



Trawsgrifiad Gwrandawriad

Prosiect:	Fferm Wynt Alltraeth Mona
Grandawriad:	Gwrandawriad Mater Penodol 6 (ISH6) – Rhan 4
Dyddiad:	10 Rhagfyr 2024

Sylwer: Bwriad y ddogfen hon yw i gynorthwyo Partion â Buddiant, nid yw'n air am air.

Cynhyrchir y cynnwys gan ddefnyddio llais i'r testun deallusrwydd artiffisial ac nid yw'n cael ei olygu. Oherwydd ymarferoldeb Microsoft Teams, mae'r trawsgrifiad yn arbennig o anghywir gyda'r iaith Gymraeg. Peidiwch â dehongli'r cyfieithiadau mor gywir. Mae'r recordiad fideo yn parhau fel prif gofnod y digwyddiad.



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Mona Offshore Wind Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) – Part 4
Date:	10 December 2024

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties; it is not verbatim.

The content is produced using artificial intelligence voice to text and is unedited. Due to the functionality of Microsoft Teams, the transcript is particularly inaccurate with the Welsh language. Please do not interpret the translations as accurate. The video recording remains as the primary record of the event.

Simon Says

Transcript Export

<https://www.simonsaysai.com>

My New Project

Created on: 2024-12-10 17:35:29

Project Length: 01:14:37

Account Holder: Ryan Ross

File Name: MONA_10DEC_ISH6_PT4-MP3.mp3

File Length: 01:14:37

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:00:23 - 00:00:15:08

Good afternoon, everyone. And on Da. Can I check with our case team or the Exa? That they can hear me? Yes. Thank you. And can I check with the case team that the live stream has recommenced?

00:00:16:06 - 00:00:17:04

Yes, it has it.

00:00:17:26 - 00:00:19:06

Thank you, Mr. Stevens.

00:00:21:03 - 00:00:53:26

I'm going to make a start on agenda item number seven, the water environment. Um, is Mr. Chambers with us? Yes, I can see that he's here. Um, we included this item on the agenda. Um, at Mr. Chambers request. He was very patient in our in person, as she specific hearing in October. Um, but we didn't actually get round to discussing his concerns before, uh, he had to, to leave us.

00:00:53:28 - 00:01:31:20

So we wanted to give them the opportunity to to make his points today. Mr. Chambers, I just want the outset to assure you, on behalf of the examining authority, that although you didn't participate in the July hearings and you had to leave, as I said in October. Um, the examination process is primarily a written one that all of your written representations to date have been taken into account, as I'm sure you'll have taken some comfort from seeing the, um, examining authority's written questions to the applicant.

00:01:32:18 - 00:02:03:21

So, um, I have some questions arising from your deadline five submission, which is rep 5123. That's just a framework for the discussion. And as part of that submission, Mr. Chambers, you forwarded an email of the 4th of November that you had sent to the applicant and it raised five specific points.

00:02:04:08 - 00:02:25:08

I just want to know two things. Um, the first being have you had a response to date or has the applicant deadline five response to the associated second written questions? That was rep 500. Has that addressed any of them? So I'll hand over to you.

00:02:26:26 - 00:02:38:17

Okay. Thank you ma'am. Um, firstly, apologies to the panel and of course to the applicant for my having to do a runner in October. Um, a family emergency, I'm afraid. Um.

00:02:38:26 - 00:02:49:28

I'm sorry to hear that, Mr. Chambers. Can I just remind you to. Even though that I do say your name to you. Use yourself every time for the benefit of the recording. Thank you.

00:02:50:00 - 00:03:32:01

Of course. Okay, so, Martin Chambers tunnel month. Um, What I'd like to do, if you humor me, is just to put some of your questions into a little bit more of an operational context, um, around the geography of the fishery, um, and how it fits with the questions that were raised by the, um, inspector in, uh, the whatever it was yet Q two document. Um, basically, as I said in my introductions this morning, my background is very much, um, chartered surveyor, chartered construction manager, chartered environmentalist, now a fishery owner.

00:03:32:24 - 00:04:09:11

The fishery here, um, was actually dug 52 years ago and went into a 53 years ago and went into operation 52 years ago. So it's it's been here some considerable time. There's a little bit of confusion in the applicants responses. Um, in the D5 responses regarding what? Water supplies? Which pools. Um, basically we have an underground spring where it comes from. I do not know, but we have an underground spring that is on the eastern, um, side of the fishery.

00:04:09:13 - 00:04:45:03

It's the southeast that fills two of the pools, not one. Um, but it's a cascade effect. And then we have a brook that it comes off the mountain that fills the other three pools. Now, typically our brook stops running round about April each year. Um, it does vary depending on rainfall, and it will restart running around about September each year. That's important, I believe, when it comes to the timing of the works and monitoring,

00:04:46:19 - 00:05:30:29

just to put geography or topography into a little bit of context. The fishery water levels that are about 160m above Ordnance Datum. Where our brook water actually surfaces on the mountain is approximately 200m above Ordnance datum, and the get my geography right. The northern edge, the bottom, the lower edge of the proposed cable corridor from the applicant, is a circa 240m above Ordnance Datum, and the top of Moira mountain is circa 310m above Ordnance Datum.

00:05:31:03 - 00:05:36:15

I'm sure the applicant will correct me because I'm probably wrong on some of them. I'm better with feet and inches.

00:05:38:03 - 00:06:15:04

So that's the that's the context. What has happened? The email that you refer to, ma'am, was, um, the follow up from a teams meeting I had with a The representative of the applicant. Um, I think it was the 23rd of October, and all I did was capture within that email the five key actions that we had agreed in the teams meeting. Um, I have to say that to date, I haven't had visibility or an answer other than the answers that have gone to you as the inspectorate to any of the five points.

00:06:15:12 - 00:06:47:01

So they're still open. We did have a follow up teams meeting on the 5th of December, um, with two members of the applicant team. And basically, I was led to believe that the hydrological risk

assessment may well have been available before today, although I haven't seen it. And I think when I read the applicant's response, uh, d5 response, they're now saying it will be available for deadline six.

00:06:47:21 - 00:07:24:04

So some cross wires somewhere there perhaps the the concern we have from the fishery perspective is that our water is quite fragile, the water that supplies via the underground spring. As I said before, we don't know the actual source. We know it comes off the mountain, but that tends to run most of the year. It does weaken during the latter part of the summer. And the only way I can evidence that to you is that regardless of evaporation, the top pool still fills up.

00:07:24:13 - 00:07:45:26

Um, not a very scientific manner, I accept. Um, but that links back to one of the offers that was made to the applicant team was if they wanted to come and monitor water levels, um, as well as brook flows, etc., that would perhaps help identify the strength of the various supplies that we enjoy.

00:07:47:25 - 00:08:19:27

The concerns we have, I have to say, are growing and I don't want to exaggerate, but they are growing. And the reason they're growing is a lack of visibility. Um, modern word would be transparency, perhaps, but a lack of visibility of things like where the boreholes that are being talked about have been located. It would be lovely to see the borehole logs. Um, I'm told monitoring of the groundwater has been ongoing.

