



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Session 7
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 ON7_16012025

00:05

The time is now 1552, and I'd 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 agenda. Agenda, Item Number 13, which is land use and ground conditions. Mr. Tandy,

00:23

thank you. Just before we get on to 13.1 during the compulsory acquisition hearing, there was an action for the applicants to check whether the land that may be segregated due to the proposed development had been included within the environmental impact assessment, as you now have the relevant individuals in the room. Could you provide that update?

00:50

Please? Rosemary tingle for the applicant, I don't think it's been fully included, so we'll take that away and have a look. We did consider access, and we were did consider access to blimped areas of land. However, I do take your point that that would not be practical in the situation of those small areas between access rates. So I think we'll take that away and look at an update to the chapter to accommodate that comment.

01:15

Yes, that would be useful. And also looking at some of the I think there's a few relevant representations made on this point by landowners around some of the sections of land which perhaps are of a particular size or shape or ease of access, potentially presents them with an issue for continuing the use even though the proposed development isn't using it. But yes, we can have that as an action.

01:47

Okay, moving on to 13.1, you may wish to have chapter 19, which is a PP 158, and chapter 21 which is as 111, in front of you, as I'll be making various references to those. So if we were looking at table 19, hyphen seven, which is page 66, of chapter 19, we can see that ALC three, a land is identified as as a highly sensitive receptor. But if we were looking at table 21 six in as 111, which is page 42 you will see that three, a, three, a ALC land is identified as a medium sensitive receptor, given sensitivity is an inherent attribute of the receptor. Could you explain how one may treat some three a land as highly sensitive or otherwise medium?

02:53

Caroline Martin from the applicant with respect to chapter 19, this background contamination, so the high sensitivity is based on how agricultural land be affected by ground contamination, whereas the land use charter looks from a different point of view.

03:17

Would you like to expand on that other point of view? I

03:27

so obviously So Caroline looks at in relation to geology and environmental contamination levels and susceptibility, the sensitivity of the receiving receptor. In the land use chapter, we consider it in relation to grade one or two or three, a the level of yeah and the level of agricultural class. But So while this is down to the agricultural classification, land classification values and the results of the agricultural land classification surveys, and very much on the on the best and most versatile land element,

04:11

yes, so on the basis of the inherent attribute of The receptor influences that sensitivity, I'm just struggling to understand why. In one case you would class the same ALC land as high, and in another case, it would be medium. You

04:47

Rosemary tingle for the applicant, as I think it's fair to say that we have not spotted this inconsistency, but we can take it away and just double check the issue. If that's okay. I.

05:00

Yes, that's fine. We can have an action point for that to be looked at.

05:10

If you decide that what's been presented is correct, it would be useful to for you to provide reasoning as to why there is a difference in those sensitivities as well.

05:21

Yeah, we can do that. That's fine. We haven't realized that was an issue, but we now we're aware of it was.

05:28

Thank you. Concentration on chapter 21 and specifically looking at the magnitude of impacts, which is table 21 eight. Could you explain why the ALC grades are then featured again as a factor in these definitions, is this using the sensitivity of the receptor to influence the significance of effect. Again, bearing in mind, we've just spoken about the ALC influencing the sensitivity.

06:00

So first of all, we sort of identify the receptor and make sure based on the ALC grade, so whether it's one, two or three, a and then that being the best for most versatile land, so that how we initially identify whether it's a higher, medium or low receptor, and then the magnitude of sensitivity. It does still consider the grade, but then also the area, and that is based on specific guidance from IEMA. I believe I must admit I did not write chapter myself, so I will have to check some of these things. But for the agricultural land classifications, I have a review of them before this. I think my understanding is that that

also reverts back to best of most versatile land which will be classed as like grade one, two or three, a so these definitions in the table, 21.8 sort of relate back to that specific guidance, which does pick up the the agricultural land classifications.

06:57

Okay, if you're able to, if it's not already there, if you could provide that reference within the update that you may be doing anyway as part of the previous action. That would be useful

07:07

guidance is referenced in paragraph 36 however, I appreciate the exact bit that tells you about the areas is in there. So I'll just double check as to exactly how closely we fold it. There have been an element of professional judgment in this chapter in relation to magnitude sensitivity. So I'll just check which bits and simply the guidance of which bit are our consultants,

07:27

professional judgment? Yes,

07:29

that would be very useful. Thank you. Okay, I just checked whether the local authority has anything it wishes to add on this point. I

07:45

Graham Valley, East Riding of Yorkshire Council. No comments from myself. We have the states in terms of contamination. This might be outside his remit, but I'll leave it so I'll pass it over if he has any comments.

07:59

No, it's no comments from me.

08:07

Okay. Moving on to Item 13.21, of the primary mitigation measures with third referred to throughout chapters 19 and 21 is reinstating and returning land within two years of commencement of construction activities. Can the applicants clarify if the proposed return of land within two years includes the reinstatement and the aftercare?

08:39

Rosemary tingle the applicant, there are some nuances to the reinstatement that I think it's probably worth me taking you through. So the two year reinstatement commitment is between jointing base and we've made that commitment that would be from the start of the first sort of start construction, so the first removal of habitat, it then has to be reinstated within two years, that's a key element of our BMG strategy which relates to this. However, within that two years, we will, we are, and I think you may have alluded to this in the world for additional questions, there are haul road requirements. Now, we can't say for sure exactly where the haul road would be removed, but we committed to saying that the 50% of all road would remain in place after that two year period. The reason we haven't said exactly where

that would be is because we're not quite sure yet it would depend on the detailed design, but we've taken account of that in our BMG calculations, and when we've looked at Area calculations, we did included the all road calculation in there. So although we couldn't show you all about exactly where that will be, and we include it in the overall calculations of agricultural floss, that was one point, areas that are not with between those joints, we haven't committed to reinstating those within two years. So the jointing Bay locations themselves, the temporary construction compounds, and obviously the. Convert substation zone footprint those we and again, there's a little bit cross over here with B and G. We assume those would be permanent loss and would be potentially out of action for the full construction program, which would be up to six years in a sequential scenario. And that six years would assume a reinstatement has happened. Then I know I've said the rather long answer there. I'm not sure if that's actually that's actually helped answer all of your points.

10:24

It is helpful, and I think it's probably helpful in line with the supplementary agenda questions that were posed as well, which is why you were prepared for that. I think just building on that, then it sounds like there could be a reasonable proportion of the construction area not returned within the period that was suggested, and I don't think that's necessarily obvious within the documents that have been submitted. So could you take an action, therefore, to just have a look at that? If it is there, please highlight it to the examine authority. Or if it isn't, if you could add that in, I appreciate

11:03

that it's quite a complicated process. I think it's very well explained to the BMG strategy, but appreciate that we probably might need to reflect it better in here or in chapter five. So I'll either provide you with the references or just can clarify. We can provide some more clarification

11:17

that will be useful just continuing on with the areas that you say will be returned within that two year period. Specifically looking at paragraph 109 of chapter 21 explains that these impacts will be short term and therefore low adverse. The outline soil management plan, which is within as zero. 94 explains that land should be managed sympathetically or for up to the first three years, and advises it will remain wetter for longer and earlier in the season, which is paragraph 179 Furthermore, it explains that some land should not be used for over wintering animals for the first 24 months, and that's in paragraph 181 so I want to go back to my original point is, is the aftercare period included, or is that after the land has been returned?

