits with colleagues, so hasn't been directly assessed by myself, but we'll make sure we take anything back to them and ensure that the approached for comment, just the commitment to reducing impact wherever possible is fully welcomed and would be expected to be taken through to the detailed design stage. Thank you.

1:09:36

Okay, thank you. And just to the applicants, again, as I mentioned, there might be an error in the ES chapter 18. Then if it mentioned that there is no HD proposed, but obviously the obstacle crossings register shows there to be HDD proposed. So you might just want to review that part of the ES, if that's okay.

1:10:01

Yes, it is a HDD cable crossing, but the Broadway continuity is provided by the link to the south.

1:10:09

Okay, perfect. Thank you.

1:10:17

I had a few question on if I'm moving to the next item now on the agenda in terms of potential effects on protected species, with particular regard to bats and water bowls, and including the appropriateness of the mitigation measures, I have moved my questions on commuting and foraging bats to written question, if that's okay with everyone, just to thinking about timings. So I'm just moving on then to the potential impact on water voles. I notice in ES chapter 18, which is PDC, 002, and 003, it has considered the assumptions and limitations in relation to the assessment of terrestrial ecology and regarding the assessment of water rolls. In paragraph 94 it states that for stream dyke, four of the eight rafts appear to have been interfered with either by flail or moved by a landowner. As a result, only half the intended number of rafts were in suitable positions. Unfortunately, second standard survey was not possible on this ditch due to the dense vegetation and limited access to the bank. Could I just clarify with the applicants whether any removed rafts were put back to complete or retake those surveys, and if not, what is the reason for not repeating those surveys? And I could also not find really any information on potential implications of those information being missing and not having being undertaken again. So if I could just have an update on that, to just get an understanding, please.

1:12:03

Another group for the applicants, the pre application surveys was basically they was mainly designed to give it an idea of how water was used to habitats. They will, because the high mobility of the species, we will have to retake them. And we have already proposed to retake them ahead of the construction, to refresh the information. Kind of have been maybe minimize the any constraints that we may have had. So we are proposing to retake the surveys for waterfalls and others again before construction, just update the results, because, I mean, maybe new boroughs might have been dug, or they have moved a new site, or they might have left the site altogether, so that will be taken to account for construction.

1:12:54

And I don't have the reference number in front of me, but that is obviously secured. The retaking of the service as part of the DCO. I'm assuming it's, think it's in the monitory, so in the outline ecological management plan. Yes, a bit. Can I just check if the local authority has any comments on that? Amish Jennifer falling for

1:13:29

the Australian of Yorkshire Council. I know we appreciated the limitations of the waterfall surveys, and obviously in our written responses, noted the requirement for pre commencement surveys and the outline of mitigation.

1:13:42

Thank you. Thank you. That's helpful. Could I just ask to share the water rolls and otters report? I just have a quick clarification question, And that's Appendix D, Section F, I

1:14:34

thank you. That's That's really helpful, and it shows the order limits, however, noting from the work plans, there's an area within the order limit shown on this plan here that have is excluded. So on the work plans, it shows an additional Hall road near the i. Near South Bullock dyke, which is ID 54 and obviously that is assessed as to have optimal suitability for water roll and with water wall present. I just wanted to check really, that the decision on providing a haul road in this location, which is shown on the work plans, was made with the knowledge that this ditch had been assessed as being of optimal suitability for water rolls, and consequently, really whether the water walls have been appropriately assessed in line with the established order limits

1:15:42

for the applicant will be back informed, I think, from the pre commencement survey, and if the water bottles are indeed present by then, then we might need to look into Maybe a licensing route, or either translocation, or perhaps moving, yeah, there's location just moving, moving water voles from the area to avoid any potential impact.

1:16:15

So, so you're saying the you're avoiding this area with the whole road, but on the work plans. The whole road is shown in this location, which isn't shown on this location. So it might just be to double check that the plans are aligning

1:16:34

and that the applicant, I think we this may be in a Rata issue. I think we have need to update the red line boundary on the plan. I'd appreciate your drawing our attention to it so we can make that update.