00:08:19:29 - 00:08:32:22

Be interesting to see the results of that. Um, and also some follow up as to why on site monitoring hasn't occurred. Um, it is still there as an option as far as I'm concerned.

00:08:34:10 - 00:08:34:25

Um,

00:08:36:19 - 00:09:12:17

big ticket items. I have commented and I won't go through them in detail on the construction surface water drainage management plan. I've only commented relative to the adequacy as I see it, to the fisheries concerns. Um, and similarly on the construction code of practice, we've offered commentary on that. What it really lends itself to, though, unfortunately, is, is a concern that we're not being taken seriously.

00:09:13:00 - 00:09:45:00

Our concerns. I don't see any real reference or sections within either of those two plans that address the groundwater. And here I, uh, I perhaps use that much abused word of unique because I do believe our situation relative to this project is a unique one in that we, as far as I'm aware, are the only business that relies entirely on groundwater. Uh, for within the the order lands.

00:09:46:21 - 00:10:24:27

More specifically, there is mention in the various plans and in the responses about the instant potential for the applicant to install drainage, either during or subsequent to the works. And my real concern here is that we not only will we end up with a number of potential cut off trenches that are formed by the cable, each individual cable trench, because they're running at 90 degrees to the slope of the mountain. Um, but we could end up also with a cut off drain potential existing if if a further drain is put across.

00:10:25:24 - 00:10:27:11

Um, so we're concerned that

00:10:28:26 - 00:11:00:02

there is a nag, and I don't know what this means from an inquiry point of inquiry points of view as to whether there is some way of affording protection. I would hope so within the DCO, which is um, at the end of the day on these mega projects and I've been involved with a few. There is a very real likelihood or potential at least, that there may be some form of corporate ownership change during the life of the project.

00:11:00:04 - 00:11:50:22

This is at the moment. This is a dream that the team are bringing forward the applicant's team when it moves to reality. It may be that the owners of the corporate JV partners decide it's not for them and they trade it on. So hence my concern is how can the inquiry and how can the DCO, if not through a side commercial agreement, how can the DCO actually protect us against the change in attitude and approach that a new owner could have seen? It will have? So just to conclude, there are a number of key documents that are mentioned in the response of the applicant to D5, such as the the hydrological conceptual model.

00:11:51:14 - 00:12:22:00

I'd love to see it, please. Um, I'd also like to understand how a conceptual model translates into reality, or is expected to be translated into reality, and how the applicant will adjust his modus operandi depending on what he finds based on reality. There's talk of a hydrological rich risk assessment, which is the one I was expecting to see before today. Um, no sign of that.

00:12:22:02 - 00:12:52:03

Would be good to see it. If it's coming at D6, maybe I just have to hold my breath a little longer. Um, and then the the applicant also refers to a mitigation hierarchy, and I suspect this is where we may have a big, um, difference of opinion in that, uh, I would suggest that the risk on the ground water supplies here is high. Um, especially as we've got a situation where the trenches, the cables will go in, uh, within.

00:12:52:23 - 00:13:01:18

Well, to their top edge, they're within, under under 60m to the peak of the mountain. So the catchment area I think is vulnerable.

00:13:03:08 - 00:13:17:11

Um, I would like to see and I'd like to understand from the applicant how robust improvements are going to be made to both the surface water and the code of practice for construction, and linked to that.

00:13:20:00 - 00:13:40:17

I have a concern, and it's probably with quite a big sea on the beginning of concern as to the ability and capability of Conway County Borough Council to resource the necessary skills to adequately approve those plans relative to the fisheries perspective.

00:13:43:03 - 00:14:17:07

Just to conclude, how do we go forward? We're very open to the potential to signing up to some form of protective agreement, um, be that an agreed mitigation strategy or some form of compensation or commercial side letter. Again, my brief look through the draft DCO and I and I professed not to

understand an awful lot of how that documents put together, but I can't see anything relative to the fishery in it.

00:14:18:08 - 00:14:44:11

Lots amounts, statutory bodies, etc.. Um, and that's where we are. We're still here. We're still engaging with the applicant. We still want to make this thing work for us both. Um, but we, pardon the pun, We're a little fish in this game, and, uh, the applicant is a huge conglomerate. Um, so we do look to the inspector to protect us, as appropriate, please.

00:14:45:24 - 00:15:18:21

Thank you, Mr. Chambers. You've very succinctly, um, summarized all your points, which, um, is, is very, very helpful. Um, I think if for the minute, if we can park the, the council resourcing, which of course is a pertinent point and the issue of the controls within the, the DCO, because I do specifically want to look at those and maybe get the applicant, um, at this stage to address the um,

00:15:20:11 - 00:15:52:13

the more construction orientated points, because I also do have specific questions on the monitoring and mitigation Post-construction, because you made some very pertinent points in your submission about, well, what happens when the agricultural liaison officer has packed up and moved off to another project. And I know lots of particular concern. So if at this juncture I can invite the applicant, um, to address the construction type concerns that Mr. Chambers has articulated for us.

00:15:52:15 - 00:15:53:01

Thank you.

00:15:59:03 - 00:16:39:03

Uh, feller Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so in terms of the construction related concerns that have been raised, um, I'll start with the the monitoring that's been ongoing. So, um, we've undertaken borehole monitoring, um, in locations along the onshore cable corridor, uh, where we believe, uh, trench techniques will be required. And that was the primary reason for the boreholes that have been, um, installed. There was a there is a location which is obviously south of the fishery, and we have been able to use those boreholes to extrapolate the groundwater data that Mr.

00:16:39:05 - 00:17:13:05

Chambers is referring to. That monitoring data, um, has been used to form the basis or an aspect of the hydrogeological risk assessment, which also includes the conceptual model that Mr.. Sorry, should I say professor or Mr.. Chambers is referring to. Um, and so both the conceptual model and the risk assessment will be submitted at deadline six. I believe we did say deadline five initially. And um, we wanted to ensure that we had the most up to date and recent borehole logs that would inform that risk assessment to ensure that that was a complete picture.

00:17:14:10 - 00:17:47:09

Um, the conceptual model which is included within that risk assessment, um, should hopefully expand on on some of the groundwater sources, uh, based on the geological data. Um, that is, that is identified both within the impact assessment and also from looking in a little bit more detail. And that does give some con, uh, some indication of what the catchment for the trout fishery may be. Um, I don't want to talk too much to the detail included within the hydrogeological risk assessment because I'm I'm conscious that it hasn't been submitted.

00:17:47:23 - 00:18:33:11

Um, I can speak to it if you think that's appropriate. Mr.. Uh, ma'am. Um, but essentially the conclusion that is drawn from the hydrogeological risk assessment is that the risk of connectivity between the construction activities along the onshore cable corridor is low. Um, and there are a number of reasons for that. Um, it is mostly to do with where we believe the groundwater fed catchment for the trout fishery is, which is actually more so to the north east of the trout fishery. Um, and also that, um, the, the distance, the large lateral distance between our construction activities and the trout fishery from a groundwater perspective is significant both from a distance in a roughly 525m to and also a vertical height as well.

