

# TEXT\_Bramford\_ISH2\_Session1\_081123

Wed, Nov 08, 2023 3:55PM • 1:29:01

00:05

Good afternoon, everybody. Happy World Town Planning Day.

00:10

I'd like you to I'd like to welcome you to this second issue specific hearing in relation to the Bramford. To instead reinforcement, which is now open.

00:19

At this afternoon's hearing, we'll be looking at the applicants draft development consent order, which we may refer to as DDS to relapse and related matters.

00:29

Before we begin cannot check up on me. Thank you and the livestream has started. Yes, it has. Thank you very much.

00:37

Okay, and I like to cut out quite a lot of the introductory stuff, but I believe we do have people on the livestream who weren't with us this morning, so we're probably to have to go through quite a lot of it again. My name is Andrew Marr. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of this examining authority. I have a background in ecology and environmental impact assessment. I'm a chartered environmentalist and a chartered landscape architect, and afternoon obligates with the management of the events and taking notes of any actions, and could ask my colleagues to introduce themselves, please.

01:08

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Julie de Courcey. And I'm a charter time planner. I have a background in appellate work, including major infrastructure projects, and the examination of local development plans.

01:24

Hello, everybody. I'm Jason Rollins. I'm a chartered civil engineer, and a chartered environmentalist. And I have the background in major projects for energy and highways.

01:41

I'm John McAvoy, I'm a chartered civil engineers have a background in major projects and local authority, highways and transport. Thank you.

01:50

We have several colleagues from the planning inspectors with us here today. Kevin Jones is at the rear of the room together now with Jake Stevens, the case manager. And they're accompanied today by Jess Weatherby and Gina Shoreland is assisting the online participants. If you've got any general questions regarding the examination process, please contact the case team we'd be happy to help, you may be able to catch them in the intervals or at the end of this hearing at the rear of the room.

02:19

Sometimes the housekeeping matters firstly, can I ask you to switch off all audible notifications for electronic devices and all participants around the table and online. Please remember to switch on your microphones to speak and to switch off unless you are speaking to reduce the background noise. I have no requests for special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this hearing. But I just like to confirm this is correct.

02:47

No notifications. Again, there's no fire alarm test due this afternoon. So if you do hear the fire alarm, it's the real thing. And you should leave the room by the fire exit to my right, which is the Cardo we came in or behind me to my left, which is the door in the corner and assemble in the middle of the car park outside the main doors of the building.

03:10

And there's toilets at the far end of the corridor that you've walked in to get to this room this afternoon.

03:17

For those of you are joining us on Microsoft Teams, please note the chat function is not working today. Please don't send us any messages via chat. It's not being monitored. If you do wish to raise a point during the meeting or you wish to speak, please put your hand up use the hands up function and turn your camera on. We may be a delay before we can acknowledge it but we will come to you as soon as we can.

03:40

And we do aim to have a short break at some stage during this afternoon.

03:45

For the purposes of identification for the benefit of those who are listening to the recording later, please could I ask that every point at which you speak? Could you please give your name and if you're representing an organization who it is that you do represent and for those present in the room. If you do speak, please ensure you speak into one of the microphones to ensure that your contribution is recorded. Are there any questions or concerns about the technology or the general management of today's event?

04:14

Okay, let's move on.

04:17

Again, a little bit about the digital recording. Digital recording is being made at this hearing. It will be made available as soon as possible on the national infrastructure website on the project page. So if you take part in this hearing, it's important to understand your comments will be recorded and that the digital recording will be published and retained. Usually for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision.

04:42

The planning inspectorate is subject to the General Data Protection Regulation. So the examining authority asks you not put any sensitive personal information, such as email addresses and economic financial, cultural or health related matters into the public domain. In fact, we actively encourage you not to

05:00

To say,

05:01

if for some reason you feel it's necessary to refer to any sort of sensitive information, please speak to the case team in the first instance. And they will explore with you whether that can be provided in a written format, and redacted before being published.

05:16

Please bear in mind that the only official record of our proceedings this afternoon is the digital recording, and tweets, blogs and similar communications which arise out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of the application.

05:31

Can I now check the names of the people who are intending to speak at the hearing this afternoon. If you could state your name who you represent, I'll be very grateful starting with the applicant, Mr. Humphries.

05:44

So I am indeed Mr. Humphries.

05:48

Thank you, barista, and I'm appearing on behalf of the applicant. So I imagine that I will be the only person speaking but if any others need to they will introduce themselves the the only person who is

06:04

like Lee to would be Mr. Field and when we get to the working hours, agenda item because he will be able to explain things far better than I could.

06:16

Thank you. And can we move on to the local authorities start with Suffolk please?

06:22

Thank you, sir. My name is Michael Bedford Kings Council. I am instructed on behalf of Suffolk County Council. I'm joined this afternoon in the room by Mr. Graham Gunby, who is the national infrastructure planning manager for the county council. And I'm also joined online virtually by Mr. Alistair Lewis, who is a partner and parliamentary agent with sharp precharge. And I may turn to him on some of the detail most of the DCO. But for the most part, I expect to be doing the presentation.

06:58

Thank you, and Braintree, I believe.

07:02

And you say yes. Matthew, our Senior planner at Braintree District Council attended to speak currently today, but I do have Richard Calvert, who's our environmental health officer in relation to noise on the call virtually as well as Katherine Hibbott, who represents homes and solicitors.

07:24

supporting us through the DCO hearing today, so they might or might call on them as we go through. Thank you. Thank you.

07:31

Mr. Bedford. Sorry to be a pain. Could you spell the last person's name for me again? How's that? Yeah, it's Alice, with an A E L A, S T A I R. And then Lewis as an L. E. wif. Thank you very much.

07:49

Is there anybody else who is intending to speak this afternoon, who would like to introduce themselves is to aija.

07:58

Thank you, sir. Good afternoon to both yourself and the rest of the examining authority. My name is Mark Wotja. I'll spell it for you, sir. It's spelled w double o DGER. And we're principal planning officer working at Essex County Council in the growth and development team.

08:16

And I'm a chartered member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. Thank you.

08:21

Thank you. Is there anybody else?

08:27

courtesies for this as well?

08:29

I've known Thank you Bronchitis Principal Planning Officer for Mid Suffolk District Council and Babby District Council.

08:37

No, not

08:39

intending to speak but I will listen to the hearing as it goes along. And if there is a point at which either of the authorities need to make submission I will do so thank you. Thank you, Miss Curtis.

08:53

And anybody else?

08:56

No hands in the room and no hands virtually. So I shall take that as the list.

09:03

So I'm going to move on to agenda item two, to explain the purpose of holding this issue specific hearing this afternoon.