1:16:48

Yeah. And also, if you could then double check that the area has been appropriately assessed or will be appropriately assessed as future surveys. Yeah,

1:16:58

we just have one moment to confer this And Apologies you

1:18:00

would it be more appropriate to coming back and writing on that? Because I think one of my follow up question would have also been that there's obviously a whole road crossing proposed and not a temporary bridge, so you might want to review that area and just to check what is proposed in this location in terms of the order limits,

1:18:24

we will take it away and just just cross check

1:18:28

page. That's fine. We'll take that as an action point. Then, if we're then moving on to the next item on the agenda, which is an overview of the proposed biodiversity enhancement, including the scope and baseline assessment of the biodiversity net gain strategy, which is reference A, P, P, 157, and in terms of the biodiversity net gain strategy, my first question is the statutory biodiversity metric and Annex A and Annex B of the PNG strategy currently shows a net loss of biodiversity. How confident are the applicants that the project would be able to provide a net gain, and why is this not already established?

1:19:18

Not a good bit for the applicants. The main point of this initial idea of mine by diversity net gain assessment was to collect information on the baseline data, see what property units we had within the onshore environment area. We projects are not committed to deliver a net gain at this stage, but it's committed to a no net loss. And the whole point of the whole of the strategy was developed around avoiding impact on high distinct habitats, or those high importance and. Follow the mitigation strategy of minimizing the impact and restore, wherever possible, the strategy at this at the moment, I think this Coronavirus is work in progress that we still need the detail design to see exactly how much, as we were talking about earlier, how much the hedges will have to be removed. I think there is copulated kind of the calculation is based on worst case scenario, and we still need results from the river COVID assessment, which will be the undertaken in April. So we're proposing a revised assessment after that.

1:20:52

So on that basis, you are confident that,

1:20:59

yeah, we're confident they will collect information accurately, and we'll try to deliver as much as possible on site, so and we will procure for site units, if needed, to at least achieve the no net loss, and with the view to achieve net gain wherever possible.

1:21:24

Yes, and in terms of off site compensation, obviously, I note the information in the bng strategy at the moment regarding the offset compensation proposals. I note in paragraph 113 it states that it is

anticipated that a proportion of biodiversity units would be required to be delivered off site, and then it continues in paragraph 116 that consultation with external stakeholders, complete to date, has revealed a number of viable options for biodiversity units delivery within the same or neighboring local planning authority or national character area to the project. Could you just provide an update on any further details of the off site compensation proposals, and if the applicants had any conversation directly with the local authority in this regard, and also if the local authority then has a view, would be useful. Thank you. And if anything has been agreed, most importantly,

1:22:21

I'll remove it for the applicants, yeah, we have been, we had quite a few discussions with the local planning authority. It's still early days, because ideally what we want is to join in a local project just as close to the project as possible. So we have been in discussion with Natural England, a third kind of a third party. You have that Bank of the peace Riding of Yorkshire. So we are looking at Yeah, to deliver the offset as close as possible to the site. And we've been in discussion with local landowners as well. So we still just try to kind of prepare the ground for future discussions so that we can kind of maybe finalize a strategy in the near future.

1:23:19

And when do you think you have more details on a on the strategy available? I'm just trying to understand whether any further information will be submitted as part of the examination, or if everything will just be left to the final strategy, which is obviously, I understand, is a requirement

1:23:40

just be tingle onshore consent manager. We've had a lot of useful discussions. We do have a third party that they have enough external units that could get us to no net loss. We have not entered into formal agreement with them at this point, because we do have the commitment to do the detailed strategy based on the detailed design, which will narrow down the final number of units. So we are working with them. They have units that are in the neighboring local character area. So we are hoping that as we get closer to, as Leah mentioned, as we get closer to construction, there might be some projects developed. I know East riding are looking to develop their own habitat banks. So we are hoping that we might be able to get some units closer, which is why the strategy has a number of options and but we are satisfied that there are some. You know, we do have the option to get units in the neighboring character area, if required. We just hope we can supplement

1:24:40

that projects. Coming.

