

TRANSCRIPT_ YORKSHIREGREEN_PRELIM22032023_RED ACTED

Wed, Mar 22, 2023 3:39PM • 1:40:23

00:15

Good morning, everybody. It is now 10am and time for this meeting to begin. Before we go any further, can I just confirm that everybody in the room can hear me clearly. I'm getting nods all the way to the back, which is great news.

00:29

And I understand that the live stream is now up and running and the recording has started. Fantastic. Okay. Then I'd like to welcome you all to this preliminary meeting for the application for the national grid electricity transmission application or an order granting development consent for the Yorkshire green energy enablement project which we shall refer to today as Yorkshire green. My name is Jessica Powis. I am a charter town planner and examining inspector and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for levelling up homes and communities to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I will now ask other members of the panel to introduce themselves, starting with Mr. Jones, who is joining us virtually this morning. Good morning, everybody. My name is Gavin Jones. I'm a chartered town planner and examining inspector and I have been appointed as a member of this panel. And I will be leading this morning's discussion later on agenda items three and seven.

01:31

My name is Annie combs. And I'm a planner and chartered landscape architect and an examining inspector. And I've been appointed also by Secretary of State as a member of this panel. I'll be leading the discussion later on agenda items four and five. And that's the examination time table and then on hearings and accompanied site inspections.

01:54

Thank you. So together we constitute the examining authority. Our role is to examine the application and to report to the Secretary of State for energy security and net zero with a recommendation as to whether or not the development consent order should be made. We've each made a declaration of interests and we have no conflicts of interest in respect of this appointment. And just while we're on the subject of the examining authority, I'd just like to take this opportunity to mention that there has been a recent change in the membership of the panel. And that is due to my colleague John Anderson having to step down due to personal circumstances from the panel and therefore Gavin Jones has been appointed and the letter dated the 16th of March confirms this is available on our website and he is the replacement panel. So we are now the examining authority.

02:41

The proposed development is described in the application as comprising new electricity substation at Overton, together with new overhead lines a 400 kV and 275 kV and ceiling and compounds. Also included as the removal of existing 275 KV overhead line. The realignment and refurbishment of existing overhead line in the areas northwest of York Poppleton Tadcaster and monk fryston. To new cables ceiling and compounds are proposed at Tadcaster, along with a new electricity substation at monk fryston and realignment of 275 kV and 400 KV overhead lines in this location.

03:22

I will now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. So can everybody please just ensure that phones and devices are all set to silent so we're not interrupted this morning.

03:33

We have toilets out just pass reception adjacent to the lift lobby. And we haven't been made aware of any fire alarm tests today. So if there was to be an alarm, then we should evacuate out through the reception and congregate in the front carpark.

03:49

Today's meeting is being undertaken as a blended event meaning that some participants are with us here at the hearing venue and some are joining us virtually via Microsoft Teams will make sure that however you've decided to attend today you'll be given a fair opportunity to participate. The meeting is being both live streamed and recorded. So for those people observing remotely or participating remotely just in order to minimize any background noise can you please make sure that you stay muted unless you need to speak

04:17

if you wish to speak at any point for those joining us virtually then please use the raised hand function which hopefully you'll have been introduced to in the arrangements conference. And just be patient if we don't come to you straight away we'll we'll know you have your hand up and we'll come to you at the appropriate time.

04:34

recording of today's hearing will be published then on the Yorkshire green webpage shortly after this meeting. And so for that reason everybody in the room if you wish to speak please make sure you always speak into a microphone because that picks make sure we pick up in the recording. And please could you mention your name before you speak every time you speak which I can appreciate can be a bit tedious but it really helps in terms of the recording to have that. have that done

05:00

A link to the planning and spectrums privacy notice was published in our rule six letter, we'll talk about our rule six letter a lot today, it's basically for those who may not be quite so familiar. It's the detailed letter that we sent out inviting parties to this meeting and setting out the details of the examination, timetable, etc. So that rule six letter is something we will talk about a lot today. Our privacy notice was

in there, and we won't repeat it here, assuming that everybody's familiarize themselves with the way that we handle personal data. But if you have any questions about this, and please do talk to our case team, which is Mr. Hanlon over there,

05:36

it's very unlikely that the panel will ask anybody to put any sensitive personal information into the public domain. And we'd encourage you not to do that. However, if for some reason, you feel it necessary to refer to information that you'd otherwise rather be kept private and confidential, that it should be in a written format, so that we can redact it before it's published. But please talk to the case team about that.