00:18:33:15 - 00:19:14:14

A difference of approximately 70m, and then also the small area of extent of the construction area relative to the large size of the groundwater catchment area that supports the the fishery. Um, given that the low risk is low risk, we believe that's associated with those construction activities. That represents to the spring fed fishery. We believe that a monitoring strategy is appropriate for the construction phase of the, uh, of the project in relation specifically to the trout fishery, um, and that is captured within our outline construction surface water drainage management plan within, I believe, section 1.9 uh, which covers monitoring.

00:19:14:28 - 00:20:01:00

Um, we we don't believe it's necessary to single out the trout fishery that would be covered under the detailed design, um, and make at that stage during discharge. specific reference to the trout fishery and the monitoring strategy. And obviously there is a long term peace associated with this in terms of establishing a baseline. And one of our proposals will be to set up a monitoring station at the trout fishery so that we can begin to gather that baseline data starting as soon as possible, so that when it does come to those construct that construction stage, we are able to, um, create a direct correlation between our activities and any consequential activities associated with the trout fishery, notwithstanding the fact that we believe there is a low risk associated with those activities.

00:20:02:10 - 00:20:29:13

Um, thank you, Mr. Robinson. We're at a wee bit of a disadvantage compared to the applicant, given that the, um, the, um, the risk assessment that encompasses the concept model isn't before us, and I haven't had a chance to look at it. Um, Mr. Chambers hasn't had a chance to look at it, so it's very hard to, uh, delve into. Let alone report any of the points. Um.

00:20:31:18 - 00:20:51:03

The borehole logs that Mr. Chambers raised an issue with, um, the the monitoring results that were partially responsible for his his concerns about lack of transparency. Are they going to be incorporated within not deadline. Sixth submission.

00:20:52:21 - 00:21:15:08

February. Williamson. On behalf of the applicant. Um, the borehole logs are informed the hydrogeological risk assessment and therefore aren't necessarily part of it. Uh, in terms of an appendix, but, uh, we are happy to, uh, send the borehole log data, uh, separately, either. I think it's an appropriate submission. I think it would be, uh, we could send those to to Mr.. Mr. chambers directly.

00:21:16:21 - 00:21:27:09

I certainly I would certainly like to note that as as an action point, I think that that would be very helpful. And I appreciate that, um, that

00:21:29:03 - 00:21:37:06

the applicants assistance with that is the same true of the monitoring results, Mr. Williamson, that, um, Mr. Chambers is concerned about.

00:21:45:29 - 00:22:19:25

Valerie Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, we can include the monitoring data as well. It's summarised in the hydrogeological risk assessment document. Um, I just also want to add that the reason why the borehole logs and the monitoring data hasn't been sent is because providing that without the context of the risk assessment and the conceptual model, it really doesn't hold any value. Uh, it's just a series of data, uh, data sets. So we didn't deem it appropriate to provide that. It really wouldn't actually help the discussion more so confuse things. Uh, so now that we have the the risk assessment, uh, conceptual model.

00:22:20:00 - 00:22:25:04

Uh, we're happy to provide all of the data that went that fed into into the production of that document.

00:22:26:00 - 00:22:58:21

Okay. Well, that would certainly be helpful. Um, you mentioned about monitoring, um, and not wishing to put words in Mr. Chambers mouth, but what security, um, will be built into the control documents to allay his concerns about the potential implications for, um, the the potential implications for for groundwater.

00:23:09:18 - 00:23:39:20

Filtering. Williamson. On behalf of the applicant. I think once the, um, hydrogeological risk assessment is read and understood. Um, I think its ultimate conclusion is that a monitoring strategy is appropriate. Um, monitoring strategies obviously are included within the, the, um, measures in the outline construction surface water drainage management plan. And obviously that would therefore be implemented as part of the the discharge of that stage of works within which the trout fishery would fall in.

00:23:42:12 - 00:24:01:22

Thank you. I know I had said to, um, Mr. Chambers that we park the issue of the, um, planning authorities resourcing at this point in time, and this is an issue that miss Lee will may also want to comment on. Um, but what

00:24:03:14 - 00:24:23:07

what comfort can, um, Mr. Chambers take from what you've just said, given the concerns that he's expressed about the council's, uh, resourcing to actually properly oversee the monitoring regime and make sure that it is implemented.

00:24:25:07 - 00:24:55:29

But less done on behalf of the applicant. Um, the applicant is doing, um, as much as is reasonable. Um, in order to ensure that the measures that are proposed in terms of mitigation, uh, and this type of monitoring are included in those outline plans. That's why they're in the outline plans in terms of setting the context. Um, obviously the local authorities have been party to this examination, and they will be aware of where there are specific, um, concerns or issues raised.

00:24:56:12 - 00:25:39:00

Um, and it isn't for the applicant to, um, it's for the it's for the local authorities to undertake their role in the context of this. Having participated in this examination and having the benefit of the, um, the outline plans that, uh, that are being provided. Um, it cannot be the applicant's responsibility to take

that local authority's position. Um, and, and the applicant is doing what it can to ensure that those things are, are clearly set out and stated, um, so that when the local authorities come to discharge the plans, they, they do those in the appropriate manner.

00:25:41:18 - 00:25:53:27

Thank you. There's a couple of points I want to come back on. But miss Sally on on the council's behalf. As if you're still with us. Is there. Hello. Is there anything that you want to add on that point?

00:25:55:00 - 00:26:36:29

So, uh, Tamsin Sealy, on behalf of the councils, um, on sort of more broadly on on resourcing, I think it is a matter that has been raised, uh, by the councils in our local impact report and is reflected in the statement of Common Ground. Um, some concerns around that again, more broadly, and in relation to the the discharge periods, which I imagine will come up, uh, in the DCO agenda items, um, in relation to this specific matter, I understanding Mr. Chambers correctly, that that you have concerns that it's, um, whether there is enough specialist resource in relation to this specific sort of use as in your fishery use.

00:26:37:01 - 00:26:38:25

Is that the point that you're trying that you're making there?

00:26:39:14 - 00:26:51:04

Okay, surely the question should be directed through through myself, but certainly, um, I will allow I'll allow that clarification of possible assistance to Mr. Chambers.

00:26:51:18 - 00:27:22:05

Martin Chambers from ten a month. Um, regarding the the resource, I think I think where my concern comes from is and it is Conway Council because that's where I happen to be. Um, they're covering quite an awful lot of interests within these two plans. Ours is very specific. Um, and therefore I don't want it to get lost in translation. So it will be as much as anything.

00:27:22:07 - 00:27:38:24

It's not just about volume of resource. It's the speciality, the knowledgeable professional that can actually look and interpret what is being offered. Um, excuse me, is it is this an appropriate time to come back on any of the applicant's points, or would you like me to hold back.

00:27:39:06 - 00:27:51:17

If you'd hold back for the Minister Chambers? Because there's another point that I want to take up with them. That that that may be of assistance to you in reverting to them. Is there anything you want to come back on there?