12:19

That's a good point and a nuance that perhaps we haven't full fully, I must admit, I was not fully aware of that line in the outline soil management plan. And I'll take that away and double check it. There are obviously some elements that we will be retaining the land back to the way it was within two years. So if it was a plow field or a pasture field available for the farmer to then, you know, kind of put back to the previous use. But I appreciate if I haven't taken it, I don't think we've taken into account here if that impacted livestock. So we will, I will just double check clarification on that. I don't think we've got that level of detail in the chapter. So I can appreciate you wouldn't have found the answer to that question. But I can take a

12:59

look, yes, if you can come back on that and just what implications that has in terms of the assessment and update accordingly, and just in relation to it into this same point, paragraph 143, of chapter 21 explains reinstatement of soil should only, should be between April and October due to the soil seasonal wetness, appreciating you can't know at this stage when the land will be available for reinstatement, but it would seem that this presents itself as a limiting factor as to when reinstatement and the aftercare could begin. So could this inhibit the land being returned within the two years which has been presented.

13:45

And yeah, great meeting on the applicant. We have discussed this with Maxwell England and with Jennifer Willing at East, right at the Yorkshire Council, obviously want to make the commitment to the two year period, but we have spoken about how we wouldn't if there were certain situations where we felt like we were coming up to the two year period that would require reinstating at the wrong seasonal time, that would cause damage to the soil. We'd want to consult with East Riding on that section and agree if we could have an extension to the two year period until the next suitable point, just because we wouldn't want to meet the two year period, but then damage the soil. But appreciate that one? Yeah,

14:23

that's fair enough, but this would need to be presented within the ES chapter. Has been the worst likely outcome that because, at the moment, you were saying there's a proportion of land that will be returned, but in reality, that proportion might not be realized, and therefore that would potentially influence the significance of effect, if any here. So I think if we can agree that this can be added to the action point we've just discussed is this needs to be looked at in terms of this reinstatement and handing back to the landowner, that would be useful

14:59

just. From our point of view, I think that would, we'd see that as trying to be an exceptional position. Obviously, we don't know exactly when we're going to start on site and when it's going to happen two years is it's less than the six year program, but I think we'll look at a way that we can try and secure that to make it more of a less likely to happen along the route by emissions from

15:22

Yeah, yes, it either needs to be secured or it needs to be suppose appropriately assessed.

15:31

I'll take that one away.

15:33

Thank you. Does the local authority wish to add anything on

15:41

this before I move on? If you're Future Council. No No comment. Thank you.

15:52

I'll move on to Item 13, three. I'm going to ask the applicants to provide a very brief explanation as to what the agri environmental stewardship schemes are, what they seek to achieve, and how they relate to the environment. Act 2021, please. And I'll highlight the very brief if we

16:16

can Rosemary single the applicant, I probably can't give you a long answer on that, because I didn't grab the chapter myself, but essentially, the countryside stewardship schemes. We're aware of this number in the scheme, and we have spoken to the landowners to provide further details. They haven't provided anything to date. They from my discussions with the land team as to what they could include, and they could include a number of measures in terms of different ways to grow crops that are more environmentally better, sustainability measures, or they could involve habitat enhancement measures, so hedgerows or planting schemes that they could include. So obviously, we're aware that there are a number of we don't know the exact details, but there's a number of different things that they could include, which could include the habitat creation as part of them. So I know that very brief, perhaps more brief than you wanted, but that's my high level summation of what they are. And obviously the landowner sees a payment for including such schemes in their land.

17:20

Thank you. And in terms of the link to the environment, the environment act 2021 and delivering its aims and the environment environmental improvement plan that goes alongside that act as well, and it has been set out in chapter 21 revision two, paragraph 73 I believe in terms of what those schemes aim to deliver, it may be useful to have a quick look at that. It doesn't necessarily need to be on screen. But considering the list of aims that are within paragraph 73 could we explain why only ecological and landowner financial impacts have been assessed Within chapter 21 and these other aims have not.

18:14

I would say that we that's probably an issue on our part. We can have a look at that and a consideration. And I think the issue is we don't quite know the detail of what they all are. So, for example, the ones that promote public access, I guess it would depend on a case by case scheme, which which these schemes are. I think overall, I know we don't know the detail of exactly what's in the countryside, stewardship schemes or the environmental stewardship schemes, but I think as a project overall, we will work the landowner, whatever they have planted habitat, put in an access plan. We should be aware of it from our baseline service and be captured in our baseline obviously, then we will, we will work with them. We will be out whatever they are gaining compensation for as part of that plan, we will be potentially taking out of action during our construction period of removing that habitat. It may be that the habitat they they put in place, we will be protecting anyway, depending on what it is. And then, obviously we do have the commitment to reinstate that the level it was at which point then the landowner can kind of return to the scheme if they wish. So although we don't know the details, and we may not have COVID, all of the different elements in terms of the relatability to conservation of wildlife or maintaining landscape quality, you know those measures are going to be something to do with the agricultural practice that they've got or having installed, or be in the process of habitat, which we are committed to reinstating again and working with the landowner to either compensate them for their

temporary loss or reinstate to get back to the habitat that it was. But I appreciate that we haven't mentioned those specific measures so

19:56

So you agree to an action to re look at those. I. We look at the assessment in light of the aims that are set out there.

20:05

Yes, we can do

20:07

could you just give the examining authority an idea when we can expect that to be

20:15

submitted? I would prefer not to say deadline one, if that's okay, to receive a little bit of time to update. I just need to confer with my colleagues. But could we preferably go for one of the later deadlines and confirm it? Deadline one,

20:31

if, if you could let us know how much work there is. I'm not, I'm not completely certain how much work you need to do to be able to present the information which is currently missing, you could inform us what that looks like, and then we, as an examiner authority, will consider when we need that information.