06:00

This meeting will follow the agenda as set out in Annex A of our rule six letter, if you have a copy of this in front of you, then please turn to that it's, I think it's page a two. If I could ask the applicant, I understand the applicant is going to be screen sharing some documents for us today. So I will let you know when we want things up on the screen. And when we want them taken down again, please. But if you could now share the agenda from the rule six letter that would be helpful just so we can all see.

06:31

Excellent technology is working well.

06:35

It's a great start.

06:38

Okay,

06:40

so the purpose of this morning's meeting is to focus on the way in which this application is proposed to be examined. So on that basis, we will only be inviting discussion about the procedural aspects of this examination in this meeting. The purpose is not to discuss the merits or any concerns that you might have about the application. But there will be the opportunity to do that as soon as the examination begins. And indeed, we're holding an open floor hearing this afternoon. So that is not the first opportunity to make those type of comments about the merits of the scheme.

07:09

We anticipate that this preliminary meeting will be concluded before lunchtime today.

07:15

Okay, I think you can probably stop sharing the agenda now so that those joining us remotely can see what's happening in the room. I'm now going to hand over to Miss Coombs, who's going to ask our participants to introduce themselves.

07:28

So I'm going to ask going now to ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to introduce yourselves, could you please introduce yourself stating your name and who you represent and which items on the agenda you wish to speak on? If you're not representing an organization, please confirm your name. Summarize your interest in the application. And again confirm the agenda items that you might wish to speak on. Can we start with the applicants and its advisors please. And if we could hear from whomever will lead the submissions today and any other members who may might make regular contributions

08:04

Good morning inspectors. My name is Richard tourney, which is t u r n e why I'm counsel instructed by Womble bond Dickinson UK LLP on behalf of the applicant, national grid electricity transmission and I've got a number of people to my left. I'll ask them to introduce themselves because they may speak on various items but I'm going to be leading the representation of the applicant so I'll be speaking potentially on all items.

08:41

Good morning. My name is Victoria Redman. I'm a partner and solicitor at Womble bond Dickinson appearing on behalf of the applicant. I don't expect to speak today but you may well hear from me tomorrow in the issue specific hearing. Thank you.

09:01

Good morning. I'm Ian McDonald. I'm national grid electricity transmission and I'm the Senior Project Manager for the off screen project. As Mr. Tony has said I don't expect to speak today but I'm here in case with needed.

09:17

Good morning, Steve, our representing National Grid. I'm here on behalf of the engineering team.

09:24

As Amy said, I don't expect to contribute we're here if needed.

09:31

Morning, thinking 10 National quota I'm the consensus officer and don't expect to be speaking today but will contribute if needed.

09:40

Sorry, I didn't quite catch your name and just for the recording if you could repeat it. Beth Kingston okay i n g to n

09:54

now if we can move to other organizations and individuals who've expressed a

10:00

I

10:02

have expressed a desire to speak today. I'm not sure that we have anyone else in the room who has, but I can see that we have other people at the table. And so if you'd like to introduce yourselves, we'd welcome that.

10:16

Hello, I'm Christine shepherd, and I'm at London over London, near the Overton substation proposal. I didn't expect to speak today, but just listening. Thank you. Thank you.

10:31

Hello, I'm Marian blacker and I'm also a landowner. I have a number of pylons going up on some of my lungs, some of which I'm not entirely happy with. Thank you. Thank you very much. And Miss blacker if you want to give more explanation about that, then the open floor hearing would be the opportunity this afternoon.

10:57

I'm now going to turn to members who might be

11:01

joining us virtually

11:03

and starting with the British Horse Society, Mr. Corrigan.