00:27:52:00 - 00:28:21:15

Yes. Thomson City, uh, on behalf of the councils. And thank you for that clarification, Mr. Chambers. I think that is, as I understood it. Um, in on that point, then I think I can take that question away. Um, it's not something I know, um, to hand in terms of that specific resource. So I think I would take it away and, and speak to colleagues at Conway about, well, whether they have any particular concerns about their capacity to deal with that, uh, that particular aspect of, um, approval. If that's okay.

00:28:22:13 - 00:29:04:23

A certain certainly, Mr. Lee, I'll get that noted as an action point. Um, so if you can revert to us with that, um, information or evidence at deadline six, please, just to come back to the applicant before I

invite Mr. Chambers to to speak, um, on the subject of the supporting information for the forthcoming hydrological risk assessment. Um, will the borehole log record give details of the the frequency and duration of the the testing?

00:29:06:09 - 00:29:07:28
if you could assist us there.

00:29:09:13 - 00:29:24:18
For example, were measurements taken every month and over a period of how many years? Given the seasonality, um, issues that Mr. Chambers raised in his introduction to his concerns.

00:29:31:25 - 00:29:40:29
Hilary Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, yes, we do, uh, have detail in terms of when that was when the logs were taken, um, and for their duration.

00:29:43:12 - 00:29:59:24
Would you be able to. I'm sorry, I was I was going to ask, would you be able to give us an indication? But I'm inviting evidence that isn't before us and need to need to wait to deadline. So, um, Mr. Chambers.

00:30:00:16 - 00:30:31:15
Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, If it's if it's at the, um, if the examining authority will allow. Um, we are in a position to submit the conceptual, uh, so the risk assessment, hydrogeological risk assessment and data associated with it in advance of deadline six, if that is, um, is that if that is of interest both to the examining authority and Mr. Chambers, there was an offer to send that to him in advance of deadline six regardless, but it can be submitted into examination outside of the deadlines. If if you feel that is appropriate.

00:30:32:14 - 00:30:58:03
Mr. Williamson, will you, um, will you just let me park that for now and I'll revert to you before the end of this agenda item? And please remind me if I haven't done so. Um, I just maybe need to, to take the, um, temperature of of the other members. Mr. chambers, you wanted to come back on some of those points. Please do so.

00:30:59:15 - 00:31:30:22
Yeah. Martin chambers, tunnel. month. Um, just to go back through some of the points the applicant has just made. If I heard you correctly, it was that boreholes were actually sunk where you're proposing to use trench less techniques. Therefore, if you've got boreholes above the fishery, am I right in concluding that you're not going to trench, that you're actually going to go trench less? So that's the first question. Second one I think is to correct the applicant.

00:31:31:13 - 00:32:04:09
Um, you talked about the primary catchment area being to the north east of the fishery. North east is actually downhill. It's south. It would be south east. I'm assume that you mean, um, north and south around here are very confusing, but. Hey, ho. Um, the, uh, there was a question from the inspector regarding sort of monitoring strategy, um, which was relative to the secure, ongoing security of the groundwater supplies.

00:32:05:05 - 00:32:14:27

Um, but there was no definition given back on no detail given that by the applicant. Am I right in assuming that will be in the deadline? Six papers.

00:32:18:21 - 00:32:58:22

And then I've got a note. But I can't even work out what my own note was. Oh, goodness. Um. Oh, it was about the two plans. Sorry. The applicant seemed to be suggesting again that the two plans did cover the groundwork or groundwater supplies. Now, I would suggest and go back to the comments that I have offered, that there is a distinct absence of reference to the groundwater supplies. The surface water talks very much about flood and pollution, doesn't talk about the groundwater to any extent and the construction code of practice.

00:33:00:03 - 00:33:41:20

As far as I can work out, the only time it talks about drainage is actually for the installation post works of cut off drains. Um, we also haven't covered, as I thought we were going to cover. Um, because you didn't mention it, ma'am was about what happens post the works. Um, when the different persons or person disappear. Um, yeah. Not naive enough to think there's going to be somebody sat around for six years, but I would imagine there has to be some form of, um, contact network set up, um, and means of reporting and actually being actively monitored.

00:33:42:26 - 00:33:53:04

Um, I very much welcome the fact that we can have sides of the borehole logs and the monitoring alongside the risk assessment. That's very much appreciated.

00:33:55:05 - 00:34:25:01

The monitoring, Mr. Chambers and the, um, the DCO issues are things that I do want to come on to very imminently. Um, because I know you've been very patient, but we have limited time today. So I do want to hear, um, the questions that that Mr. Chambers was raising for the applicant through me. Um, certainly like to hear from the applicant on those before we move on to the monitoring and the DCO issues, please.

00:34:34:01 - 00:35:04:10

That Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, so with regard to the question about whether the onshore cable route will be trenched or trench less, um, as per the onshore crossing schedule, we identify those obstacles that will be, um, crossed by trenches, techniques. Um, because that is a obviously a slightly deeper underground technique. There is a requirement to understand the ground conditions in those locations, and that's why we have established boreholes in those locations.

00:35:04:21 - 00:35:39:12

Regardless, there is both trench and trench trench techniques, and that will be used at the onshore cable route to the south of the of the trout fishery. Um, but the connectivity associated with the groundwater is obviously going to be primarily associated with those, those excavations or deeper excavations, um, to do with trenches techniques. It's so happens that because we had that borehole data, we are able to use that to inform any potential connectivity between the boreholes and the trout fishery or the groundwater associated with the trout fishery.

00:35:40:21 - 00:36:14:06

Um, Mr. Chambers is correct. That was a I misspoke with regards to whether it was southeast or north east and north east is discounted. Um, south east, the um The catchment for the trout fisheries established to the southeast of which the of which the where the construction activities overlap with that large catchment catchment is quite small, which is why we we deem it to be quite low risk in

terms of establishing a connection between our construction activities and the trout fishery, and that should become more apparent once the conceptual model and the risk assessment is provided.

00:36:15:16 - 00:36:46:10

Um, and last and also we talked about the monitoring strategy for the I believe you're asking about the monitoring strategy for the trench loss techniques. Um, obviously the monitoring strategy is was primarily geared at understanding, um, the ground, ground conditions and obviously water and hydrogeological make up, um, at those boreholes for the purposes of construction activities. However, we have been able to use that information for the purposes of forming the conceptual model and hydrogeological risk assessment.

00:36:46:19 - 00:37:26:02

And so in terms of the monitoring data that's used to that monitoring data that is used to inform the conceptual model, and the hydrogeological risk assessment is outlined within those documents. So it should be quite clear what information has been used to inform the production of those documents. And lastly on post works, um, the hydrogeological risk assessment identifies that they're the only pathway to, um, any potential impacts associated with the groundwater and hydrogeological activities associated with construction activities only, uh, because it's to do with excavation and drilling associated with the trench techniques.