20:51

Yeah. I mean, I think, just to limit expectations, I don't think we're going to get any detail into those countryside access schemes, so I've only got the publicly available information to go on, which doesn't really tell me what any of those one it's qualified for. So it would have to be a higher level assessment, assuming if they were there. I think this point, but I can certainly take it away. But I just want to confer with my colleagues about timescale for that. Okay, you're

21:15

now moving into something else I wanted to pick up, which you've sort of answered in part, which was whether any more information in relation to these agri environmental schemes has been obtained. I think from what you've said so far, that's a no So, but you please correct me if I'm wrong on that, on the basis of you haven't been able to obtain any further scheme details, how have you been able to undertake the environmental impact assessment for the proposed development on these schemes, and how can it be concluded that all of the land under an agri environment scheme within the onshore development area would be reinstated, which is sort of set out in paragraph 171 of as 111,

22:04

yeah. And I think this kind of goes back to my, my previous point. I mean, obviously there's a lot of aims here in paragraph 73 but ultimately there, if you think about the physical element of what could be installed as one of these schemes, it's either going to be some kind of habitat element, if it was a flood

defense point, we would have probably already picked that up. If it was a public access point, we would have identified it as a public footpath. We would have done plenty of surveys on those. So we're really down to what remains is terms of some kind of agricultural practice, at which point we've already kind of covered further on in the assessment that we'll be taking agricultural land out of the ability of the landowner to use for a certain period of time. So that leaves us with habitats that are there. And I said we should have, you know that habitat will either have been already included in the ecology assessment in terms of baseline, but obviously then as part of the assessment, we've made the commitment to reinstate and put any of that back. So I think I need to make that clear in the chapter, that that could be element that's

23:01

yes certainly needs to be made clear. Because it also needs to be made clear that when once it's returned, is it immediately back to where it was before, or will it take an amount of years to be reinstated again? Because without the information as to know what the schemes are there to deliver I'm struggling to understand how you can justify that there, well, how you've assessed the impact on these schemes?

23:35

Yeah, no, I can take that away. I think it's fair to say we've also done a comparison against other other schemes, other projects, and how they've assessed this, and most people have used public information. I haven't found any other example that's that's got details of individual schemes at this stage, but I can, I can take it away and try and provide further detail to provide you with some more reassurance.

23:58

Yes, that would be useful. Thank you. Just before I move on, I just want to make the point that in ES chapter 21 table, 2114 of a PP 169 which was the original land chapter, there were nine agri environment schemes covering 37 hectares within the onshore development area, the latest revision of this chapter, which is as 111, identifies there are now 18 agri environment schemes covering 227 hectares within the onshore development area. Just very briefly, could you explain to the examining authority why there has been such a discrepancy between these two chapters and what assurance and what assurance Can you provide the examine authority that you have now identified all of the agri environmental schemes that may be affected?

24:55

Yeah. Rosemary tingle for the applicant, the original application had a plan showing very. Environmental Stewardship scheme, which is the older type scheme, and then and the construction the countryside stewardship scheme, which is the more recent scheme. They're different iterations of the same type of agricultural environment, agri environmental scheme, the chapter it appears, had only considered the environmental stewardship schemes in the table, even though the figure showed both. So initially we were going to update the table to match the figure when we checked the magic database, which is where the public information is available that is published by Defra that had actually changed since publication. So this is one of the issues with these agri environmental stewardship schemes, is that they do change quite regularly. I need to check the periods. But there could be a

situation where it has all changed again prior to us constructing it. They do change quite regularly in terms of who signed up and how long they last. So in terms of from submission or when we finalize baseline up to our last refresh, when you kind of raised this issue, there were some changes across the plan. So some of them must do that, and some of them was an omission on our part of not having aligned the countryside and stewardship schemes into the table. There's a

26:19

local authority of anything else it wishes to add before I move on

26:25

very East Road and council. No No comments.

26:28

Thank you. I'll move on to 13.4,

26:37

chapter 19, paragraph 96 that's a PP, 158, explains that investigations may be required prior to construction to determine the extent and source of any contamination. It goes on to explain if areas of potential concern are identified during the ground investigation and a remediation sort of plan or strategy would be developed and agreed with relevant bodies prior to the commencement of remedial works and construction activities. What surety can the applicants provide the examining authority that remediation could be delivered within the order limits and within the construction program?

27:26

I believe you're on mute, if you could start again.

27:31

Caroline Martin, on behalf of the applicant, I work at Royal houstonia with a specialism in ground conditions, contamination issues, application document 161 presents desk based information and sources which have been used to complete a geo environmental desk based preliminary risk assessment. The risk assessment considers the potential sources of contamination to be present within and adjacent to the onshore development limits and how contaminant linkage may be formed through the presence of pathways and receptors. The majority of the potential sources identified within the dog bank South onshore development limits and adjacent areas are very localized and not likely to pose a potential risk to underlying groundwater resources through the construction of the scheme. Therefore remediation requirements are likely to be minimal, if at all.

28:19

And just to add to that, sir, I'm sure you'll be aware. But the this is all secured by requirement 29 in the DCO, which requires the any sort of contamination scheme to be signed up by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency.

28:40

Yes, aware of that requirement. I guess my point was more just around what surety can be provided that any remediation could be delivered within the order limits, given we don't know at this stage what that remediation may look like and how long it may need to be constructed.

28:59

Alright? Martin, on behalf of the applicant, based on professional judgment, inclusion of the preliminary risk assessment, the sources identified within the onshore development limits are not potential sources of contamination that we would consider to arrive at growth that gross contamination, gross remediation would be required.

29:21

Thank you. And I could just go to the local authority now on this point as to whether they have anything they want to add or are in support of what's been presented.

29:33

John Tati surround New York Council contaminated specialist support with the applicant suggested, I don't see gross contamination risk at the site, and they'll remediate as they come across contamination, but the only way to do that is to the site investigation as the development progresses.

29:51

Thank you. And just to confirm your you've got some surety around that being able to be delivered.

29:58

Yes, I have. Yeah. Thank you. You,

30:03

I would have also asked the Environment Agency, had they been here, so we may follow up with an action point on that for them as well to comment on,

30:14

raise me tingle the applicant. I know the Environment Agency aren't here, but we have discussed the chapter with them and the mitigation measures and the proposed contamination, and they've been very happy. We haven't received any specific comments, but that'll be reflected in our statement of

30:29

congrats. Thank you. My

30:32

next question is sort of been answered, but it's kind of also in relation, in related to the point I was making earlier around onshore water environment as well, which so in Table 19, three of chapter 19 of a P, P, 158, explains that potential areas of contamination. Perch waters have been made ground or groundwater from activities for de watering could be collected within a tank or lagoon prior to any treatment of discharge an on site treatment plant may be required to treat any wastewater prior to disposal. Could the applicant's evidence, the remediation measures described here could readily be

delivered within the order limits, is there sufficient space without disrupting other construction works or access, and also in light of surface water drainage features we were talking about earlier today, that again, we're sort of waiting on your response on where those may be located,

31:35

and as well for the applicant. So I'll just highlight, while my expert colleagues are involved in that, obviously on the construction and operational drainage strategy. This does all need to be signed off based consent under requirement 16, with the local the relevant local planning authority, in consultation with the lead local flood authority and the Environment Agency. And obviously similar requirements apply in relation to ground contamination, and until that detailed design information is available. You know, it's obviously difficult to give you the detail that I think you're possibly looking for at this stage, but I'll just turn to my colleagues to see if they've got anything more to add.