09:12

Today's hearing is being held by the examining authority to explore a number of matters orally in respect of the scope and details of the applicant's draft development consent order. A summary of these summary of these was included in appendix to the agenda that we issued.

09:29

The examination is predominantly a written process, and the examining authority will be asking questions on this and other topics in its written questions.

09:38

You'll see from the draft examination timetable, we've already issued our first written questions, and that we currently propose to issue a further round of written questions. And we've also provided an opportunity in the timetable to hold further hearings in December if we require them.

09:56

During the examination, we will be scrutinizing the information submitted by the

10:00

applicants, local authorities, statutory parties affected persons, and all other interested parties. And I can assure you that the examining authority is familiar with the documents that you've sent in already. So when answering any questions today, you do not need to repeat at length something that has already been submitted.

10:18

If you want to refer to the information already submitted, we will be very grateful if you could use the appropriate examination Library Reference wherever possible.

10:28

Furthermore, could I ask that the first time you use any abbreviations or acronyms that you set out its meaning and for us, there may be people listening online to the digital recording or the live stream, there are not as familiar with the application or the documents as we are.

10:45

This is a public examination. And if there is an urgent point that you wish to make, please raise your real or virtual hand at the time. But whether online or in the room, please do wait to be invited before skipped speaking.

10:59

The hearing today will be a structured discussion based on the agenda that has already been published. The purpose of this discussion is for us to ask questions, and to seek clarification on the matters that are listed on the agenda. To ensure to ensure that we have all the information that we need to make our reports to the Secretary of State.

11:18

The questions that we're going to ask today will be focused on those areas that we think would benefit from examination or really,

11:26

there may be other questions or topics that you were expecting us to cover. Please be reassured. This simply indicates that we consider we already have the information we need on this topic, or that we are proposing to examine it later in writing or as a future hearing.

11:41

Finally, I'd like to remind everyone that this is an examination and not an inquiry. Therefore, unless the examining authority has specifically requested or agreed to it, there'll be no formal presentation of cases or cross examination.

11:57

Examination procedure rules require us at the start of the hearing to identify the matters that will be considered at this hearing. So the agenda for the hearing was placed on the website on Friday the 27th of October 2023. And its main purpose, as I've stated is to examine evidence relating to the applicants draft development consent order.

12:17

Please note that the issued agenda is for guidance only, we may add other issues for consideration as we progress, we will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration. Should issues take longer than anticipated, it may be necessary to prioritize matters and defer others to further written questions.

12:40

If we do take a short break, those, those of you online can stay logged on. But if we do have any issues with the technology, you may need to refresh your browser when we come back.

12:52

Finally, it's important we get the right answers to the questions we're going to ask. As I said, this is a predominantly written process. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or require time to get the information requested, then rather than giving a restricted or potentially incorrect answer, can you please indicate that you would prefer to respond in writing, we can then defer the response to an action point to be submitted at deadline for on the draft examination timetable, which is the 16th of November.

13:24

So before we move on to deal with the items detailed on the agenda, are there any questions about the procedural aspects of today's hearing?

13:35

No, nothing there. So I'm now going to hand over to Mr. Corsi to lead on the substantive sections of the agenda. Thank you.

13:43

Thank you, Mr. Mom.

13:45

So I'm going to start with Agenda Item three, which is review of the applicants schedule of changes to the draft development consent order. And Mr. Humphries, by way of setting the scene for today's subsequent discussion, it would be useful if you could give us a brief overview of the principle changes to the draft development consent order. After both deadlines two and three, please. Madam Thank you. Michael Humphreys for National Grid.

14:18

Mme, the document that people would need to look at is rep 3040. And that's an omnibus document that picks up both the deadline two changes that we made and the deadline, three changes. So there was a deadline

14:39

to document but in effect, it's superseded because we've simply added in extra text.

14:47

A deadline to

14:50

a number of changes were made some of those were responding to Section 51 advice. There were some CrossRef

15:00

rinsing errors in shedule seven, for example, and those are all set out in the document rep. 3040. And in the latest version of the drop DCO. There were also some matters that arose from issue specific hearing number one,

15:23

things such as typographical things, Her Majesty was changed to His Majesty, a few things of that sort some masts,

15:33

you know, and shells and things like that. I spotted another one last night. So there will be one more that comes forward.

15:42

A lot of this arose because of guidance that certain words should be used. And so things were changed. And in some cases, they, they, they shouldn't have been changed in quite the way they were in the first draft.

15:58

We responded to some matters

16:02

in the LI Rs. So for example, unless otherwise agreed,

16:09

it was added to various deeming mechanisms. For example, in a number of the articles, again, they're listed, I won't, I won't read out a list that's not very helpful to anyone.

16:21

References were made to the relevant Highway Authority as an approving body within sheduled. Three in certain requirements.

16:33

And, again, other other consequential amendments were were also made, I will make sure that they're all set out in this document. And they can also be made clear in the summary of the of this hearing that we put in so I won't be tiresome and just go through a list of things. Deadline three, there was some more things.

17:00

In the deadline three submission, we responded to some of your first written questions.

17:10

Relating, for example, to appendices to management plans, there was a query about whether the management plans included their appendices that's been clarified in the text. Also, the title of



requirement 10 was tweaked in response to a particular question. We've also again responded to more things in the local impact reports, some typographical errors, compliance with the

17:43

law, public rights of way management plan, correction to various other

17:49

errors in cross referencing errors, and so on, and consequential amendments. So all of those are

17:59

set out in this document, which, which also, as well as describing them in the way I did actually sort of gives you kind of track changed.

18:10

Kind of extracts from the development, consent order, but the development consent order rep. 3007, which I think is the untracked version, the clean version, and oh eight, which I think is the track version.

18:27

Also include all of those matters.

18:33

As your home face. Thank sorry, thank thank you very much for that.

18:37

I'm mindful that all of the changes that the Councils sought in their local impact reports, I'm mindful of them, that many from their perspective are still outstanding. Now without rehearsing those submissions, again, is there anything that any of the Councils want to say on the subject of changes to the draft development consent order to date?

19:06

Mr. Bedford?

19:09

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Madam, as you say, there's not really a great deal of assistance to you in simply rehearsing what we've already provided to you in written form, because you've got that material.