00:37:26:04 - 00:37:47:25

So in terms of post works, once the ducts are in, uh, there should be no connectivity or there should be no issues associated with the hydrogeological regime and the trout fishery, and therefore, there should be no requirement for any sort of post works or operational, um, liaison or monitoring once, uh, once we have stepped away from the construction activities in that particular location.

00:37:49:29 - 00:38:20:14

Thank you, Mr. Williamson. Um, I think, um, again, there's there's a reliance on the evidence is not yet before us in your answer, to some extent. Um, if if the applicant is in a position to submit that the Xa will exercise is discretion upon receipt. I don't want to say no for the sake of being helpful to Mr. Chambers that, yes, you know, will accept it and publish it, because we're effectively creating a new deadline.

00:38:20:16 - 00:38:33:18

And there are issues of fairness and equity down with, with, with, with other contributors. So if you're in a position to submit it, um, can you do so. And we'll reserve our position on how we deal with it. Thank you.

00:38:34:07 - 00:38:47:01

Um, Vincent, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, yes, we will do as I suggested. Um, but I think we have a direct line of communication with Mr. Chambers, and we will submit it to him at exactly the same time.

00:38:48:16 - 00:39:10:08

Thank you. That's. That's obviously your prerogative. And that would move things on and be helpful. Thank you, Mr. Chambers. Um, I, I hate after your your patient. Wait for a couple of months to hurry you. Uh, I do want to come on to monitoring the DCO before I do. So is there any burning points that you want to revert to the applicant on?

00:39:11:14 - 00:39:47:07

Sorry. Um, um, if if I can, through your office, uh, offer just back to two of them. I'm sorry. It was clear as mud as to whether we trench less or trenched above the fishery. I think I heard at the end it's trench loss. But can we clarify that? Or could you also get the applicant to point out if there is a document where it's identified, that would be helpful. And the second one, um, Mr. Williamson didn't mention anything about, um, the upgrade of the the two plans relative to groundwater.

00:39:47:28 - 00:39:50:03

After that, I will be quiet.

00:39:52:00 - 00:39:57:03

Mr. Gibson, if you could or Miss Dunn, could the applicant assist us on those points? Thank you.

00:39:57:16 - 00:40:26:17

Please stand on behalf of the applicant. I think given Mr. Williamson's tried to explain it twice. I think I'll have a go now. Um, the point around whether the, uh, the, um, cables would be trenched or trenched in that location. There is the option for both. Um, there is the the boreholes were done to investigate whether it would be suitable for trench, but it isn't being committed to. And therefore there's the option, um, there's the option for both trench and trench in that location. Is that correct?

00:40:30:17 - 00:40:46:19

Yes yes, yes. Thank you. I'm getting yeses from around the room. Uh, the second point around surface water. I think we will take away that point and check the outline plans, um, and revert on that position in in at deadline six.

00:40:57:22 - 00:41:00:29

Okay. There are sorry you finished missed on the.

00:41:03:11 - 00:41:03:29

Present.

00:41:05:22 - 00:41:06:24

I have thank you.

00:41:06:28 - 00:41:38:17

Thank you. Um, there are just two points that I wanted to clarify. Mr. chambers had asked where the the the trenched versus trench. Less deliberation. Where where he could find that in evidence. Um, if that could be if it was easy to lay your hands on that and and just it could be me that's flagging at this time of the day. You mentioned surface water, and Mr. Chambers concern is groundwater. Um, so can we just be clear on that, Mr.

00:41:38:19 - 00:41:46:17

Chambers? It's it's groundwater. That's very much your concern, not surface water. Yes. Okay, okay. So.

00:41:47:06 - 00:42:08:19

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, uh, the whether it's trenched or trench less is identified within the onshore crossing schedule, which is rep 5012. But any in terms of any commitment in terms of whether it is trenched or trench less, that will be part of the detailed design and therefore discharge associated with that stage of the works.

00:42:10:07 - 00:42:14:20

Thank you. That reference is very helpful, Mr. Williamson.

00:42:16:10 - 00:42:53:18

Mr. chambers, can I move on to the the DCO and to monitoring, please? Thank you. Um, there are three points I have on the DCO. And the first point, uh, might seem like pedantry, but it's actually accuracy. And I just wanted to be sure that the fisheries included as a category three person in the book of reference. And that's rep 3006. Now, if I can get the parties to have a look at page, or get the applicant to have a look at page 487.

00:42:54:18 - 00:43:29:10

Um, and there's an entry there for a Catholic three person, but it's actually a different spelling for the the name of the fishery. And the parties are in the name of Banfield. So is the there's debate going on about whether a category, the fisheries category three interest should be boosted up to category one, but I just want to be sure that it actually is included as a category three interest.

00:43:29:12 - 00:43:32:21

So if the the applicant could assist me in that respect, please.

00:43:33:22 - 00:44:06:14

Uh, less than on behalf of the applicant. Um, it isn't a category three interest, um, because it doesn't fall within the, uh, the specified, um, legal framework for category three. Um, I haven't got that in front of me at the moment, but, um, it's in the book of reference. Um, it sets out, um, which the, um, in respect of the, the relevant compulsory acquisition legislation, what a category three person, uh, is in terms of what types of impact they are.

00:44:06:20 - 00:44:11:10

Uh, and this isn't an impact that would fall within category three categories.

00:44:12:14 - 00:44:56:27

Um, I did have section 44 of the Planning Act 2008 in front of me, and I seem to have closed it, but it seemed from my reading of that as, as in trying to figure out, um, whether the examining authority or ultimately the Secretary of State has any discretion in this matter, that the wording of that relevant, uh, section of the legislation seemed to confer the discretion and not matter solely with the applicant, and very much take it out of the, uh, Secretary of State, let alone the examining authority's hands.

00:44:57:29 - 00:45:20:16

It's done. If you could lay your hands on section 44 would be just, um, useful to have a look at that. Or. Or if it's something that you want to come back on. And the compulsory acquisition hearing. Um, I, I'm mindful that we're straying a little into that territory, but it was only because I didn't want to, um, inconvenience Mr. Chambers by not dealing with it today.

00:45:21:15 - 00:45:59:11

At least done on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think it's it's probably something for us to come back on, um, in writing. We can deal with it tomorrow, but we'll also be obviously adding it to our CCA hearing submissions. I think the point is that, um, it. Whether you're a category one, 2 or 3 person, um, is not something that you can pick or choose. It's based on having the relevant legal interest or the right to a claim in respect of category three that comes under either section ten of the Compulsory Purchase Act, part one of the Land Compensation Compensation Act, or under section 1523.

00:45:59:13 - 00:46:19:24

So it isn't something that, um, that a party can effectively have conferred on them unless they have the relevant interest, particularly in respect of categories one and two, or whether, um, they're able to make a claim, um, under those specific areas of legislation. But we can we can revert on that.

00:46:21:25 - 00:46:54:26

I certainly would appreciate that. Um, this done in the I know that there's been, um, back and forth in the respect of written submissions about Mr. Chambers request for indemnification, and for some such mechanism to be included within the DCO. But I think that was was being done from the. We've now found out the mistaken premise that there was a category three interest. So, um, certainly as an action point that you could take that away.