1:24:43

So how can we, as the XA then be confident that there will be no net loss or net gain, as you describe it at the end of the examination? It. If the details have not been fully agreed or at least been set out in more detail, just trying to understand that

1:25:09

we are committed to know that loss, and as it stands, we are fairly close to achieving no net loss, and we have, at the moment again on heroes, but still early days, I said, because the the strategy and the calculation will have to be redone to detail design, but we are committed to no net loss, and we're hoping to achieve as much as much net gain as possible through The on site by diversity of setting.

1:25:41

Okay, thank you. I know the local authority wanted to come in, I think as well. Thank

1:25:47

you. Jennifer, falling for the East riding Bucha Council appreciate that the biodiversity strategy is very early stage. The baseline needs updating. But obviously, working with the applicants, we've seen avoidance measures implemented throughout this design stage, so encouraging refinement of it to avoid impacts. Particularly brought up the fact that trees were not included in the presented baseline metric, but the broad principles behind assumptions made We fully agree with in terms of off site habitat banks within the local authority area. We're currently active working with private landowners to deliver some but these are not complete and section 106 as have not been signed on them yet. So continue to work with the applicant on any updates with that,

1:26:44

thank you that's appreciated. So could I just check Are you proposing to submit updated b and g strategies throughout the examination? And also, I note you said in your B and G strategy, you're happy to provide a updated metric in Excel format as part of the examination, because that obviously has not been provided at this stage. So could I just double check that that will be provided? We

1:27:13

tingle with the applicant in our response to the environment agencies written rec where they highlighted that we haven't completed the river condition assessments, we confirmed that we would submit a revised application at that point. So if there's any other sort of points that come up, for example, the tree element that Jennifer mentioned, we can incorporate in that update. And we could also provide an update if there's any further schemes come forward, I think the final point that we just need to make is that we have fully committed to achieving no debt loss, and that is in the biodiversity strategy. I think it's in the outlining Cultural Management Plan as well. So it is, you know, secured. We cannot be forced without that, being able to prove that in our detailed strategy.

1:27:58

And just to add to that, madam, that obviously requirements 32 of the DCO requires the full biodiversity net gain strategy to be in accordance with the outline, so it would need to also reflect the fact that the applicants have committed to no net loss.

1:28:17

Yes, I'm aware of

1:28:20

Yes. Ms Wolin,

1:28:22

thank you. Jennifer Lynn, for the East Road of Yorkshire, just add that the the admissions from the initial biodiversity net gain strategy are detailed within our written response for reference, and also includes the inclusion of veteran trees within the area and

1:28:42

will that be provided at deadline? One

1:28:45

Channel 495, Yorkshire Council. It's already, I know, submission. It's detailed at 7.44

1:28:56

and I think

1:28:58

it's just 7.44 is detailing veteran trees and emission from the

1:29:05

Okay, that's fine. Yeah, thank you. Okay, I'll just move on from biodiversity and again now. So I'll just go to the to the last point on the agenda in terms of ideal ecology. And that's a bit of a mixed topic in terms of it's also relating, obviously, to air quality effects and designated sites, but that's just a bit of clarification, I think required here, in terms of Table 528, of ES chapter 55 detailed the different proposed construction compounds for the project, and this includes the provision of trenchless crossing compounds as part of the onshore export cable corridor in the applicant's response to natural England, relevant representation, which is as. Dash, 048, it is stated that whilst there are no temporary construction compounds within 200 meter of a designated site, the exact location that non road mobile machinery will be operational within the onshore development area is unknown, including the precise locations of horizontal, directional drilling compounds. For the purpose of clarity, the applicants wish to highlight that it may be the case that HDD compounds may be located within 200 meter of designated sites, for example, Bentley Moore wood, ancient woodland. However, then the applicants continue in their response to natural England that in Table 2626 it highlights the designated site within 200 meter of the onshore development area. However, these locations there are no temporary construction compounds within 200 meters. So could the applicants please clarify whether trenchless crossing or HDD compounds are classed as temporary construction compounds, as is indicated by table 528, or not, as indicated by the following response, so by the additional response to the national England, relevant representation And what is the reason for now classing them differently, and does this have any wide implications on the environmental statement?