19:26

I mean, in simple overview terms, it's fair to say that there has been some positive movement by the applicant on some of the issues that we raised in our

19:41

representations. But there is, in our view, still a considerable way to go on a number of the fundamental issues where either the applicants position hasn't changed, or we consider that the change is not

20:00

sufficient to address the concerns that we have identified? Obviously, we set out our

20:08

principal position in the local impact report. That was it. Rep. 1045. We added further comments on the development consent order, in our comments on the submissions made it deadline, one that was in our rep two, zero 13 comments. And then we made further submissions in our submissions. At deadline three, that was in rep 3078, which actually has two parts. It's it's been given on the examination library, a single reference number, which is rep 3078. But part of it are the comments we've made on submissions at deadline three, and part of it was our responses to your examination questions. One.

21:03

So you've got say both of those combined into one library reference document. Madam, obviously, we know that the applicant has submitted further explanation of its position at deadline three in a number of deadline, three documents.

21:25

Obviously, we will provide our responses to those at deadline for so that's the overview. And that's as much as I was going to say at this stage. Thank you. Mr. belfry. Just excuse me one minute.

21:49

Sorry, just addressing a bit of a technical issue.

21:55

Mr. Wilde, please.

21:57

Welcome, Adam. Yeah, just to reiterate, the comments of Suffolk County Council. Really the changes are honest far as you know, obviously, we don't have an issue with the changes that have been put forward to date. But obviously, as you say,

22:14

many of the changes have an address for optimal fundamental concerns and are relevant documents. I'm happy to give you the reference numbers for those if you need them. Thank you.

22:26

Thank you, Mr. Weber, maybe in the written summation that would that would be useful, but I will. I won't ask you to take us through them. No, thank you.

22:37

Can I move on from that? Initial agenda item? And Mr. Humphreys? Yes, absolutely. I mean, I think, Madam, what the initial agenda item sort of helpfully highlights. And and Mr. Bedford, you know, has also made clear is that on on this issues, specific hearing topic, as much, if not more than any, there's

been a huge exchange of views. You've asked a lot of questions, we've responded to questions. Very often your questions, we're picking up things that were points that were made in the LI ours, we'd independently responded to all of the LI RS and if necessary,

23:21

cross referenced. And clearly we could all take an awful lot of time just sort of grinding through things that have been asked. And I know that's not what you intend. So

23:32

I know, for example, under Agenda Item five, you've got local authorities suggested amendments. And I think, I think what Mr. Bedford and I are anticipating is that you will pick out particular things where you'd find it helpful for us to discuss

23:50

things and we'll clearly respond to that. If you can just bear in mind, because there is so much documentation, we will probably take a few moments just to get to the right, the right version of the document, so we understand what the dispute is, and we can find what around loads. We'll pull things together. But I think that's going to be really helpful if we could do that for us. Okay. Yes, certainly. Do my best at that stage. Thank you. Thank you to the parties. I'm going to make a little bit of a change to the agenda. There's certainly no suggestion that any item is more important than the other. But I do have a lot on the agenda.

24:35

With the fallback if necessary, have written questions. The item that I want to bring forward is agenda item six, and that's review of the party's current positions on requirements seven construction hours. Because I think that that would really benefit from some dialogue as opposed to maybe

25:00

just ending up relegated to written questions. So I hope that hasn't unduly inconvenienced anyone. And I see Mr. Fielding is. Yes, madam. That's exactly the sort of thing I was kind of hinting at just just now there are certain things that are better dealt with by you asking questions, and us having witnesses. And and this is an obvious example. So Mr. Fields? Yeah. And I think you asked for, there's a, there's a document that we put in on construction hours, and there's a table in that you think you would find helpful if we put on the screen as general freeze? Thank you for reminding me.

25:44

Because I certainly will be calling on it at some stage, maybe just just or that's that. That's fine. We can just leave it there as a as a banner. Thank you. Okay, well, I don't see that anybody is has any problem with that rescheduling, so I will get straight in. At deadline three, the applicant submitted its justification for construction, working hours, that are the subject of requirements seven of the draft development consent order. The new evidence is found in the examination library, as rep 3045. As not everyone might yet have had the chance to consider it. It would be useful if the applicant could give a brief synopsis of the rationale behind it. The scenarios, the two scenarios that were considered the conclusions. It's not a lengthy document, but I think just to set the scene that an overview would be of

26:57

benefit to us. So like handover to the applicant? Yes, metamodel do very rapidly, for obvious reasons is handover to Mr. Mr. Fielden, but the the document, as you rightly

27:15

say, deals with our baseline construction program. And then the two scenarios that were looked at were, in effect, a change to the working hours that I think software could had suggested and a change I think, that Essex had suggested. And so what Mr. Fielden and the the the team that do these things did was sort of work through in a sense, the consequences of these things. And

27:51

pretty important in all of this is meeting the outage date. So you'll see in that table and Mr. Field, and we'll talk you through all of this, but you'll see the tables in effect in two parts. The top part that's the main part on screen is working through various activities. The second part of it, I don't know, whether it can just be shrunk down in size vary slightly so that we see a bit more of the table. I don't know whether that's possible.

28:26

That's probably enough. Yeah. What do you see in the second part are a series of outage dates, and

28:34

we have to hit certain outage dates, those are absolutely fixed items.

28:40

And if we don't fit those, then sometimes the next outage date that will be suitable can be years later.

28:48

So that is why it is absolutely essential that we hit those now what I'll get Mr. Fuel them to do is just explain to you the top half of the table, how that's been put together, what the two scenarios

29:04

were and and in the sense the agency and not only does this relate to

29:12

working hours, it also indirectly relates to our insistence on certain decisions being taken within 28 days, we have to hit these targets. We have to hit these outage dates.

29:29

or building a national bridge.

29:32

Enough, excuse me, I'm gonna have to flip between glasses and sunglasses.

29:36

So we've got two scenarios associated maybe move the microphone a wee bit closer just for the benefit of the recording. Thank you. No problem. Sorry. We're building national grid.

29:47

So as you can see on the screen, we've got the baseline scenario.

29:52

The activities on the left hand side are sort of key milestone activities until you get down to where it says out each for

30:00

We'll start. So all of the items above there to be read sort of left to right. The key activity for me on there is commissioning works to circuit one and two final activity to be completed before our h4,

30:20

which I think is a sixth activity down. So on our baseline that finishes on the Eighth of March ready for our outage to start, on the ninth of March,

30:32

scenario one where we've modelled, reduce working hours to

30:42

standard working hours during the week, and then reduced weekend working between eight and three, on Saturday with no working on weekends.

30:52

we've modeled that into our program. And it gives us an output of those activities you see on the screen. So that pushes to the 29th of April 27, which as you can see me It misses out which for start date. So that that small

31:12

delay there actually equate to a year delay potentially, in us getting an outage again, because outages four through two, seven need to be done in one out the season. And they're quite long duration. So

31:29

if we were to be able to just pick our project up and not consider other schemes and other outages on the network, that small delay in the reduction of not being able to work on Sundays actually gives us a 12 month delay in our in our program.