00:46:55:17 - 00:47:25:27

Um, is there anything that you want to say at this juncture, in response to Mr. Chambers ongoing concern about the lack of indemnification? And I guess it it dovetails very nicely with the remaining point that I need to cover. Um, and that was concerns about monitoring and mitigation of any disruption to the fisheries water supply from a year post-construction onwards. As I say, when the agricultural liaison officer has packed up, um, and or that the interests, as Mr.

00:47:25:29 - 00:47:33:18

Chambers are concerned, have been sold on. So if you could, uh, address those two concerns in the drawing, that would be helpful. Thank you.

00:47:35:07 - 00:48:07:03

A madam, just one point to pick up, um, which has been flagged to me, um, section 44 of the Planning Act, which was the one that you referred to, is actually in relation to consultation. Uh, it's not to do with relevant claims. So when we respond, um, on that point, um, it clearly it's flagging those parties that would be engaged for the purposes of consultation. But um, so it sets the framework for when those claims are. But it isn't it isn't the part of the planning Act that actually deals with the circumstances in which that would be engaged.

00:48:07:20 - 00:48:08:05

Um.

00:48:11:15 - 00:48:12:12

Can you pick up Uncle.

00:48:13:23 - 00:48:59:20

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant? Um, uh, just a point in terms of monitoring, uh, within the outline construction, surface water drainage management plan, section 1.6.2 states that monitoring of surface and groundwater resources will be undertaken at agreed locations to determine the baseline flows and quality conditions. And so that is a commitment that's made within the management plan and obviously the detail of which is established through the discharge process. Um, I think I tried to make the point earlier that in terms of Post-construction, um, there currently we don't believe there is a need for that because obviously it's the construction activities, the excavations themselves that pose a potential connection risk between the between the activities of the project and the groundwater associated with the trout fishery.

00:48:59:26 - 00:49:13:13

Uh, notwithstanding that if, uh, the local authority deem it appropriate to continue the monitoring, that can be something that's, uh, discussed and agreed through the discharge of the outlying construction surface water management plan. Um.

00:49:16:10 - 00:49:25:03

That that provision that you're referring is to Mr. Williamson. As things stand, is that time limited in the current version of the plan?

00:49:27:12 - 00:49:37:01

Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. No, it's it's not time limited. It's it's an outline at this stage. And obviously that's to be agreed at the detailed design stage and discharged at the local authority.

00:49:37:26 - 00:49:43:14

Okay. Thank you for that. Mr. chambers, is there anything there that you want to come back on today?

00:49:47:17 - 00:50:29:11

Yes. If I, if I can come back on the very last point, which was the applicant. Sorry. Martin Chambers. Um, the point that the applicant made at the end about the fact that the monitoring would be done so as to form the baseline position. That's understood. What I haven't heard is anything that monitors the situation, post the works or during the works. Um, what I have read, I think it was in the construction code of practice, was that there is a preference to carry out the excavations during the the drier months of the year, shall we say, the summer, etc.

00:50:30:04 - 00:51:02:27

the reality is that's when our water doesn't particularly flow anyway. So monitoring post-construction I think would be very important because in reality the first we will know of it potentially is when no water arrives come the winter. Um, so I think that I think there is a shortcoming there in what the applicant's proposing. Um, a little bit stunned to hear that we were not actually considered to be a category three, um, interest.

00:51:03:08 - 00:51:18:20

Um, so I'm not quite sure where that leaves us regards to protective measures. Um, sounds like we've been hung out to dry, to be frank. Uh, or potentially. So, um, okay. I haven't anything else to add.

00:51:20:08 - 00:51:44:19

Thank you, Mr. Chambers. Thank you for your brevity. Um, the applicant, um, is to come back on the compulsory acquisition matters, but given, um, the Mr. Chambers strength of feeling, it may. I'll admit one brief comment before we move away. See if there's anything that the applicant monster had.

00:51:47:08 - 00:52:17:04

Done on behalf of the applicant. Um, just because, um, Mr. Chambers wouldn't be legally a category three claimant, doesn't mean that he would not be able to make a claim in the event that there was a there was a demonstrable effect from the project in respect of, um, of his, uh, fishery. So just because you're not captured within that particular, uh, legal framework doesn't mean that there isn't the ability to, obviously, to bring a claim.

00:52:20:23 - 00:52:56:12

Thank you, Miss Douglas. That's that's very useful. Um, just to have that on the record. Are there any other points? Um, there was nothing else that I wanted to raise, and I'm sure that we'll get a. Well, I hope that we get a full response from the applicant at deadline six. And, Mr. Chambers, I know you're

fairly much in limbo until you get, um, get sight of that additional, um, evidence that you've been awaiting.

00:52:57:09 - 00:53:03:24

Is there anything else or can I close that particular agenda item today?

00:53:05:21 - 00:53:14:18

Um, I think you can close the agenda item for today, ma'am. Thank you. I'm sorry. Martin Chambers from the month. Yes, of course you can go, Mr. Chambers.

00:53:14:23 - 00:53:21:07

And then the applicant. Is there anything that you want to add, or can I move on to the next agenda item?

00:53:23:17 - 00:53:54:19

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, we have six, six weekly meetings with Mr. Chambers. But I think once we send across the, um, the documents that we've committed to sending, I think it would be useful for us to sit down with him and our hydrogeology and potentially some engineering support as well, to go through exactly what's going to be happening south of the fishery. And, uh, what we believe in terms of construction activities and groundwater connectivity, um, is outlined in the risk assessment. So I think, uh, we'll try and set that up as soon as possible.

00:53:55:07 - 00:54:25:13

Mr. Williamson. Thank you. That's, uh, very, um, good unhelpful note to end on because I was tempted to ask about meetings, but I know that's not the the purview of the EXR. So it's it's that's a heartening development. So thank you for that. So thank you. Um, If the parties are amenable, um, I would like to make a start on noise and vibration.

00:54:26:12 - 00:54:38:26

Um, but I'm conscious that it is 5:05, and it's been a long day. Are there any dissenting voices to the proposition that I make a start on that this afternoon?

00:54:41:28 - 00:55:12:21

Uh, less than on behalf of the applicant. Um, if appreciate that people have been here all day. Um, if it was possible to push that to tomorrow morning, and I think it I think it merits being dealt with, uh, in one, uh, go, as it were, in terms of all those elements, I think, um, there is the potential for it to be. I don't know how many questions you have, madam. Um, but, um, our suggestion would be to, to start that tomorrow morning.

00:55:14:09 - 00:55:21:23

Um. It's not so much that I have a lot of questions on it. Miss Donna, I'm obviously going to be very much, um.

00:55:24:08 - 00:56:05:02

Guided by the interested parties and on the issues that they want to raise. Um, I'm concerned, uh, we were having this, um, exchange in the background about whether to make a start tomorrow or not or. Sorry, today, uh, we we have to finish tomorrow by 12. Um, so that our case team can get ready for the the compulsory acquisition hearing at half one. Um, and there is quite a lot to get through on the DCO, and I'm just concerned that if we don't make a start today, that something is going to slip.