1:31:31

I can speak to this one. Lauren Thompson, for the applicant. We have got the distinction within the project details of the temporary construction compounds which are defined and are shown on the works plans, and the horizontal directional drill compounds which haven't been shown because the location is still to be determined. So that the paragraph that you read out from our relevant rep response to natural

England was just the purpose of clarity, highlighting that whilst we have got a commitment to maintain the 200 meter separation distance between temporary construction compounds and designated sites, that wasn't necessarily the case in all instances of HDD compounds, Particularly with Bentley more wood where we are drilling underneath the woodland to avoid that receptor. We are not able to maintain a 200 meter separation distance with a non mobile machinery. So it was just to clarify that we have got that distinction between the HDD compounds, which aren't defined and the TCCs, which are shown specific locations.

1:32:45

So if you're assessing the worst case scenario, shouldn't they then be included in the assessment, if they're also being considered as to be a temporary construction compound, and then on the worst case? Because obviously the the number, the location, or the number of potential HDD compounds is obviously mentioned in the environmental statements, so should, on that basis, should they not be included? Yes,

1:33:16

I might pass over to my colleague Richard Lane, who has undertaken the air quality assessment. But essentially the assessment is based on the worst case scenario, and it's the short term duration of the HDD works which determines significance. But can I pass over to Richard for that question?

1:33:35

Hi, Richard lane, air quality consultant for the applicant. Thank you, Lauren. So essentially, with regard to this, the assessment obviously shows where the temporary construction compounds are not within 200 meters of the designated sites, but because the horizontal, directional drilling compounds are in various places across the wider side and are not at this stage, known in full. The assessment has undertaken a qualitative assessment and put in place mitigation measures for any nrmm that's associated with those HDD compounds, and in the specific case of Bentley Moore wood, I believe this is the only location where there may be HDD compounds within 200 meters. So just to add a bit of context to that, the HDD compounds themselves will only be very short term, short duration operations, so one month at a time, or one month of drilling of 24/7 operation. And to add that context in terms of the local air quality conditions, we have the nearby dual carriage way to approximately 160 meters to the next. Fourth of the A 1079, and having looked at or having undertaken the assessment, we understand that the background concentrations and deposition rates are well above the critical levels and critical loads for certain pollutants. So for example, in this instance, we have background levels of ammonia which almost double the critical level at the site of one microgram per meter cubed. And then similarly, background levels of nitrogen deposition are 30.24 kilograms of nitrogen per hectare per year, and that's in exceedance of both the lower critical load and the upper critical load at Bentley Moore wood. So to put that into the context of adding a fairly small generator for one month, the likelihood of the long term impact of that when you compare that against the existing road traffic, would be negligible.

1:36:07

Okay, thank you.

1:36:10

What I'm just trying to understand in terms of the wider HDD compounds, obviously, there's not just the one close to the Bentley Moore would

1:36:25

so how have they?

1:36:30

Have they been assessed in the assess in terms of the worst case? Because at the moment, I don't think this is included.

1:36:44

So in terms of how they were assessed at the assessment stage that we looked at the criteria that's given in local air quality management, technical guidance, 2022, and we undertook the assessment in line with the specifications there, whereby we put in controls for all the nrm to be used on site to ensure that any impacts would be minimized. So for example, in table,

1:37:26

or in chapter 26 so document, A, P, P, 208, paragraphs, 257, and 258, and the table following that discusses that NRM should use fuel equivalent to ultra low sulfur diesel. NRM should comply with all appropriate nrm regulations. Should be fitted with diesel particulate filters, and then those diesel particulate filters should be fitted to a defined performance standard. And then other items such as fuel conservation measures. And then in this instance, as we're discussing the consideration of the location of the equipment in relation to sensitive receptors.

1:38:21

Lauren Thompson for the applicant, if I can just add to that that the control measures that Richard's outlined are specified in the outline code of construction practice, which is secured by the CEO requirement 19, and we have responded to Natural England on this point. I think the only two locations where this sort of HDD compound is low in proximity of a designated site. There is the Bentley ball wood, and then there's the Burton bushes, which is sort of further up the cable route, where we have got enough space to be able to microsite and maintain that 200 meters. So it's really, really only this one location, and we have got those measures in the outline code of construction practice, which also have a sort of additional reassurance that we will obtain any necessary permits for nrm as required, which will again give local planning authority further reassurance that that yeah, the measures of in place to protect the designated sites. So

1:39:20

just to confirm, that's the only location where there where it would not be possible to have a 200 meter buffer to a HDD compound,

1:39:31

I believe. So it's the Bentley more wood, and also, yeah, the burden Bucha triple Si. But we have got enough space there to micro sites and maintain that 200 meters, and again, in the code of construction

outline code of construction practice, there's a commitment to siting nrmm away from designated sites as far as possible. So we've got, we feel we've got adequate measures in there to protect designated sites.