31:44

We then gone away model scenario two, which is reducing the working hours during the week, and only working on a Saturday as well, which further compounds the delay to the energized commissioning that circuit ready air.

32:01

Sorry,

32:03

the commissioning that works ready for the outage for two, the 29th September,

32:11

which is subsequently passed the arts March.

32:16

Is that help?

32:18

That's certainly a useful introduction. Mr. Feynman. Thank you. And can I just get I don't know whether on screen we could just scroll to paragraph

32:30

2.1 point six in the

32:34

document, which is I think above the two bathroom table.

32:40

Yeah, 2.1 point six. And just the last two

32:45

sentences there, Mr. Field and can I just you made the point about what happens if you miss the various outage dates in 2027. I'll read it. But if you can just explain this to the inspectors we says the availability of transmission outages must be coordinated with other outage taking place across the UK transmission system. These are normally coordinated years in advance with the outage dates for this project starting in March 2027, which we've discussed, having already been agreed following preliminary discussions with a National Grid Electricity System Operator, it's been indicated that should the 2027 outages not be met the next available outages would not be until 2032. Now

33:32

just what are the consequences if you miss

33:38

the 2027 outages? What happens in terms of work on the ground? Can you can you de energize the existing lines and so on.

33:53

failed on National Grid

33:55

very complex question with multiple options of answering.

34:00

There could be if we were to miss the 2027 outages or depending on when we find out we was going to miss those. We will probably delay the project to a later date.

34:13

As you said, Mr. Humphries, the first discussion I've had with the Electricity System Operator without actually looking at other customer connections and other outages the first gap in our availability would be 2032 2032 is past the date where we need to provide a an EC five boundary uplift to remove constraints from the national grid system.

34:41

So that that wouldn't be sort of aligning with

34:45

with the requirements of the business.

34:50

Madam obviously you you were repeatedly you know from the need case, the need is obviously predicated on being able to

35:00

to transport the electricity from various new offshore generating stations and various other

35:10

forms of generation that that, that need this reinforcement or need this improvement.

35:18

Thank you both for that

35:21

I can turn to the council's

35:24

and does the applicants justification for construction working hours the rep three zero 45 that we've had the overview on? Does it provide a satisfactory rationale for requirements seven? Or are there any omissions that you consider still need to be addressed or reasoning that should be clarified?

35:51

Thank you, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council.

35:55

Um, first of all, we are grateful to be provided with the information in the New Document rep. 3045. It is helpful, but it also raises a number of further questions.

36:17

I think perhaps it would be helpful to hear a little bit more from Mr. Field and on the point that he was touching on a moment ago. Because you'll recall that when he gave his oral summation of the position that well, if the 2012 Sorry, it's the 2027 outage deadlines were missed. What would happen? And what he said initially was, well, if that was the case, it would be a complex question. And what we would have to do, there will be a number of options. So then, obviously, Mr. Humphries wanted, as it were, a more black and white picture than that. So took Mr. fieldon, simply as the narrative Text in Paragraph 2.1 point six. But I think we would appreciate a little bit more as to what Mr. fieldon meant, when he said it was complex. And that the number of options because that sounded as if it wasn't just a case of, well, if you miss this boat,

37:30

this bus, the next bus doesn't arrive until 2032. It sounded as if Mr. Field and we're saying well, the worst case is that if we miss this bus, the next pass isn't until 2032. But there might be other options because we might be able, if I carry my little similarly a little bit more, there might be other buses that we can divert from other people's projects and so on, and it was getting a little bit of an understanding of that will be helpful to us. So it if it's acceptable to you. I'd like to hear a little bit more from Mr. Field on that before I then make some further submissions.

38:10

I think certainly Mr. Bedford, it would be helpful not only to you, but but to me as well. So if Mr. Humphries disagreeable if we could hear from Mr. Phelan? Absolutely. Absolutely, madam. Okay.

38:29

Now we're building a national grid. So I think

38:33

we've all done,

38:35

I've been used to delivering large construction projects. So I think what I was trying to what I was trying to say was, if I knew now that we were unlikely to hit the 27 dates, then I would be going back to the USA and having discussions about the other

38:52

applicants that are looking for outages between now and 2030, to see whether there was any availability in those dates. But bearing in mind, there's 104 applicants, around 104 applicants in East Anglia at the moment all trying to get connection dates in that period, it was going to be quite challenging, and it's quite complicated to identify



39:17

who our project

39:21

is an enabler for. So it's working with those teams to identify that. So our program at the moment is to hit 2027

39:33

as not to affect any of the other projects that have been submitted into our board plan.

39:47

Thank you, Mr. Fiedler does not take you any further forward. Mr. Bedford. Thank you, Madam. Yes, it does. Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. That is helpful because I think what it does attend to

40:00

To confirm is that the way that matters are presented in rep 3045 is very much presenting to a worst case. And obviously, as Mr. Fielding has very fairly accepted through that further clarification, there are other options they do obviously require liaison with other operators and with the relevant regulating body, National Grid, eso, but it would be in our submission wrong for you to take from this, that the outages are of as it were such absolute nature in terms of

40:47

the need to achieve them, that if they're not achieved, the only alternative is that the project is delayed to post 2032, which is the impression you're left with on the written documentation.

41:05

So that's as it were, at the outset the context, I think, of what we've learned from the new information that we're moving on to the points that we would want to make. Clearly, we are not

41:28

wishing to frustrate the delivery of the project. So if there are genuine construction related reasons why activities have to take place, even at what might be thought to be antisocial times, then if there is no sensible workaround of those, then clearly, we wouldn't be seeking to stand in the way. But we do need to be persuaded that that is the case.

41:57

And we remain not yet satisfied that more could not be done to avoid the working, particularly on the Sundays and on the bank holidays.

42:14

If I can just pick up on the bank holidays, first of all, because in a sense, it's quite a discrete point, you will notice that the scenario testing carried out in rep 3045 focuses on the effects of no Sunday working. And so what has been modeled is a baseline which allows for Sunday working and then the two

scenarios, which don't allow for Sunday working and obviously one is slightly different than the other in terms of the the weekday hours.

42:48

And so it doesn't seem to us that the position that we've adopted in relation to bank holidays, has been addressed through that. And we're not aware Well, generally speaking, we don't think that bank holidays occur on Sundays for fairly obvious reasons.

43:06

So that's that's a discrete point. Then if you then come to the Sundays,

43:13

what we seem to been told in the document at paragraph two point 1.3.