11:11

Yes, good morning. My name is Mark Corrigan, in the British Royal Society, Access field officer for Yorkshire. I'm not necessarily expecting to speak this afternoon. But I may interject with certain comments on specifics. I'm not sure yet. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Corrigan.

11:37

Is there anyone else virtually joining us virtually today who wishes to speak?

11:43

Now I'm guessing a negative sign from his handle on. So just moving on. I'd also like to bring your attention to the procedural deadline a submission from North Yorkshire county council which was PDA 003. And in this explains that officers are not able to attend today. And we're aware that hearings of another and CIP have affected offices in attendance here. But we have tried to mitigate and mitigate against any further overlap in the draft timetable. We understand that officers will be viewing recordings after today. And all parties have had the opportunity to comment on the process through responding to the real six letter at procedural deadline a for hearings taking place later in the week. Any party who's on the able to attend virtually or in person may submit comments at deadline one.

12:40

North Yorkshire county council also mentioned that vesting day for the local government reorganization is likely to be on the first of April 2023 and it stated but thereafter legal representation at Yorkshire green hearings will become much simpler because Yorkshire county council sorry North Yorkshire county council Selby District Council Harrogate Borough Council and Hamilton District Council will all become one council North Yorkshire Council.

13:11

If anybody else decides that they wish to speak during the course of this morning's proceedings, for example, to make comments in response to representations that have made, then you may do so. And as Miss Powell said earlier, just please raise your hand, either physically if you're in the room or virtually if you're on Microsoft Teams. And I'm not going to pass back to miss pass.

13:33

Thank you very much. And just to make mention here, I've just been told by the case team that there's a problem with the captions on the live stream. So just for anyone who's following on the live stream, the cap the we're aware there's a problem with the captions and the team are working on it. So hopefully that will be resolved shortly. We'll we'll carry on in the meantime,

13:53

are there any other comments anyone wishes to make under Agenda Item one before we move on?

14:00

No. Okay, then we'll move straight on to item two of our agenda, which is the examining authorities remarks about the examination process. So in order to streamline the running of this event in Annex B of our rule six letter we provide an introduction to the preliminary meeting, and the examination process explaining how it will be conducted and how you can participate. So for expediency, I'm assuming that everyone has read this and therefore I don't propose to spend a time reading it out. Now, there are a couple of matters that I wanted to draw briefly to your attention at this stage. The first relates to additional submissions and that's just to ensure that parties are aware that in the pre examination stage, which is the stage since the application was accepted, and before we start the examination formally, there have been a number of documents which have been submitted and the which we have decided to accept as what we call additional submissions. These documents include some revised versions of some of the key application documents, such as the draft develop

15:00

and consent order, the explanatory memorandum and the land plans. So there aren't significant changes. But just to make you aware that now now we are working on version B or revision B of those documents, and when we come to talk about them in more detail, possibly this afternoon, but certainly tomorrow, those are the documents that we will be working on the latest bit the latest versions. And they were mainly those changes were made to address advice that the planning Inspectorate gave to the applicant at the acceptance stage. And also because we invited some procedural deadline, a comments which came in by the Eighth of March. So it's just it's essentially tidying up things that needed sorting out, correcting any minor omissions so that we're in a good place when we start the examination.

15:46

All of those additional submissions can be accessed through the examination library at references as 002 to a s 019. And if anyone has any comment to make on those submissions, you can do so by deadline one.

16:02

So I've just mentioned procedural deadline, A, which was the Eighth of March and Miss Coombs, has already mentioned the submission from North Yorkshire County Council. We also received at that deadline submissions from a landowner inviting us to visit his land and northern gas networks limited regarding its asset, and then also from the applicant responding to some items on this agenda, which we shall cover during the course of this meeting.

16:26

These submissions can be viewed in the examination library at references, PDA, 001, and PDA 004.