32:17

Rosemary tingle for the applicant. We will take it away and double check, cross check, with the drainage strategy, and come back in your original point about whether what measures in the drainage strategy could be included in the red line boundary pointing to think

32:31

in terms of the requirements. I think that seems on the face of it, it's not where I'm asking this question. I think there just appears to be a lot of remediation. Or mitigation measures of some nature in and around the same areas, as well as construction activities and haul roads and access, etc, that at the moment, I appreciate you won't know exactly where that they all are, and the detail will be confirmed later through the requirements, but there would need to be some surety that this is able to be delivered, and that we're not sort of setting up potential for issues later. So that's the reason for the question that you've accepted to be an action point so we can come back. I

33:26

And just before I conclude on this agenda item again, does the local authority wish to make any further comment or raise anything else under this item?

33:38

John Tatius, or any village council? No, nothing further to add. Thank you.

33:44

Thank you. That concludes my question on land use and ground conditions. I'm now going to hand over to Mrs. Shawnee, who will deal with item 14 on the agenda.

33:56

Thank you. Yeah, okay, moving now to traffic and transport.

34:02

We're just meeting some people around. Apologies,

34:04

yeah, no problem. I

34:42

thank you. Thanks COVID. I think we're ready now.

34:46

Thank you. Okay, starting with the first item of the agenda, and that's the approach to the assessment of driver delay effects and sensitive junction capacity modeling, with specific regard to Junctions one to 13. In terms of the sensitive junction modeling, obviously, the sensitive junctions are identified in ES chapter 24 which is a, PP 195 and they're also shown on figure 24 four of a, PP 196 my first question, really is, I noticed that their location, sorry, yeah, so that not all junctions, all round about between the onshore converter station location, the port of Hull and surrounding link roads have been identified as sensitive junctions. Could the applicant explain, first of all, how it was decided whether a junction would be classed as sensitive and would require modeling, and on what basis have various junctions been excluded from modeling such as various junctions between identified junction eight and 17, as shown on figure 24, four, obviously, I also know I should just mention that obviously that I understand that this has been discussed with the highway authorities, but as there hasn't been any further information provided in terms of background, yes, thank you for sharing the plan. I just wanted to understand how it was decided where the junction would be cluster sensitive.

36:34

Sam Taylor, for the applicants, if I may, 1, maybe it should be useful just to go back on the highway authorities, just to say there's an update that we've had good negotiations with all three highway authorities. See local impact report from East riding, confirming no significant matters. We also have a standard common ground from national highways, which arrived on a Tuesday, which again, shows agreement of all technical matters, and similar, with the whole city council. So I think just that's useful, maybe just to set the context, hopefully going forward, in terms of where we are, where we feel we are, transport matters, just in sort of relation to to your question turning to your question, it's, I guess it's important Firstly, to recognize the extent of the traffic and transport study area. We have a study area here that is approximate 150 kilometers of road network. So in terms of how sensitive junctions have been identified, we took a proportionate approach, working with the three relevant highway authorities. The construction traffic demand for the projects was derived by construction consultants, and we by we assigned that to the highway network. Our data was then shared with the highway authorities so they had an understanding of the likely levels of traffic demand that would be using each of the roads within their area, and they were asked to provide details upon locations known to be operating close to capacity or active capacity. So using their local and professional knowledge, and equally, locations where they considered the projects traffic could result in that I just, if I just go back a step as well, just to say that, but traffic and transport, the guidance identifies that significant effects are only likely to occur at junctions where they are at or approaching capacity. But with all that in mind, these are the junctions we arrived at with the highway authorities, or this is these have been agreed with the highway authorities based upon the levels of their understanding of how the highway network operates currently and equally the levels of traffic proposed.

39:19

And is that explained in you said you have a statement of common ground, because, obviously, as part of the Yes, it is explained that that the highway authorities mean in terms of these sensitive junction that I'm obviously most concerned about are whole city council and national highways that they have confirmed in writing that they are happy with that approach, because I couldn't see that as part of the consultation responses provided. So it might be worth just to add as an action point to provide those discussions that you had to confirm that

39:56

sort of just sounds Taylor for the applicant within. Appendix 24 one, which is app 197 says, during consultation with relevant highway authorities, the junctions were identified. So that was with East riding Bucha Council on the eighth of the eighth, 2023 and with Hull City Council and national highways on the sixth of the ninth, 2023 but equally, as I just alluded to, hopefully same common ground coming forward, which will confirm agreement matters as well.

40:32

Yes, I know, or I'm aware of the those information I'm just because, obviously, there hasn't been, actually any information from the Councils provided to confirm that they're happy with that. It just says that they're happy, but not no information from themselves. So yes, if that could be provided, that would be that would be useful,

40:57

Lauren Thompson for the applicant. The notes of those meetings are within the consultation report appendix, which I don't have a reference to, but those stakeholder meeting notes with the agreement are within

41:11

tab 197 so appendix 24 one and app 197 which

41:16

is, yeah, no, sorry, the actual meeting notes are Within one of the consultation report appendices, which I can provide the detailed reference to,

41:26

yeah. So that's the consultation responses. Yeah, obviously, that's the meeting notes from yourself. So they have been agreed with the council. So they have agreed that they're happy with those notes. Is that what you're saying

41:40

something? Yeah, that's correct. Yes, they have been agreed with the council and the Brent highway authorities.

41:47

Okay? Thank you. If I then move on to the actual sensitive junctions one to 13, the assessment of those, just have a follow up questions. I note in paragraph 109 that the obviously proposing to delay the Capacity Assessment of those junctions until a later date, and that is because of the a 63 Castle Street scheme, which I understand our improvement works. Could you clarify exactly where that scheme is located, and also the proposed timescales to finish this improvement scheme? Because I don't think that is clear from the submission at the moment, it might actually be easier to have this action as an action point, because it might actually be useful to have a plan to show where this scheme is located.

42:45

Sometimes, on behalf of the applicant, we can provide that a plan. But essentially it's along the 83 there, where it was eventually where it says central orbit trading Park in that vicinity there. But as you say, it'd be probably more useful to provide that on a plan in terms of when that works are likely to be completed, as of December 2024 I think national highways advisor, the works won't be completed till 2026 this was updated very recently from the previous position of 2024 2025 that's the publicly available information from national highways. It

43:37

might be worth just to have an action point for national highways to confirm when that scheme will be completed, just to follow up on that again, where I'm trying to understand this, obviously, with the location of the Castle Street improvement scheme, could you clarify why this scheme would be relevant to the junctions one to 13, and why the improvement works would affect The results of the modeling of junctions one to 13, considering the majority of unmoder junctions are not located between the Castle Street improvement scheme and the port of Hull.

44:12

Sam Taylor, for the applicants, think it's just useful to go back and say, this is, this was discussed and agreed with national highways and East riding of the Yorkshire Council. And that's again captured within appendix 24 197 the the direction of the highway authorities was that, based on their local knowledge of the area that traffic is currently having to is not performing in the manner it has historically so traffic and potentially reassigning so to avoid those Castle Street work. So it's using different parts of the network, basically to drive or drive in different parts of the network and drive round that drivers are changing their. The travel patterns in terms of the time they maybe leave and arrive for their journey. So there wasn't confidence in the current baseline is representative of historic but equally what it will be in the future. So that works. That's That's why sort of track those junctures in whole. There you go north. People who go east are are sort of noted because that traffic is having to move around the network to avoid that work.