43:21

Is that the way that the modeling, as has been done, has to assume

43:29

that actually, it would be alternate Saturdays and Sundays in terms of the scheduling of work. So it's not actually as it were 52 Sundays

43:41

that we're talking about, that they need to achieve outages is that most 26 Sundays using an annual period is that the reference point?

43:57

So that's the next point. And we notice in relation to that point, the in the applicants response to your x q ones, it's your C M 1.5. Point 12.

44:14

In the applicants response in reps 3052. On page 69.

44:24

They give an example from Hinkley Point C's development consent order

44:33

where

44:35

there was a similar restriction, but it related there to weekend working. But what it allowed for was yes, you could work at weekends on Saturdays and Sundays in that instance because it was weekend's rather than just Sundays, but what it said effectively and obviously you can see the reference in the applicants material that it will

45:00

be limited to two out of four consecutive weekends in any local authority area. So again, you could say translate that to, if there is genuinely a need to work on Sundays for part of the year to achieve these outages, then you can provide respite to local communities by but it won't be actually every Sunday it will be every other Sunday. So that seems to us to not go beyond the scenario that's been modeled in the report taking the information in the reported at face value.

45:37

The next issue is that it seems that the driver in the assessment is the need to achieve those outages.

45:50

And those, it's the commissioning works, which has to happen during those outage periods.

45:59

And what the applicant is spelling out is, well, if we can't work on Sundays, we can't get to those works by relevant time. But what we're not yet satisfied is that in relation to the HGV movements, which is a particular concern on the Sundays, primarily, not, for instance, traffic capacity reasons, because obviously on a Sunday, if there's a lighter level of baseline traffic, the HGV movements are unlikely to cause capacity issues. But in terms of the environmental impact of HGV movements, particularly for those living in the villages, which might be on an HTV route, or for those using the lanes or the recreational corridors within the affected area. HGV movements on a Sunday, whether you're walking your dog, you're riding your horse or pony or you're out on your bicycle, whatever it may be, that really HGV movements are a thing. So again,

47:05

we see the applicants report presents in the sense of fairly black and white picture of all activities have to be able to be happening on a Sunday. In order for us to achieve these outages. We're not really persuaded that that is be made out in the documentation. So again, we see the maybe some flags, which may say, Well, yes, there may be some activities that do have to take place on some Sundays during the course of the year. But it doesn't necessarily have to HGVs. The next point is that, of course, this is a linear scheme. And so geographically,

47:46

it will progress.

47:48

But the way that the requirement is worded,

47:53

the applicant is being given the freedom within the whole of the scheme to work on all of these hours

48:03

throughout the scheme. In reality, we don't think that's likely to be what will actually happen.

48:12

And we don't think

48:15

that there's a need for that degree of freedom across the whole of the scheme.

48:22

And that brings us to again, a wider point that we have been emphasizing through our representations, that what the applicant is really seeking is too much of a

48:39

blanket level of freedom, when a more targeted set of restrictions would be a more suitable response. And the applicant is unwilling to tie itself to that, because it says it needs the freedom for its contractors to do things in ways which are best suited to the contractor.

49:05

But actually, if you step back and you look at table 2.1, you see that the applicant is already tied itself to a pretty rigid program of working to achieve those outage periods.

49:21

So actually, there isn't as much as it were flexibility the the applicant doesn't really need as much flexibility as it's asking for. And so we would say

49:31

that the answer here is that if the control documents provided rather more detail,

49:40

or if the applicant doesn't want to provide that detail, if the control documents provided a further discharge stage,

49:49

then it may well be

49:51

that the applicants hours in particular locations

49:58

or particular activity

50:00

is maybe justifiable. But I say our position at the moment is really the applicants asking for rather too much without enough substance to back that up. Then I think perhaps the

50:15

final point to make is that we see, Mr. Humphries, as it was side reference to our course, this also has a bearing on the 28 days, whether, you know, there's a different dispute between us about the periods of time to be allowed to discharge requirements, we see that with respect to something as a red herring, because, of course, the

50:39

if the development consent order as an aid was clear, that the period of time that the applicant had to allow for local authorities to discharge, whatever requirement it was, was a fixed period of 56 days, rather than a period of 28 days, the applicant would know that at the outset of the project. And so what it would do is it would require the applicant to make sure that its submissions,

51:06

were timed to go in insufficient time to meet those timetables. It's with respect, we think, not really appropriate to as we're bringing that argument into this argument, which was two things are different. And so those are the submissions that we would make in relation to construction hours matter. Thank you.

51:31

Madam, if I might just respond to that there is no I'm sorry. Can I Can I just interject with with one thing, certainly one of the points that Mr. Bedford had brought up about the alternate Sunday working. And he quoted the the document references was exactly the subject of one of my questions. Because it almost seemed as if the applicant had put forward the the the carat of alternate Sundays that had been used in other projects, which immediately raises the question of well, if, if why they're not not here. So

52:15

my question at the at the end of that introductory paragraph was, well consideration Have you given to a similar restriction in respect of this project? So if you just bear that in mind, Mr. Humphries, in responding, I'll get on that particular point, I'll get Mr. field and in a few minutes to explain our position on that.

52:41

The first point, though, just overall on this and some

52:47

obvious errors in Milan friend submission that mean he, what Mr. fieldon actually said is, if he knew now, that we would not have those hours, he would go back to the ESO, he will not know now, that we will not have those hours, the examination will continue until its end, there will be a then a three month period for you to report and then another three month period unless extended by the Secretary of State within which he decides before we will know. So there is no prospect of us going back. Now. In the meantime, of course, all those other competitors, wanting outages will be securing their positions in the queue. Second point, therefore that is an obvious error is that it seemed to be assumed by the county council that in going back to the year so that we would get an early outage,

53:55

there was no guarantee that we will get an early outage, if we go back even if we went back. Now, there is no guarantee. Third point. This is therefore in effect, inviting the Secretary of State to play dice with the future of the electricity system. This is not, you know, a superstore or a housing development. This is essential infrastructure to deliver electricity to this part of the country. If we get this wrong, the consequences are very serious. Indeed. And we wouldn't be surprised if the Secretary of State was willing to take that risk on the hope

54:42

in a macabre ish way that something will turn up. Now. Obviously National Grid is under a number of legal duties to ensure an efficient supply it takes those very seriously and it is telling you

54:58

based on the work that Mr. fieldon

55:00

has done that it needs these working hours now, obviously Mr. buildin can talk to you about alternative Sundays and, and various other things. But that is important. Of course, it is right, that the project will continue my fourth point geographically. And yes, it is absolutely right that it may not be necessary to have seven days or the full number of hours in each and every location. But

55:34

there is no contractor at the moment, we simply don't know precisely what the contractor will need. And that's the context within which Mr. fieldon and his team have modeled the consequences

55:51

of reducing, reducing the hours and this is our best estimate on what those particular consequences are. The other thing fifth point that I will say before handing over to Mr. Fielding to remember is we have environmentally assessed all of this, we have looked at the full number of hours and and assess these things, you have our assessment, which it is our case is acceptable. And in the context, therefore, where this is essential national infrastructure.