16:35

There are a couple of more general observations that I would like to make about the examination process in the interests of ensuring that it is as productive and efficient as it can be. We'll come on shortly to talk about the examination timetable in detail. But I just like to highlight the importance now of ensuring that information is submitted in accordance with set deadlines. So the timetable can only be delivered if all parties meet the deadlines, and provide submissions that are as comprehensive as possible for each deadline. Late submissions restrict the ability of other parties involved to respond to information which can lead to unfairness in the process. So it's therefore important for everybody to know that if you do submit something late there is the possibility that it may not be accepted into the examination or it may not be accepted straightaway, meaning that there could be

17:23

knock on effects later down the examination timetable. So please adhere to deadlines as much as you possibly can with where you where you can't please explain why.

17:34

The other matter wants to raise was just about general point about resolving disagreements. So where there is disagreement between the parties on matters so between the applicant and parties, we would ask that all sides engage in a positive and timely manner to seek resolution as soon as possible. And this includes progressing statements of common ground as proactively as possible and demonstrating progress with land negotiations and protective provisions were relevant.

17:59

The final point I just like to mention here relates to the planning and spectris national infrastructure planning website, you've already probably heard us mention it several times in our opening comments, it is a really important hub of all the information. So this process is completely open, we are not party to any information that is not in the public domain. For this examination, every document is publicly available. And therefore, the examination library, which is available through the Yorkshire Green Project

page is the place where all of the application documents can be found. And after each deadline, the documents that have been submitted for each deadline will also be published into that examination library. Every document has a unique reference number. So hopefully, we all know exactly which documents are in in for consideration.

18:46

So we would strongly encourage everybody to familiarize themselves with that website, because we will be using it also to communicate with you. And to provide access to all of our documents throughout the examination.

18:59

It is important that everybody's clear and their understanding of the process. Therefore if there's anything else that you're unclear about, or which you need clarity on, then this is your opportunity to ask, we'll be coming on in a moment to talk about the draft timetable, and to talk about hearings and accompanied site inspections. But I just wanted to give this opportunity now for any other questions to be raised about the way in which we propose to examine this application.

19:24

I'm looking in the room and also online, I'm not seeing any indications that anyone has anything else to raise at this point. So that concludes our remarks about the examination process. And I will now hand it over to Mr. Jones who will take us through item three, which is the initial assessment of principal issues.

19:44

Thank you Miss Powis. For this item, it would be useful if you could have Annex C of our rule six letter in front of you please.

19:54

We are now going to share the list of the main headings of the principal issues on the screen.

20:00

but you can find details of each of these within Annex C of the rule six letter also. Thank you very much that's come up on the screen nicely. This list provides an initial framework of issues for the examination of this application. Though it does not preclude us from amending the list by removing or adding to the proposed principle issues at a later stage in the process.

20:24

I have nothing further to add at this stage. Nevertheless, individuals here today may wish to comment on either the broad headings or the individual matters within each of those broad headings. We have also had an initial response from the applicants setting out where the points set out in our initial assessment of principal issues can be found in the application documents. The applicate the applicants response is in sheduled, three of document reference PDA 002.

20:55

Okay, I think we can stop sharing on the screen now. Thank you very much.

21:03

We have not had any requests to speak on this matter. So I am inquiring now. Is there anybody who wish to make any points regarding item three on this agenda? And I'll start with any interested parties, members of the public first.

21:24

I'm not seeing anybody. I'm not hearing any indications of Anybody wishing to speak, in which case, I shall turn to the applicant. Mr. Turney, we have noted sheduled, three of your submissions to procedural deadline, a which cross refer to the ex as principal issues with the relevant application documents. Is there anything else that the applicant would like to add at this stage?

21:49

Richard tourney attorney for the applicant? Thanks. So nothing to add. As you've noted, shedule three identifies simply where those points are covered in the application documents, but the applicant is content with the identification of the principal issues for examination. Thank you. Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Turney. I don't have any further points to raise on this agenda item at this stage. But just before we move on is there anybody else wanted to make any final comments?

22:20

I'm not seeing anything, not seeing any hands virtually either, in which case, I shall hand over now to miss Coons, who's going to deal with agenda item four. Thank you. Thank you, Miss Jones. For this agenda item, it be useful to have Annex D of our rule six letter in front of you and on the screen if possible.