1:39:57

Okay, thank you. And just, obviously. As you've noticed, noted, the HD compounds are not shown shown on the work plans at the moment. Would it be possible to include them? Because obviously the worst case scenario, or the worst case number has been included, or at least to show an indicative layout of those HDD compounds. I mean, I know obviously the information provided in the outlet code of construction practice in terms of the trenching cross, trenchless crossing compounds, and the details that are part of that compound. But I just think it would be useful to just have a bit more understanding about

1:40:42

of the I believe major HDD locations are shown on the works plans. But I pass over to my colleague Anthony with regard to showing the HDD locations

1:40:54

so that Anthony Pearson, of the applicant, the HDD locations are indicated the obstacle crossing register of the where HDDs will be taking place. Or unknown HDDs are the exact location of the compound subject to the feasibility study and detailed design of those crossings, so that entry and exit points for HDD around that crossing, and that is depending on the obstacle being crossed the depth in that detailed design stage of the actual HD crossing. So we have indicative HDD lengths and optical crossings, but we're not a point where we can detail define exactly where the HDDs will start and end. Some had to be longer or shorter, and obviously there's some in discussion in terms of things like the some of the more courses and things where HD treasures crossing has not been committed to at this stage. And so the numbers involved the assuming a HD crossing at all those crossings where the obstacle crossing register indicates a HD crossing could take place, so the final number of HDDs is not in this time.

1:42:04

Okay, I understand that. I'm just wondering if it is possible to just have an indicative layout, because, from my memory, they are indicative layouts of the temporary construction compounds provided. So maybe that'd be something that could be added to just understand what is provided as part of a HD compound.

1:42:24

Have been provided outline drawing so that the HD compound so the generic hGD most involved in HD compound. But the and these, the locations sit within the cable route along that corridor. Exact locations is subject to detailed design we could, I think some of the long HDDs and known HDDs we've got indicative HD trajectories, and they're addictive, so the length can vary, and that's going to have to be discussed with each of those kind of obstacles for crossing on the asset owners.

1:43:04

Did you say they have been submitted already? Or this is something you could provide. I'm just

1:43:09

meeting all the applicants. A document that might be helpful is the obstacle crossing register figures at the end. So page 21 for example, of the obstacle crossing register just shows the number of dash lines that show the extent of the proposed transitors Crossing, which is a very helpful indication of where the compounds are likely to go.

1:43:28

Yes, yeah, I understand the location. I'm more interested about what is provided as part of actually the so if it's an area of 60 square meter, what is proposed as part of that so obviously, talking about any non mobile machinery, for example, is that included on that?

1:43:53

On that compound? I

1:44:00

I understand it's in the the typical HDD compound is in the engineering drawings, which I believe is appendix five, three. Might need to just confirm that,

1:44:21

yeah, I had to look at them. I don't think I saw a HD compound. That's exactly basically what I was asking for. But double check potential, maybe, and then if it is, and if that could be provided,

1:44:36

is a typical TCC in that appendix, not an HDD compound. So that

1:44:43

definitely

1:44:45

we can take that away and look to provide a typical HDD Compound Layout that would

1:44:50

be really useful. Thank you. Just checking if you're starting off your. Yorkshire councilors, any comments on that? Whether you've added any comments on potentially air quality effects?

1:45:15

Jennifer, in the East surrounding Yorkshire, I have no additional comments on this matter. Thank you.