56:31

We do invite you to

56:35

accept the particular document we've put forward on the working hours, for the reasons that are set out there in our handover. Now to Mr. Field, and on this one particular point, and he may want to add some other things. I'll let him do that. Okay. Thank you,

56:53

Rob, build a national grid. Very short answer for me, I'll turn it over weekend workings is based on multiple contractors being on the site, not just looking at one contractor. So they may have different working patterns to each other.

57:09

So it's not a case that if there were, for example, two contractors, Mr. Fields, and the contractor, one could work on weekends, one and three per month, and contractor two could work on weekends two and four. So you could still end up with contractors working alternate weekends, but having all four weekends

57:31

being worked roughly on a national grid. Yeah, that's That's correct.

57:37

But they'd been different yet. They would be in different locations, they wouldn't be the same work location, it'd be different contractors delivering different packages of work.

57:49

The proposition or the this suggestion that I was going to put to you later on when we'd had come towards the end was is there

57:59

utility in modelling a scenario three with the alternate weekends? But I think you may just have answered my question, if that's how the applicant envisages that the alternate weekends the implications that had may have for this particular scheme.

58:23

But I'll I'll, I'll make a proposition ask you to advise me.

58:30

Sir, up to national grid, I think your question is,

58:35

have we modeled it with the multiple contractors in mind work in different weekends one and three to four. That's, that's effectively how our baseline is derived.

58:49

So if I had asked, Will you model a third scenario with alternate working weekends, that immediately gets us it seems to get us no further forward because of the duality of the work pattern that you've just said is likely to happen. Build a National Grid effectively. That brings you back to your scenario one.

59:15

Okay, thank you that answers my point on that

59:24

Mr. Humphrey said you any further submissions in response to Mr. Bedford? No. Okay. I mean, there are clearly things that may get picked up later, but I'll I'll leave those to later rather than trying to deal

with everything now. Okay. Of course. Mr. Bedford, is there anything that you want to come back on before I had admitted mystery while

59:45

Michael Bedford Thank you, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, but only that we don't think that what is Fielden said just now. That directly answers the point. That is

59:58

about ultimate work.

1:00:00

Working and looking at paragraph 2.13 game of red 3045.

1:00:11

What what it says in the middle of that paragraph. It is, however, generally anticipated that only alternate weekends would be worked in any specific geographic location.

1:00:25

Noting that the overhead line works and underground cable works would be in different locations and with different factors. So

1:00:35

leaving aside the wider points that we made, we don't see subject obviously, to better articulation through the control documents. Why even if it were necessary to work on a number of Sundays, it would not be possible through geographic specification together with alternate working to have alternate in any one location, you would not be faced with successive Sunday workings, you could have alternate working that does not seem to be inconsistent with the baseline scenario that has been modeled

1:01:11

as a wider points we'll pick up in our post hearing submission. Sure, I think it was probably my similar interpretation of that sentence. Mr. Bedford that had led to the question about the utility of a scenario three with with alternate weekends. But I'm sure we'll revert to that. Mr. While you've been very patient. So I'd certainly like to give you the chance.

1:01:38

Thank you, Madam Macky. Road Ranger District Council, I think it's fair to say, Doris, I speak on behalf of my colleague, Mark, Roger Essex County Council, although Mark wants to come in following my representation then. Please do Mark.

1:01:53

Yeah, now, as I mentioned, very interesting discussion.

1:01:58



Certainly, we'll come back to him writing on the justification document that's been submitted. Although,

1:02:06

initially, I agree with what Mr. Bedford has said, on behalf of Suffolk by the outages and the program.

1:02:15

Just picking up a couple of general comments. So I want to say that we're not wishing to prostrate matters either.

1:02:22

Our main concern is about protecting the immunity of residents.

1:02:28

As you'll have seen in our local impact report, which is red one, not three, nine,

1:02:34

and Adelante, response rep two, nine, and the rep free response, rep 3061.

1:02:44

You know, we we do remain concerned about it, we're willing to try and work with the applicant to try and get some of a sense more sensible working hours or another solution that might might try and sort of protect the manatee more so than obviously, the flexibility which is currently being brought to you to consider.

1:03:05

I think it's also fair to say, and I'd be very surprised as any fault with the project team. But the actual project was shelved since 2013. And is now being obviously brought forward now and 2021. And with a short time to get active. So obviously it's not really a matter, I suppose the problem with the applicants

1:03:30

at the expense of residence, it feels like at the moment. Thank you.

1:03:35

Okay, thank you, Mr. Wilde. I don't see Mr. Wood your stand up, but given that Mr. Wilde has mentioned, yes, thank you. Mr. Whicher. Do you want to come in? Join us please?

1:03:47

Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. Pardon. Maharajah as this current Council of growth and development.

1:03:54

Quite clearly, as Matt has indicated, we've set out our comments in our local impact report match, give me the references for that. But, you know, I did get Mr. Humphries comment that this little line we playing dice with the regulator?

1:04:09

I think no, it has to be set off against Puffin uses terminology, playing dice with a community in relation to this development. But as Matt has indicated, we're more than happy to try and work with the applicant to try and find sensible solutions to this throughout the life. The DCR ended up in discussions will be ongoing. But thank you for the opportunity to speak on this. Thank you. Thank you for your submission.

1:04:36

Are there any other parties that want to to come in at this stage?

1:04:42

Nope.

1:04:44

I have a question that I think has maybe largely been addressed but I'll just ask the end of it. On the back of what Mr. Wood juice just said.

1:04:55

Playing devil's advocate for the for the applicant

1:04:59

and

1:05:00

No, you made the comment about the worst case scenario having been examined and the environmental statement, which is something that I will want to hear from the council's on. But the construction are set out and requirements seven could be seen to have been driven from the top down by these fixed debts for outages. And that arguably not enough consideration of impact on residential amenity local businesses, the term tourism and the recreational opportunities that have already been mentioned. How would you respond to that?

1:05:40

Well, Madam in the sense because this is

1:05:44

a project where we are trying to connect two points in the electricity network,

1:05:52

within certain dates, obviously,

1:05:57

you know, there are certain fixed things

1:06:02  
about it.