45:42

Okay, thank you. Just to say I fully appreciate that this has been agreed with whole city council and national highways and East Riding of Yorkshire Council. But obviously, for me to it is important to understand why, why this has been agreed because, as I say, that that's not fully clear to me, and that's why I'm asking those questions, just to understand then when would further junction modeling be undertaken? Is that immediately after the Castle Street scheme is completed, or so potentially in the next two years, or when is that proposed to be undertaken?

46:24

Sam Taylor, for the applicants, the approach to future assessment of driver delay is detailed within section 4.6 of the outline construction traffic management plan, which is as 20 and getting secured by requirement 14. That in this the outline construction traffic management plan includes a commitment to submitting detailed information regarding forecast traffic flows and timings through those junctions to the respective highway authorities. In this case, Peter right, excuse me, hurl city council and national highways, who will then advise, if they consider further juncture modeling is required so that the that would be prior to writing commencement of the projects.

47:16

So if there, if there was a delay, potentially, to the a 63 Castle Street scheme, Is there potential to delay commencement of works because the junction modeling cannot be undertaken, or what is the approach if that was delayed?

47:37

Sam Taylor, for the Atkins, the works on the a 63 have been delayed years. You'd have to, we'd have to, you'd want, you'd have to ask national hires, respectively, whether they consider those any razor likelihood of further delay. If, in, I guess, in that hypothetical scenario of the works being delayed beyond this commencement of the projects wishing to commence construction, that would be a discussion that would have to happen between the applicants and national highways and policy councils task of discharge, and That requirement as to how, how the confidence that there wouldn't be significant effects I would envisage in that scenario, you take an element of modeling and then potentially look to revisit that With control else at some point in the future.

48:44

Okay, thank you. And just as a follow up question, then, what are the potential implications of the assessment being provided after development concern has been granted

49:01

terms of so that the there are tend to be some benefits, I suppose, to to this approach, in that the contractor would be pointed at that stage, There will be information in updated information in relation to items such as start times and shift times, employee mode share, and at that point that information can Then add an equally updated information in relation to cumulative projects as well. So at that point that information would be submitted, those donut assessments undertaken and that modeling, that modeling, sort of presenting to the highway authorities to understand whether they consider significant effects. It's been mitigated.

50:04

So if the potential, if there potentially be, like, any largely significant effects at that stage, you're then considering the mitigation measures, once the assessment has been undertaken. Obviously, I note what's been submitted in the transport assessment in terms of the information, but I'm just trying to, yeah, understand why. Why is that acceptable for junctions one to 13? Obviously, the the assessment has been undertaken for junctions 14 to 17. So the question then would be, why is the assessment of

junction modeling then not been undertaken for all junctions at a later stage? If that, if that makes sense,

51:02

as I guess there's Sam Taylor for the applicants. There's probably two parts to that question, in terms of how significant effects, if significant modeling shows significant effects were to occur at junctions 113 how that would be mitigated? That would be through demand management measures as promoted by em one. So looking at measures such as avoiding shift peak periods. So employees, for example, would be the shift times would be aligned so they don't align with the peak hours. So by being before network peak hours and departing after all measures such as the use of video busses travel planning, what are sort of commonly known as travel planning measures. So again, you contractor would be required, required banked employees on minibus so could effectively produce the number of vehicles through through that junction. So that's in terms of how, how significant effects would be mitigated, that that's, that's the approach would be adopted, and being it's evidence for the junctions in its riding that that that is an approach we adopted for those junctions to mitigate where we found significant effects and confidence that those types of measures would be effective. In terms of why the junctions in each riding were assessed could be the baseline network of the the the study area is a greater distance from the Castle Street work and East Riding of Yorkshire council as a highway authority considered that the baseline conditions within that part of the network probably Not being affected by that project, so it was possible to undertake that assessment for for those junctions, so that allows us to report on significant effects of those locations.

53:15

Okay, thank you. Is there anything that the local authority would like to add?

53:27

I don't think so. Obviously, national highways and whole city council are not here, so I've already, we already had an action point to for them to comment on this anyway, but thank you. That's really helpful. And I'm moving on now to the extent of proposed public road improvements and road closures. Terms of my first question, paragraph 85 of the outline construction traffic management plan, which is at as zero, 20 and zero 21 states that all road junction all road and junction widening, would be temporary, and following completion of construction, would be reinstated to their former state, unless otherwise agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Which could you explain whether any discussions in this regard have already taken place with East Riding of Yorkshire Council, or when those would be this would be held, obviously, just noting you saying that you have a statement of common ground in place, and how is a decision being made. When this will be decided, if the improvements were to remain in place, who would be responsible for the maintenance.

54:43

Sam Taylor, for the applicants, maybe just again, if sorry, if I could just take it back one step. But there are a range of measures proposed for the number of the links, which are. A new widening and passing places, and road widening is one of them. But equally, there are traffic management measures, such as the use of mobile escort vehicles stop works which could be used. So then road widening passing places is one option but to sort of turn again, just turning back to directly to your question, it's not a

matter that we have discussed with East riding, but it was something that would be at this stage, but it's something that would be discussed a part of developing the outline construction traffic management plan so to, as part of developing those works, we would enter into an agreement with the high authority in terms of how, how those works are designed and implement those works at the end as then, as part of that, there would be agreement with these riding as to Whether those they would wish to retain those measures. Our approach, our approach is that that those wood measures would be removed at the end and reinstated unless East riding wish to retain them, I guess, as a long term legacy benefit, in which case they would be then be managed by the Highway Authority.

56:27

Thank you. He's trading in future Council. Do you have any comments on this? I can't see a hand, so

56:40

sorry. Hello, East front

56:42

of the Bucha council. So if, if the temporary works are within the adopted highway boundary and they are of benefit to the authority, ie, the access is used for other purposes as well, we would probably look to return as long as they've been installed from an adoptable standard. If if they are of no benefit and they are solely for access for this project, then we'd want them reinstating that to as was to, as the gentleman said, it would be for discussion and the final ctmp, going forward. Thank you.

57:32

Could I just ask, in terms of road closures, how you're dealing with private access tracks? I'm noticing, I note the information provided in paragraph 204 of the outline code of construction practice that they will be maintained wherever reasonably practical, practical, but between the highway and private property to avoid disruption, to transport you this, but could you just explain the procedure of crossing private access tracks, please, especially obviously when using open cut trenching. I

58:20

that. Yeah. Anthony Pearson for the applicant, so, but open cups for private track plays, we provide either an alternative route of access or temporary OSHA provisions, depending on the size extent to the open car egg operation it will be on a parking spaces.