00:56:05:04 - 00:56:11:04

So I'll hear what Councillor Barlow has to say and then we'll see where we stand. Councillor Barlow.

00:56:13:22 - 00:56:33:00

Thank you, Martin Marietta community Council. Um, I don't want to speak on behalf of anybody else, but I know that Mr. Hussey, uh, will have something to say on noise. Um, so I would just like to check that he is still, um, um, online and part of the discussion.

00:56:35:12 - 00:56:40:15

That's a valid point. Mr. Barlow, are they still with us?

00:56:42:18 - 00:57:00:01

Hello, Martin. Yes, we still. I'm still with you. To be honest, I don't have an awful lot. I've put a lot in my submission. We're obviously waiting for that, um, uh, response to come. I only have a couple of points for clarification, if I can, through this, through this agenda item. So I'm happy to carry on if everybody else is.

00:57:03:02 - 00:57:18:16

This done, could we maybe make a start because given what Mr. Hosie say is and really the, the the manner in which I intended to conduct this item, we might actually cover it, um, in a fairly brief fashion.

00:57:21:04 - 00:57:39:21

Uh, list done on behalf of the applicant. Happy to proceed. Was just mindful that, um, it's often difficult if you break something partway through. Um, and that obviously the desire to get through it. Um, today we're very happy to continue. Um, if that's if that's what everybody would rather do.

00:57:40:28 - 00:58:34:28

Um, it's not what I would rather do in this done. But for the sake of expediency and giving everybody their say and making sure that we get through the, the, um, agenda, um, it certainly it would be of assistance if we could make a start in it today. So I do appreciate that latitude on your behalf. As I say, I, I don't have any really sad questions. It was more my intention to facilitate, um, the main points that that the horses and and Mister Barlow might want to or the Councillor Barlow might want to raise today, because there is an awful lot of evidence that has been submitted, um, in the additions to the environmental statement and, um, certainly in the form of the code of construction practice controls for Tennant Meredith.

00:58:35:00 - 00:59:02:05

The rep 5076. So it might be useful just to hear the point of clarification that Mr. Hosie was seeking so that everybody has a better structure for their deadline. Six submissions. So maybe if I could, um, expedite the matter in that way. Mr. Hosie, would you like to, to make put your points forward place?

00:59:07:16 - 00:59:39:21

How? Hi. Uh, Martin. Meredith. Um, I think my my main points have been put into my submission, uh, at deadline five. Um, a lot of what I just heard with Mr. Chambers struck a chord, really, with my wife and I, in that we also don't think that we're being taken seriously. Um, being individuals, we don't think the system is suited for our case.

00:59:39:23 - 01:00:10:24

And we do believe that we are unique. Um, and we also feel we're being hung out to dry a little bit. So a lot of what Mr. Chambers said did strike a resonant chord with us. Um, as I say, we've put most of our, um, sorry, our comments within our deadline. Five um, but we are of the mind that no amount of mitigation can adequately screeners from the noise impacts, um, that are going to come with the construction activity.

01:00:11:00 - 01:00:47:20

I do have a couple of questions which I'd like to to ask if I can. Um, the first one is relating to mobilisation hours, which the applicant has redefined, um, in its rep five submissions. Rep 5038 and rep 5047. So I was wondering if the applicant could explain or expand on what they mean in the mobilization hours as regards to movements to place of work, what does that actually entail? What does it mean? And also deliveries and unloading.

01:00:47:26 - 01:01:18:19

Again, what does that entail and what does it mean? Because one of the comments I've made in my submission is there is no noise. Impacts from mobilization hours that have been presented and mobilization hours will occur during the highly sensitive times between 6:00 in the morning and seven, which is a highly sensitive nighttime period. So any more detail on movements to place of work and deliveries and unloading during mobilization hours would be appreciated.

01:01:18:21 - 01:01:19:06

Thank you.

01:01:21:03 - 01:01:52:29

Thank you. Um, Mr. Halsey, the systemic point that you make, um, there's there's really not an awful lot that I can say by way of addressing that. Um, the examination process, the examining authority is trying to administer it in as evenhanded, um, a manner as we can within the, the strictures of of the legislation and procedures.

01:01:53:21 - 01:02:29:18

Um, and I think the points that you're raising are maybe outwith our, uh, our remit, So I can't really engage too much with that. The mobilization. I know that that's something that Mrs. Jones, um, is going to deal with when it comes to looking at the working hours and the mobilization as part of the development consent order. Uh, but certainly I think you've been very patient today that, um, that it's something that we, we, we can't deal with this afternoon.

01:02:30:10 - 01:02:36:13

Um, Mrs. Jones, you've given an indication that you might like to to step in on that.

01:02:39:08 - 01:02:47:03

Or maybe if we could hear from the applicant in the first instance, please. As to the response to the point that Mr. Halsey has raised.

01:02:48:29 - 01:03:16:23

Uh, Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Uh, so, yes, at deadline five, we've included a definition of, uh, of what mobilization activities include. Uh, to answer Mr. Hughes's question about the movement to place of work that is, about arrival of staff, um, and and vehicles. And the point made about unloading um is something that we need to correct. Unloading was not meant to be included in that definition and will be removed at a submission deadline. Six.

01:03:18:14 - 01:03:50:17

And on the point on, uh, the sort of systemic point, I think I'd just like to add that, um, I don't think it's any secret that the applicant has been is, uh, is seeking engagement with the local authority. And one of the things that is, um, that we are trying to will be pushing through as much as possible is a planning performance agreement, which will obviously include specialist support for the local authority. So we we intend to submit that as soon as possible, as soon as we possibly can, uh, to expedite the discharge process and obviously provide technical support for the local authority.

01:03:50:19 - 01:03:55:18

And that should hopefully alleviate some of the concerns from that have been raised in this session as well.

01:03:57:00 - 01:04:16:07

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Just for for my benefit as much as Mr. Halsey. I think it would be just a useful aid memoire. Uh, if you could point out for the record where that, um, definition has been included, is it within the the deadline five version of the DCO, etc.?

01:04:17:09 - 01:04:33:00

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Yes, it was submitted at deadline five. Um, and they're sorry as part of the draft development consent order. Um and text actually explaining that submission was included in rep 5006.

01:04:36:13 - 01:04:43:05

Okay. Um, Miss Jones, is there anything that that you want to add on mobilisation at this stage?

01:04:44:17 - 01:04:48:00

Yes. It was really just to well, want to double check that.

01:04:48:02 - 01:04:57:12

Mr. Hussey will will be joining us tomorrow for, um, the remainder of, of the hearing. Is that is that correct, Mr. Hussey you intend on attending in the morning as well?

01:04:59:13 - 01:05:01:05

Uh, yes. That's correct. Yeah.