1:06:04  
But in doing that, in bringing forward a scheme where we need to do this, we have tried to both environmentally mitigate the

1:06:16  
effects and cite things, for example, construction compounds in in areas that will not have

1:06:25  
unacceptable environmental impact. What are the working, we're talking about? The erection or tensioning of towers is going to happen.

1:06:36  
In the middle of fields,

1:06:39  
quite some considerable distance from residential properties, each of the sites where construction will take place in relative terms compared with housing development or something like that are really very small.

1:06:56  
They're places where

1:06:59  
amounts of equipment can be taken and vehicles put before teams go out.

1:07:06  
On site.

1:07:09  
You've seen the environmental assessment, I'm not going to repeat that. And indeed on tomorrow and noon, afternoon, yes, we've we've got the ISA h four. And we will have the environmental team there if you want to pick up on on on any of those on any of those things. But

1:07:30  
you know, there's nothing that indicates to us that there is some unacceptable environmental impact or, or something that is particularly approaching an unacceptable environmental impact, including the fact that

1:07:48  
because of flexibility, we have included where appropriate, reasonable worst cases, and in the ice age three tomorrow morning.

1:08:01

You know, if necessary, we can repeat the points that we have made in writing about the

1:08:08

traffic generation and how we've looked at the peak. And then we've added a large contingency, on top of that to have an even worse worst case.

1:08:19

And that's what we're assessing. But it would be inappropriate when looking at those very worst case figures to consider a that it's particularly likely that they're going to happen, they're not likely they are the worst case or reasonable worst case. And to in any event, even as the most likely, they're not the most likely during the duration of the project, that they're the peak during that duration. And so,

1:08:48

you know, our position very strongly on this is that, that we do need these hours.

1:08:57

For the reasons that have been described, we have looked to mitigate effects through either embedded things where we've cited stuff or other means and the environmental effects are acceptable, and therefore should, you know, the national need be accepted.

1:09:17

Thank you for that. I want to preempt what my colleagues want to ask and the the issue specific hearings tomorrow, it was more than the general point rather than drilling down into the specifics of the assessment. There are two other questions that I want to ask before I hear from any of the other parties. And that was coming back to the scenario modeling in the document that that we have in front of us. And I wondered in that respect was any risk allocation made in the baseline for the working hours that article seven, two of the draft development consent

1:10:00

The Order might provide for or have they been excluded. And only alternate alternate weekend working relied on albeit that we've since heard the alternate weekends might be every weekend. But was there any reliance in Article Seven to

1:10:18

obviously pass it to Mr. Field and that that's that's well belong above my paygrade.

1:10:28

Refer to the national group. So

1:10:32

the operations that may take out take place outside of working hours, is what you're referring to.

1:10:40

allowance in the baseline program for them

1:10:47

is effectively limited. And he's that alternative weekend being out to allow that main work contractor to utilize those two days when necessary to recover.

1:11:02

program if they can't continue to work, and then

1:11:07

alternative

1:11:09

outside of the working hours, this

1:11:12

is effectively

1:11:15

if we're in the middle of an activity, and it's gone slow due to bad weather or something like that. He's actually just getting that into a position where we can safely stop it and secure it for the night.

1:11:26

Yes, he gave a or the applicant, Mr. Hasan gave a very full rundown of pages 109 and 110 of its commentary on the Suffolk councils local impact report in respect of the scope of requirements seven two

1:11:45

that was in the document rep. 3048. And because they

1:11:52

because there's such a wide range of activities.

1:11:56

Enabled by that requirements. I just wanted to be sure. And I'm not sure that I am sure. I just wanted to be here whether Reliance was placed on them. I think the answer is no. Sorry. I'm Rob Bo. Naturally, I understand where you're coming from now. So, in my experience in delivering projects, that I I've never had to rely on these

1:12:22

on any of the projects I've delivered the saurian I've had one environmental incident where I've had to go outside of working hours to stop and contain a spillage, but that that's the only activity I've utilized additional working hours.

1:12:38

So am I right in saying that in modeling both scenario one and scenario two, that there wasn't any Reliance placed on the activities enabled by report by sorry, by Yes, by requirements? Seven, two? You're correct. Okay. Thank you.

1:12:59

And a question in the same vein, was any reliance in the baseline hours? Sorry, has there been any reliance in the baseline modeling, on the startup on the closed down activities and are either side of core working hours that Article Three of the draft development consent order seeks to provide for rebuilding? No.

1:13:25

No's

1:13:28

IQ.

1:13:31

I think that Mr. Rollins, my colleague has some questions to ask, are the consoles happy at this stage to to give me a composite response in due course, or is there anything that they want to pursue? At this stage? I'd be guided by them. Well, maybe more helpful to allow the panel to put their questions on this topic. I, I was proposing to come back as it were this afternoon with some comments in the light of what we've just heard, but I'm quite happy to defer those until other members have made their point. I'm equally happy to do those now. If you would prefer clean your ship. Let's do the nine Mr. Bedford, there's a there's I think it's possibly more timely. Thank you, Madam, thank you.

1:14:19

Just as a general point, which I'm sure we may explore, perhaps more tomorrow afternoon under the environment topic of is h four. But as a general point, in terms of

1:14:36

impacts, we do not accept that the limit as it were of your investigation into whether impacts are acceptable or not acceptable is to be found simply in the test of weather impacts for the purposes of EIA assessment.

1:15:00

are either significant or not significant.

1:15:05

That is to say, we do not consider it would be a correct approach to assume that any impact which the environmental statement assesses as less than significant in AIA terms.

1:15:24

Therefore, and thereby becomes either immaterial or have no or minimal weight, so as to fall out of account in any planning talent

1:15:40

also asked to not merit any need or measures to mitigate that impact.

1:15:50

And therefore, in very simple terms, we don't accept that a less than significant impact

1:15:57

equates to an acceptable impact.

1:16:06

And we don't consider there is any support for that approach in the relevant national network, sorry,

1:16:14

energy NPS is which which required to be considered, we accept entirely that EIA is part of process. But the important word there it is part of the process. It is not the process of assessing the appropriateness or inappropriateness of a particular developed consent order project.

1:16:39

So, that's that's a general point. Then,

1:16:44

the second more specific point in the light of those further remarks from Mr. Field, and I was less slightly unclear

1:16:56

as to whether it was being said,

1:17:01

because I understood that it was being said that the purposes of the assessment carried out in red 3045. So as to come up with the,

1:17:11

as it were correlation between the baseline scenario and the other scenarios on timescale, I understood that it was being assumed in those assessments, that no activity was being carried out, relying on the flexibility in

1:17:32

requirements seven to close those other activities, which may be permitted outside of the hours. I also understood it to be said that,

1:17:43

in that assessment, no reliance was also been placed on whatever activity might be carried out in the startup who plays down periods.