58:54

Could I just clarify how that how that is secured? Um,

59:09

Thompson, the applicant, there's a the obstacle crossing register lists all the private access roads, some of which are crossed by eight trenches crossing and somewhere cut is an option as well. The I

59:29

think that's more in relation to where there's a proposed to use a trenchless crossing. I have a few examples on the streets plan, for example, where I was questioning whether it would be crossed. It

might be worth for you to just go back to check how you're planning to cross private access threats and just to confirm that, and then also how that would be secured, to ensure that there's obviously appropriate access to those properties. So.

59:59

Madam, I would just add on that that article 15 two does require the undertaker to compensate the person who uses that private road or the repair of any road, or any sort of loss or damage which that person may suffer as a result of the use of that road for the projects during construction. So hopefully that just provides a little bit of reassurance on that point

1:00:26

is that just in relation to the use of the road, rather than the open cut trenching as well,

1:00:38

maybe if we just have that as an action point, then to just we could come back to

1:00:41

you in writing on this specific question, that would be great. Thank you. That's

1:00:45

fine. Thank you. I just wanted to, in terms of closure of roads, just specifically have a quick conversation about cadfolls road. It's been assessed that the closure of cuts road could potentially result in significant driver delay effects, and further side investigation is proposed to establish the potential use of trenchless crossing technology or proposed mitigation measures. Could you clarify what is meant by further site investigation? Why this has not been undertaken already?

1:01:40

And maybe also just as a follow up question, then to say, Would it be more appropriate to consider trenchless crossing for Catford road, and that this should be committed to prior to development consent being granted, noting that there's currently, I think, a delay of up to 12 minutes to the road from that closure.

1:02:05

Some time for the applicants, the delay is the delay reported prior to rights mitigation. One of the options potentially is to look whether it's possible to HDD under that road, but there is a second option presented, which would be involve retaining access along cat Voss road through what's sort of known as shuttle working. So you sort of traffic signals or stop go boards. So you would maintain one lane in each direction, which would remove, remove that delay. And I mean would be, would not be significant effect. So HDD is a, is a, is an option that could be employed. But equally, trenchless crossing of that road is still an option, albeit maintaining access for vehicles so that would not be a full closure, would be just a single lane closure of vehicle passing and repassing the traffic control.

1:03:18

And when would this decision be made? I think that goes back to my first question about the further site investigation. Is that something that's being undertaken during the examination, or will that be decided at a later stage,

1:03:34

some of the applicant, that's something that will be post consent as part of the main contractor scope of works to sort of undertake the site investigation and to sort of confirm the crossing methodologies.

1:03:51

Okay, thank you for confirming that. Okay, moving on to the emergency. BG, access, I know we briefly, oh, maybe just to double check if the local authority had any comments on on cadfolls Road. Apologies.

1:04:16

Now I don't think so. Okay, as I mentioned, we've briefly discussed the emergency beach access yesterday at the compulsory acquisition hearing one, actually, that was on Tuesday. Apologies, but just thought, I'll come back to that, because I think some of the questions weren't able to answer, and it would be useful to have your transport consultants available. Obviously, as I mentioned, as we mentioned, we had an unaccompanied site inspection in September 24 and we could not see an existing access road. So maybe would be just worth to just briefly explain again what is proposed from the. Of North turnpike up to the beach or to the landfill location. Really, what is proposed in terms of the emergency beach access, if you could just briefly explain that

1:05:15

for the applicants, a we've sort of outlined, I think again, previously, that there's this potential for this emergency beach access in the sort of unlikely event of needing to get, you know, and so in terms of sort of traffic movements, that there would be an establishment of a small compound there for emergencies. And when I say small, we're talking about item. So the very limited number of items, things like hay bales or sandbags, potentially a web, mobile welfare union Duncan excavator, so they would be brought to site, typically, sort of by a tractor trailer type combination with employees traveling by, again by sort of four by four type vehicles, noting that the works are temporary and for emergency, that the plan is to kind of make use of those types of vehicles to access. So that would come off the B, 1242, and then travel up north turnpike and then pick up the track towards the boat yard.

1:06:38

So it is not proposed to have any actual temporary road constructed. It is more using the existing, okay, there's not really an access track at the moment, so just basically take a four by four and just follow the line of the field to get down to the beach. Really, is that? Do I understand that correctly? Thompson, for

1:07:09

the applicant, yes, that's correct. It's not envisaged at the stage that we'd need a stone wall road. It would just be sort of four by four type vehicles using the existing access track, which is used by farm vehicles, so it would be suitable, but the detailed design of that access track is something that happened post consent.

1:07:29

Okay, thank you. And could I just clarify the terms emergency and infrequently?

1:07:37

Yes, Lauren Thompson with the applicant. So the the emergency access and compound would be in place for the entirety of the landfall trenches crossing work so anticipated up to 18 months. So it would be put in place in advance of that works and be maintained for that duration. It's envisaged it would only be required in a sort of unlikely event of a breakout during the plan for trenches crossing works. So it would be there, but it's unlikely to be required to be used, we hope. But there would be sort of weekly or daily or weekly checks to make sure it is accessible, that it's just to be there in the unlikely event of a sort of Frag out the drilling fluid during the land for trenches crossing.

1:08:37

So in terms of a Frag out event and unlikely event. Do you have any examples from other offshore wind farms and how often this happens? So, for example, how often has this happened on, for example, Dogger Bank A, or dog a bank B. Do you have any figures on those? Just trying, I'm just trying to understand infrequently or unlikely. I

1:09:39

would it be worth to come back to this.

1:09:43

Thanks for the applicant. So the kind of the long HDD closed involves Betty drilling from the cliff line down underneath beach. So the access is required while that drill head is moving underneath the beach. Reach out to sea. The actual risk of fractal, the primary control is through the design of the HDD. So that trajectory of HDD which strata it's drilling in, but it's mitigate against the risk of where there is a kind of affectionate fracture in the rock or soil or ground that is undetected. Obviously, there are natural pathways within the ground. So it's a mitigation is mainly through design and through geology and through ground investigation. But there has been occasion with HD operations where frack outs occur. It usually occurs within the first 30 meters of a drill, where it's at shallow depth. So again, it depends on that detailed HD design and kind of consultation and study. So each location is is different, so it may not be necessarily applicable. I mean, dogma and B are in similar geology, so the frequency rates from that, so I don't have any figures from whether any crack outs occurred on on those projects, and I can look into that and then get a response on. We believe it's an unlikely scenario, but it's one we need to mitigate against, just in case there is a a fracture there. So it's no

1:11:19

that's really helpful. Thank you. And I just have one last question. I note in the responses to the relevant representations that there was also consideration of offshore vessels, and that was also briefly touched on on Tuesday, that you could use offshore vessels during high tide for any potential emergency situation. Has consideration been given to just using offshore vessels as the as an emergency access, or is that only during high tide? And why not? Is, is the follow up really,