01:05:01:07 - 01:05:33:26

It's that we given given the time now and obviously Mr. Causley has started noise, but because we're dealing with DCO and requirements are on the agenda for tomorrow, what we'll do is we'll deal with, um, requirements. At the top of my head, I think it's 14, isn't it? Is the construction hours yet? Um, we'll we'll come to that tomorrow. And I do have questions on on mobilization. One of the things that I probably would, would say now and it's maybe something that the applicant can take away overnight to have a think about to come back tomorrow is a couple of questions that I have.

01:05:34:07 - 01:06:05:20

Um, in advance of that. Are you talked about taking unloading out of out of mobilisation. But one of the things that's also in there are, um, deliveries. Um, but I think, um, a while back, I can't remember the original writing of the, um, of, of the requirement or whether it's in one of the management plans. You specifically said there would be no HGV arriving during mobilisation. Um, the way it's worded at the minute doesn't preclude that from happening. Deliveries occurring on HGV.

01:06:05:22 - 01:06:36:22

So that's one thing that I would like you to take away. Think about tomorrow. And another is the possibility. Um, when we talk about, um, noise on some of the discos and noise limit and maximum noise limit has been imposed for mobilisation. And whether that's something that you can, um, take away, I can certainly give, give you an example of one. If you wanted to have a look at that. And that's the um Bramford to twin set made DCO had a noise limit imposed for mobilisation.

01:06:36:24 - 01:06:46:02

So there were things just to sort of reassure you, Mr. Hussey, that the examining authority wanted to raise with regards to the requirements, and we'll be bringing that up tomorrow.

01:06:49:11 - 01:06:54:09

Thank you, Mrs. Johnson. Mr. Hussey, do you want to commend there. Put your hand up.

01:06:55:19 - 01:07:33:07

Yeah, if I can, please. Um, the question I raised about mobilization was really was associated with noise impacts from that. Um, I'm still a little bit unclear about the movements to place of work because staff arrival, they're not going to be working in the car park. So place of work, if that's what what the applicant is referring to is basically arriving at the car park. And that, in essence is probably fine, but place of work could well be within the cable corridor, could be on the substation site.

01:07:33:09 - 01:07:41:27

So yeah, I'm still a bit unclear as to what movement to place of work actually means.

01:07:49:03 - 01:07:50:02

It's not something.

01:07:50:04 - 01:07:54:19

That we can deal with today. An applicant assist.

01:07:55:09 - 01:08:00:14

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant. I think we'll take that one overnight and provide an answer tomorrow, if that's okay.

01:08:01:21 - 01:08:43:04

And the other thing, if I can just add to to the list, um, for things to be considered, um, Mr. Hussey and his submission had made a point about survey work. Um, certainly an associations or sorry monitoring survey work in association with monitoring. Um, for example, the dust on on vehicles and I know that um, that the current outline code of construction practice your rep 5038 had omitted mention of site inspections, safety checks and site meetings from the section 1.8.2.2.

01:08:43:06 - 01:08:57:14

But it still refers to inspections. So if you could give some thought to that in the context of the associated concern that the horses have raised in their deadline five submission, that that would be very helpful. Thank you.

01:08:59:14 - 01:09:07:14

Mr.. Is there anything that you wanted to raise today in advance of your deliberations at deadline six or

01:09:09:03 - 01:09:12:24

or reading what the the applicant has to say in response to that deadline?

01:09:17:25 - 01:09:40:07

Hi, Martin. Uh, no, I think I'd prefer to wait for the deadline. Six responses. Uh, before I come back any further, I do have a couple of specific questions relating to my property, but rather than, uh, do this through the examination process, I'll see what comes back. Really? Um, I think I've raised enough points in my deadline five submission that that's all fine.

01:09:41:15 - 01:09:59:17

Thank you, Mr. Hussey. Whatever works best for you. We certainly don't want to, um, deny you the right to make your submission. But but that's certainly if that's how you want to proceed. Um, councillor Barlow, you're. Is there anything that you wanted to add at this point on the issue?

01:10:00:16 - 01:10:11:09

Martin Barlow community council. Um. No, madam. Um, Mr. Hussey has dealt with these issues in such great detail that I don't think I need to add anything. Thank you.

01:10:12:10 - 01:10:12:27

Thank you.

01:10:15:13 - 01:10:50:10

Are there any. Well, that's. Thank you very much for that. Um, as I say, it was really just to, to, to take a sounding exercises to where the party stood on not subsequent to the, um, deadline. Six submissions. So that was was short but nevertheless useful. So thank you for that. That's I've concluded, um, on that issue. Uh, see if for consideration of the construction hours and the mobilization period which will commence under the development Consent Order.

01:10:51:04 - 01:10:56:08

Um, Miss Jones, I'll hand over to you to round things off for the day. Thank you.

01:10:58:09 - 01:11:19:16

Thank you. Mr.. Just one point. Sorry, I was I was trying to, um, come in that I was a bit. I wasn't quick enough. Um, we've got the, um, why we have the councils on. I just wondered if it was worth just asking, Miss Seely, if there's anything that the councils, um, would like to add on noise and vibration. And the most recent submissions that come in.

01:11:23:13 - 01:11:59:21

By Thompson City. Speaking on behalf of the councils. Um, we do have points around the working hours, but that's probably best for the discussion tomorrow. By the sounds of it, in terms of the noise assessment itself, um, I think the latest position in the statement of common ground that was submitted, uh, at deadline five is that there is, um, just a couple of, uh, points outstanding. Um, which we are still discussing with the applicant, and they relate to, uh, specifically the sort of structural amplification, um, of vibration rather than noise and how that's been, um, assessed.

01:11:59:27 - 01:12:34:23

Um, I understand we're going to get some clarification from the applicant on that point, um, which will hopefully move that position to agreed once received. Um, but I probably should clarify the point that, uh, having discussed that with our specialist, we even if they were not able to necessarily completely resolve it, I don't think it's a point that would be considered sort of materially significant

from our perspective. So if we can't agree that the point, it will probably move to something that is, um, sort of not agreed, but not material, which I think is one of the categories in the statement of common ground.

01:12:34:29 - 01:12:46:12

So that's really where we are. I think, um, all other matters in terms of noise, uh, are in terms of the assessment of agreed as per the SOG. It's really around the working hours that we can talk about more detail.

01:12:47:15 - 01:12:52:18

And we'll come to that under under the agenda item where we cover requirements tomorrow, I think.

01:12:58:16 - 01:13:02:16

Thank you. Anything the applicant would like to to to add to that.

01:13:08:00 - 01:13:12:05

Valerie Williamson on behalf of the applicant. I don't think we have anything further to add. Thank you.

01:13:15:18 - 01:13:24:00

Okay. Thank you. Am I all right to move to, uh, close today's. Yeah.

01:13:26:29 - 01:13:49:03

Okay, everyone. Um, well, it's now 520. Thank you for letting us go over slightly. That does mean that we will be able to start with the, um, the DCO first thing in the, in the morning, so I do think that was worthwhile? Um, we're not closing. We're adjourning, and we'll reopen again tomorrow. All on Microsoft Teams again at 9:30 a.m.. Thanks, everybody.