1:17:51

Well, that is helpful to have that clarified. But what I didn't understand is whether Mr. Feldman was also intending to say that for the purposes of the environmental impact assessment, and particularly the assessment on whether it'd be right as a way users and or whether it be residents and residential immunity, that it had been assumed in the environmental statement, that there was no activity being carried out outside of the core hours.

1:18:21

All activity that is necessary to construct the project. So it'd be helpful to have some clarifications on that, because that again, pairs slightly on your point, Madam about has the worst case being assessed.

1:18:35

I think that certainly would be helpful clarification I went so far, but I think you've taken helpfully taking that a little further, Mr. Bedford. So if Mr. Feldman or Tamia submitted this, I think it's what did the environmental statement? Do? That's probably not, Mr. Field, and

1:18:56

it is. I don't know what you want to do. We're obviously sort of in a sense, I don't say this critically, but straying slightly beyond DCO. Drafting here, is this something we could pick up in the SSH or session where we'll have all the environmental team there?

1:19:15

Just bear with me.

1:19:17

I think, yes. Maybe two, if we could include it in the written pursuit and writing Mr. Humphreys position, because I know from having seen the is h four agenda that it is already. It is already quite extensive. It's it's a pretty terrifying agenda. Yeah, I would go along with that.

1:19:38

Yes, your your assistance. I think just developing that point would be very helpful. Mr. Wilde he looked is poised for contribution makira With Braintree Student Council, I don't really have anything to add other than suffer.

1:19:54

Point seem very sensible to us and we would agree.

1:19:59

Thank you.

1:20:00



I don't see any other hands raised. I think. Just bear with me one minute.

1:20:23

Thank you, everyone. Mr. Rollins is going to ask some questions. Okay. Um, queue.

1:20:31

We've heard quite a lot today about the justification for construction working hours. And you've made reference to the critical path program. And you've also cross reference to the baseline construction schedule. I think what would be really helpful to us here as a panel, if you could maybe just talk us through what the critical path is, and maybe reserve it to the baseline construction schedule?

1:21:08

Or build a national grid?

1:21:11

That's a great question. It's a 360 page P six document.

1:21:21

A very, very high level sort of assessment of the critical path. Is, is the project.

1:21:31

Fair, effectively, the critical path is on the cable installation of the project.

1:21:37

With the help maybe, because we're still looking at high level, possibly if you're able to pull up the baseline construction schedule, which is up dash 0921 Not mine? Nope.

1:21:53

Yeah, I think.

1:22:08

So So that's showing the justification document with key milestones that you had up on the screen, but maybe it's because it's interlinked with a baseline construction.

1:22:22

So this is a high level construction shows you it's not the critical path isn't showing on here effectively, as turns off critical path. And

1:22:31

but, yeah,

1:22:34

it's quite a challenge, because obviously, in the justification, you're making reference to the critical paths, because then when we look at the baseline, it's really challenging then to interpret, which way

does the critical path go through? So we can see from the key milestone dates, that you're indicating you lead to the outage for, so which was the ninth of March. So if you're looking at that particular baseline, so they say q1 or q2, that that's a particular milestone. So if you were trying to look at the predecessors of Q two,

1:23:18

it's not clear is it? Is it coming through maybe the overhead line? So if it's coming through the overhead line, you can see from that, q3 2026, the activities are finish. So you appear to have a lag there. So yeah, it's challenging to try and interpret the critical path and whether there are opportunities to bring the construction period, maybe closer together. Is it would it be helpful? So because as

1:23:55

as Mr. Putin said, it's a good and important question. Would it be helpful if we tried to produce an note or, you know, perhaps with some sort of Gantt chart type of thing? Yeah. Well beyond this sort of thing to do? Absolutely. That would really be helpful if you could maybe provide that. Yeah.

1:24:15

Yeah. So Rob's doing national grid. So from a very high level perspective, what you see on the screen there is your main construction activities are in 25 and 26. So the linear bars for underground cable installation and overhead line works in the second block.

1:24:37

They are the main construction activities. After that you move into 2027, which are outage works. Now predominantly, the outage works are based around hintlesham Wood due to transposition of the overhead line.

1:24:51

So from a critical path point of view, it's the activities from mobilization to completion of the construction

1:25:00

And then your critical part which predominantly drives on the cabling installation, then your critical path changes on to the overhead line and the sequencing of the outages. So from 27 onwards, you've got outages north and south. And the notion was to complete the transition around the woods.

1:25:19

I don't want to go into too great detail now of of the interpretation of circuits to and circuit one, but it would be useful if you could provide maybe some sort of notes just to clarify that critical path, as well as you in terms of the table of 2.1 that you utilize to justify the one sack reduce working hours, we'd have

1:25:49

the comparison between baseline and Scenario one. So if I took maybe the first line which the HV AC testing, appears to give 292 days or the other other difference, but that doesn't seem to be any information to justify what how we derived that 92 days. And when you look at the second line, and then the difference between the 25th of November to the first of March, it's not 92 days, you've got 96 days.

So clarity on how you've been able to determine the number of days between the different scenarios would also be helpful.

1:26:38

Possibly maybe just one final query, the

1:26:43

time limits that you have, and as a draft DCO I think that's and that is it sheduled. Three requirements.

1:26:53

Authorized developments must begin no later than the expiration of five years, beginning with the dates in which this order comes into force. The baseline scenario is based on boxes a year 01. Year two, and what effect would that then have on this issue that you've highlighted? With regards to outages? So there's probably three actions, they're actually points. It's, if you can take away and maybe address.

1:27:27

Is that okay? Rather than go into detail now? Yeah.

1:27:32

Okay, thank you.

1:27:36

Just I think everyone's tried to take a note of

1:27:41

that when we have to sort of wrap up where you set out if you if we can make sure that we're absolutely clear what three things because obviously, it's important that we respond to precisely what you want, that will be helpful. Thank you.

1:27:56

It's your own. Thank you. That was helpful.

1:28:00

Is there anything that councils want to come back on the stage?

1:28:06

Madam, no, we obviously welcome the provision of more clarification by the applicant on these detail batters. And obviously, we can respond when we've seen that. But I say I think it's just worth repeating. We are clearly not in the business of wanting to put as it were unnecessary spokes in the delivery of a project. What we just want to make sure is it's adequately justified, that the flexibility the applicant wants really is needed to deliver the project.

1:28:38

Thank you, Mr. Bradford. Thank you. I think that's definitely an opportune moment now to to have a break. Could I suggest that we're trying to be back here for 22 For place? Thank you.