1:45:20

Thank you. Okay, I'll hand back to ms Dowling then you

1:45:46

i Sorry. Just have one last question. It might be more appropriate to copy that cover that in the transport and traffic section, because it's relating to the emergency beach access, but it's overlapping a little bit with ecology as well. So I'll just see if we can answer it here. But if not, then we'll just move it to transport and traffic. I just wanted to check in references made to the provision of a ramp or ground protection matting to safeguard the priority cliff and slope habitat in order to lower vehicles onto the beach. Do you have any detailed design or size of those mattings? And if it is a temporary structure, would it be retained on site throughout the construction period? And I'm just from understanding from our conversation yesterday, that would be around 18 months. So would the matting be on site for that area and in that priority Cliff habited

1:46:54

rose meeting or the applicant? We have not done a detailed design of that particular access point at this point, just given the dynamic nature of the cliff erosion at that site, we there are a number of options that can be employed, and at the time we will agree the detailed design. So yeah, we want to make sure that we want to make a commitment that we will avoid, that we haven't got a detailed sign yet at the exact crossing and how it will work, but we will. We've made the commitment that we will.

1:47:28

So at this stage, you don't have any details of the proposed ramp or matting. Is that correct?

1:47:33

We don't have any detailed drawings now, but unless Anthony wants to add

1:47:39

there was a an earth ramp there. It was used by the boat yard, and that was previously used for survey access, but that's been eroded in over a long period, so we weren't able to use it. So saying that there's a constantly eroding coastline, so that design will be done close to the point where we actually know where the baseline is. Talking several years down the line that the access will be required at the HD point, and it may have to be rebuilt during that 18 month period, but it might be temporary installed, used for the emergency beat access, doing the HD drilling, and then removed and actually reinstated again afterwards. So it's

1:48:28

so

1:48:32

the proposed matting or ramp or whatever is supposed to be used would be located at the beach, and obviously, where you're proposing to let vehicles onto the beach. But would that then remain, or would you remove that after the emergency that was so that would remain for the 18 months potentially on the beach? Do you understand that correctly?

1:48:59

That decision made at time. So it would because the erosion seasonal, and maybe that is in place while the emergency access from the is required to the beach. So the high risk activity is being undertaken,

but in the intervening periods where high risk activities are not being undertaken, there'll be a view as to whether that is better to remove it during that period, or to leave it.

1:49:25

But are you proposing to discuss the details of the access onto the beach with the local authority, and could you just confirm how that is secured? I

1:49:51

It might be easier to come back on that in writing, but we'll

1:49:55

double check, but we are happy to consult with the relevant local planning authority. To make sure that what we what gets to the detailed design stage is agreed with the contractor that we agree it with suitable to do that. We'll just make sure it's written for the right document, but it could go in the ecological amount of plant, which would then use,

1:50:19

okay, and the local authority. Do you have any comments on that at all?

1:50:24

Thank you. Yes. Jennifer William, for the Australian Yorkshire Council, I'd say, given the dynamic nature of the cliff here, then that you could potentially look at temporary impacts, so reducing the amount of time that beach access is required, as you've detailed, but also seek that best practice design minimizes the extent of the beach access to and obviously with safety considerations in place, so seasonality of beach access, if that could be considered as part of the design phase, if could align with Your project. Thank you. Thank

1:51:02

you. Do you have any final comments the applicants?

1:51:08

Rosemary tingle for the for the applicant, and we're happy just to continue that discussion with East riding over the next few weeks, we have a meeting planned in a week's time.

1:51:19

Sounds good? Thank you. Okay, well, that does now conclude my comments on questions on untreated ecology, so try again, going back to miss Dowling now. Thank you, everyone.

1:51:33

Thank you. I think this would be an appropriate point to take short comfort breaks. So the time is now 1536 and I suggest we take a break for 10 minutes and come back at 1546

1:51:43

Adam, yes. Would it be possible for these breaks to be 15 minutes? Because we're finding 10 minutes to be a challenge with number of people involved.

1:51:51

Okay, so after bear with my maths for 15 minutes, adding 15 minutes on to 37 now. So, yes, so if we break, we'll break for 15 minutes, and we'll come back at 1552, while we're adjourned, can I ask that all the participants turn off their cameras and mute their microphones? Those people watching the live stream will need to refresh the browser, and this meeting is now adjourned and will be resumed at 40. At 1352, you.