1:12:04

applicant, because it's in the intertidal zone. It's there are points where vessels, maybe, because of draft depth and things can't access it. So depending on exactly where the frack out occurs, if it's kind of close to clarify and further out, one method or the other might be more appropriate. A kind of consideration is that some sort of landing craft or a toilet option could be provided, but it depends on the contractors proposed kind of method statement, and they're likely to be vessels operating to deal with the HTTP punch out. But that's again, comes down to their HTTP design and the feasibility study elements of it. So the beach access is kind of provided in case that is, that is required by their method, but it depending on the location. It could be done either way. So

1:13:02

depends on where the cable is currently being drilled, really, whether there's a requirement to use the beach access or potentially an offshore vessel to understand that, yeah,

1:13:12

so it's where that drill is underneath that beach, so that exact location and when it occurs. Okay,

1:13:22

that makes sense. And could I just check are you planning on preparing a detailed emergency access plan? I

1:13:46

Yes, there's a drilling fluid management plan. So it would be part of the contractors method statement of how they would manage

1:13:55

Thompson for the applicant. And that drilling fluid management plan would be an appendix to the code of construction practice so secure and do requirement 19.

1:14:05

Okay, thank you for confirming.

1:14:13

Just have one last question on the emergency B Jack says, and in terms of the temporary construction compound, again, on Tuesday, it was mentioned that it would be located adjacent to the existing boat storage area. But I noticed in paragraph 256, of ES chapter 18, that the proposed satellite, temporary construction compound would be located at the end of turnpike Road, where there is an existing boat storage area, and this would be returned to its current land use on completion of the works. So I'm just trying to understand, does it interfere with the boat storage area, and what is happening to the boat storage area? If it does, if it is i.

1:15:00

Rosemary tingle with the applicant. I actually wrote that incorrectly in the chapter 18. It is adjacent to it, not the same one, so I can confirm that we checked is next to you, but not using the same area. So yes, apologies, that was incorrect drafting in chapter 18.

1:15:16

That's that's no problem. Thank you. And that, could we just take that as an action point to amend that, yeah.

1:15:37

In terms of the next item of the agenda, the proposed haul roads, we have covered this already in the compulsory acquisition hearing, so I don't have any further questions on that at this stage. So the question is, we could move to a noise and vibration now, or we could have a short break, but maybe just to go back. If the local authority had any comments on highways at matters, sorry about that. No one is raising any hands, so I don't think so,

1:16:15

madam, just say we're happy to continue over the viewer,

1:16:18

okay, yes, I am. Can I just check with the local authority that you're happy to continue as well with noise and vibration?

1:16:27

That's Graham Valley, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, I believe. So we've got Jonathan Smith here, and it looks like he's still available. I was just struggling with my cursor before and getting it up to raise the hands before. I was just going to just make a point in terms of the beach access comments that have been made, one of the action points for us from earlier earlier on in the day, is to provide comments from our coastal change management team. So I will make sure that if they have any comments related to that, that they they are included in that response as well. Excuse me,

1:17:00

that's appreciated. Thank you.

1:17:10

Okay, just in terms of the first point on the agenda, just to highlight that, I have added some of the questions to the supplementary agenda, so there will be many questions. I just have a general question in terms of the noise sensitive receptors, please. Table 2015, 16 of A, PP, 200, le, lists 70 onshore noise sensitive receptors, including their sensitivity classification and potential impacts and their location, is shown on figure 25 one of A, P, P, 0202, could the applicants please provide an explanation on what basis properties have been grouped or kept as individual receptors, and where's that approach explained

1:18:16

For the applicant? The majority, I think the vast majority are kind of isolating properties or small number of properties. There's a kind of text description of that in the list of sectors, I believe what I

1:18:43

is that, is that in relation to the grouping of receptors? Is that, is that the query, or is it in relation to how the receptors were chosen? Sorry,

1:18:52

yes, so I could not find anywhere where the approach is explained, of grouping any properties, for example, looking at S plane, there are two individual properties, but they would appear to have been grouped as one. And I'm just trying to understand where that approach has been explained. I also will refer to requirement 21 in a minute in one of my follow up questions. But also, there is, it's unclear, considering they are seven noise sensitive receptors within a 500 meter radius of the onshore converter station. But in requirement 21 there are 12 properties referenced. So there's clearly what I don't understand is, at the moment, is, whereas it is explained what properties cover which noise sensitive receptor? So it might be worth, if that's possible, to provide a list of properties that form part of each noise sensitive receptor. So. Just to follow the thread through. If that makes sense,

1:20:06

actually, for the applicant, yes, that makes sense. We can provide a list of those. I mean, just in summary, in terms of how we've selected them, we've essentially where there's a site, we've looked at the site, and then we've looked at receptors around site using the buffer zones that we've talked about. So I think you're aware there's a 300 meter zone for noise, 100 meter for vibration, and then we've selected receptors that are at the edge of if there is one or two receptors, we've selected the one that's nearest. So being, therefore being that's the part that's most affected, if you see what I mean, so the part nearest to the site and the construction activity. But we can, we can definitely provide a list of the groupings. So if

1:20:53

various properties have been, for example, receptor, I think, three or four near the landfill location, that's quite a large number of properties that have been grouped together. Is it correct, then, that the closest, or the nearest property to the impact is the one that has been assessed as the worst case scenario?

1:21:14

Yes, that's correct. Okay, correct. And we've selected receptor locations that are kind of representative of receptors around a site. So obviously we wouldn't want to list that every single receptor, so we've picked the one that's nearest in each relevant direction around the site.

1:21:38

Thank you.

1:21:41

List. Sorry, the full list of preceptors. That'd

1:21:44

be really useful, because that would then also explain how the properties have been chosen for as part of requirement 21 because at the moment, there doesn't seem to be aligned through from the ES to the requirement local. Authority, do you have any any comments on that at all?

1:22:08

Jonathan police riding with Bucha Council, principal officer and environmental control. No that. That methodology seems fine to me, and that's kind of what I assumed.

1:22:18

Okay. Thank you. Applause.

1:22:32

In terms of the next agenda item, the potential effects from construction, construction noise at the landfall location and alongside the cable corridor, with particular regard to the use of HDD and the requirement for temporary construction compounds,

1:22:56

we have discussed some of the in terms of requirement 20, in terms of the construction hours. We've discussed that, obviously at the DCO hearing yesterday, so I don't, would not want to go into that again in more detail. Obviously, I understand that you're currently in conversation with the local authority to agree a way forward on that, that is correct, isn't it?

1:23:29

The applicant, yes, we've got a meeting scheduled with Easterling of Yorkshire to discuss the local impact report comments, which I believe, 23rd of January.

1:23:40

So we'll report back. Okay, thank you. And just in terms of the local authority, I noted from the local impact report that the comments from the council's Public Protection Team are still pending at the moment, are you proposing to submit them as at the a deadline. One,

1:24:06

yes, we'll we'll submit them by deadline. One, yes,

1:24:09

okay, thank you.

1:24:18

I know I said we finished on the beach access, but I just wanted to have one questions on the temporary construction compound in terms of noise at the emergency beach access, and with regards to the construction noise impacts from the temporary construction compounds at the emergency beach access. Paragraphs, 149 and 150 of ES chapter 25 which is a PP, zero, dash 201 highlights that noise sensitive receptor r2 has been identified as having a noise impact from the emergency beach access on Saturday afternoon at temporary construction compound. However, it is argued that. The use of the

temporary construction compound here is limited, and consequently, impact on receptor two would be negligible, as it would only be used in the event of an emergency without explicit information on the amount of the use the temporary construction compound at the emergency beach axis could potentially be used throughout the construction period and in a similar manner to other temporary construction compounds. Could you clarify how the use would be restricted to into emergency use only would that also be included in the emergency access plan or in the that you mentioned earlier?

1:25:42

And Lauren is on something the applicant to confirm it would only be used in a very unlikely event of a frack out. So apart we don't anticipate, can't say, but that's very unlikely event in our understanding these situations. And then, apart from that, it would just be the sort of establishment of the compound at the beginning, and then sort of regular inspections to make sure that the access track is available. So pass over to my colleague engineering,

1:26:21

once it's established, it's mainly there to store materials for that emergency use, so beyond a scheduled visit, and I suppose those schedules could be outside of hours,

1:26:38

so maybe that would be one of the locations to discuss with the local authority, I mean in terms of the construction hours, where there's potential to restrict the Saturday afternoon use of that location. Not really a question, it's

1:26:58

just, but if, again, if there's that emergency situation, it would need to be used, but then it would just be people passing through there to get to the point on the beach.

1:27:09

Okay, thank you. Moving on to nighttime noise from HDD working in relation to nighttime noise from horizontal directional drilling, the likelihood of 24 hour HDD working for individual noise sensitive receptors is listed in Table 2519 of ES chapter 25 which is a PP, 201, please. Could the applicants explain the approach of allowing 10 out of 15 days, nights, consecutive work, and how this relates to the proposed 24 hour HDD working requirements. And could you explain or signpost where this is explained in the environmental chapter,

1:27:55

Sasha villa for the applicant? So the way that we've looked at HDD locations in terms of night work, we liaison with the engineering team. The likelihood of night time work being required is kind of dependent on the length of the crossing. So the crossing is less than 200 meters. There's a low potential for night time work, but it is a possibility, if the crossing is greater than 200 meters, then there's a higher probability of some nighttime work, but likely to be less than 1010 days duration. Do you want the paragraphs where that's explained? Because that that is outlined in the chapter.

1:28:44

Yes, please. That would be useful, because I think the only reference I could find to the 10 out of 15 days, night consecutive working was in table, 2519,

1:29:00

so I'm just trying to understand, in a period of 15 days, this would allow for 10 days to work during night time. Is that correct?

1:29:13

It's not succession of the applicant. It's not really, I wouldn't say it's about allowing, I think it's really in terms of assessment of impact, really. So if you just bear with me for one moment, I'll say it's paragraph seven to the main chapter.

1:29:41

So this kind of outlines. So obviously we have impact levels in terms of noise levels, but then in terms of determining an effect of those noise levels, we look at the duration of that noise impact. So in the daytime, we look at longer durations. And. Month. So a month of activities is what we look at in the daytime, but in the night time, we recognize that impacts can happen in a shorter duration period, because people are more sensitive to noise at night. So we've taken the 10 in 15 days, and that's referenced in British Standard, 5228, so that's where, and it's also used on other projects. HST, where that comes from. Thank you.

1:30:32

So just to that, I understand this correctly in terms of if the HDD table is less than 200 meters, then there's less likely for night time works. Is that, because the cable can be

1:30:52

laid

1:30:55

within the day, or is there, or is that? Is is that? Is that correct?

1:31:03

Yeah, so, so it's the shorter the crossing, the lower the likelihood of needing to work at night. So so shorter crossings have have a lower probability of night work, and so that that is then because duration, because we have two factors to assess impact effects. Sorry, we've got the noise level, and obviously the duration of the noise level. We've had to kind of come up with a methodology that recognizes the likelihood of the duration, if that makes sense. So how likely it is that that noise level would be experienced for a certain number of days?

1:31:42

Okay, thank you. But there's no possibility of stopping and restarting works once you're starting to lay the cable.

1:31:52

Fancy applicant, the it's dependent particularly on the ground conditions and the method of HGV drilling adopted, so brick size and ground conditions affect the rate of progress to the ground, and say it's possible to stop the drilling. But there's risk elements involved in stopping and starting the drilling in terms of kind of, again, going to frack out, or for the drill stalling on the ground. So there may be some pumping or element needed to kind of maintain the hole in the ground.

1:32:26

Yeah, natural for the applicants. And obviously, Madam, this is all controlled under requirement 20, because if we are working outside of the core working hours authorized by the DCA, then that would need to be agreed with the relevant local authority in advance. In any event.

1:32:45

And that also relates to HTD works, yeah,

1:32:48

it would relate to any works, apart from emergency works that were done outside of those core hours. Yes,

1:32:55

okay, thank you. I

1:33:13

i have moved my question in terms of the construction, road traffic, noise on es claim to written questions. So that concludes my questions on noise and vibration. So I'll hand back to ms Dowling. Thank

1:33:32

you very much. Given the number of action points, sorry if you want to go just briefly, go back to the council. Yeah, that's no problem. My colleague just wants to ask if the council have any points that they want to raise with regards to highways before we move off that final agenda, but regard to noise, rather sorry, I apologize on that final item. No, that's fine, madam. Thank you. Thank you. Right. Given the number of action points, and there are a lot, I think I've got sort of 60, rather than go through these in detail now, they're going to be published on the project page of the national infrastructure website in the next day or two. I've not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business that's relevant to this hearing. But before we close, can I just ask if there are any other matters that any party wishes to raise. So then I'm just going to provide some updates for ourselves. Actually, before I close, I just want to let you know that the rule eight has been published and the action points for compulsory acquisition, hearing one and issue specific hearing one have also been published, and will seek to issue the action points for this issue specific hearing as soon as possible. We propose to issue the preliminary meeting note as soon as we can, and obviously the recordings of these hearings. We all try and get up as quickly as possible. The next action for the examining authority is obviously. To deal with the change request, and we're mindful, obviously, that we'd like to deal with that as quickly as possible to enable you to progress with any of works that you need to do, and get that action into the examination as quickly as possible. Subject was accepting it. So 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 recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectorates website, as I've just referred to, as soon as possible after this hearing, before we close, I'd like to take to thank all of yesterday's and today's participants for their time and assistance during the course of this hearing, we shall consider all of your responses carefully, and they will inform the examining authority's decision when drafting questions and deciding whether further rounds of hearings will be necessary. So the time is now 1727, and this issue specific hearing to the proposed Dogger bank South offshore wind farms is now closed the