22:43

So Annex D sets out our draft examination timetable for the next six months, from today to completion on or before Friday, the 22nd of September. The Annex sets out the draft dates for hearings and deadlines for the submission of written documents. It also include states for the examining authority to issue documents such as our further written questions, our proposed schedule of changes to the draft DCO. The report on implications for European sites, which is commonly abbreviated to the risks.

23:16

Please note that the submission time for each the time for each submission is 2359, which is one minutes to midnight.

23:26

As you'll see from the draft timetable, there are eight proposed deadlines where the examining authority requires information to be submitted. In the interest of brevity, I don't intend to go through the draft timetable in its entirety, but I will just highlight some key points. Following the start of the examination, we'll hold our first open floor hearing this afternoon at 2pm. This is an opportunity for individuals to speak directly to us as the examining authority. As the name suggests, they're open to any interested

party to attend. And they're not about a particular location or particular topic. They're in relation to the proposed development. So any matters that anyone wishes to raise can be raised this afternoon.

24:10

This will be followed by our first issue specific hearing tomorrow morning at 10am. And this hearing is going to cover the scope of the proposed development and the draft development consent order.

24:24

As soon as possible after this week's open floor hearing and the draft DCO hearing we'll issue our rule eight letter, which will finalize the examination timetable, and at the same time, we'll publish our first set of written questions.

24:40

Mr. Toney a point was made in your procedural deadline, a submission PD a 2002. Regarding publishing the rule, eight letter written questions, which we've noted but if you want to add anything else, we'd be pleased to hear that

24:56

rich attorney for the outcome. Thank you

25:00

It's simply a point about

25:02

the fact that the

25:05

first deadline won

25:08

is obviously coming up relatively soon on the fifth of April. And it's really just an we know that the examining authority will wish to publish this as soon as possible anyway. But just noting that the sooner it's published, the more comprehensive our responses will be at deadline one, but it's just an observation.

25:28

Thank you. I just wanted to pick up the points that you you'd make. But we have noted this, and we'll be doing our best next week.

25:39

And, as you've said, Mr. Turney moving on to Deadline one that is timetabled for Wednesday, the fifth of April.

25:46

Appointments also made in the procedural deadline, a submission regarding publishing the deadline one submissions before the Easter break the bank before the bank holidays, which we've noted, I wonder if you've just want to make a comment on that.

26:02

Richard, only for the applicant, again, yes, we made a couple of observations along these lines in our response to the rule six letter. And we appreciate that there's a huge pressure on pins, because

26:15

the deadline tends to be met, just so there's lots of submissions arrive late in the evening on the day of the deadline, and that there's no pressure on

26:28

the team at pins to publish them. It's really just emphasizing that, particularly where weekends or bank holidays intervene. If they can go up as soon as possible, then that means that the next deadline is an appropriate length away. Whereas if it's perhaps in the case of Easter, as a good example, if it's delayed by the Easter weekend, then in fact,

26:52

five or six days are lost to the next deadline.

26:57

Thank you. And we have noted those specific points about the Easter bank holidays, and we appreciate it's in everybody's interest to expedite publishing. But I will be perfectly frank, and it's unlikely we can commit to publishing on Thursday, the sixth of April.

27:15

What we are looking at the moment though, is the potential to put back deadline to state by one or two days. So that's something that we're considering

27:25

to, in part take on board the the point that you made.

27:30

Obviously that would be confirmed in the rule eight lessor in the final examination timetable. Does anybody else want to comment on this point in particular?

27:41

No, I'm not seeing any signs from the room or from the screen. I'm

27:47

so just moving on, then there'll be an accompanied site inspection that is likely to be held during the week commencing the 22nd of May. And I'll talk a bit more about the site inspections later under agenda item five.

28:02

You'll see from the draft timetable that if required, a second set of written questions is currently programmed for Tuesday, the 20th of June. And we may also at any point during the examination issue a specific request for information from named parties, but only if necessary. That's known as a rule 17 request.

28:30

We are conscious that it's a tight timetable in some places, as you've noted, Mr. Turney, but we know we have aims to avoid hearings during the main school holidays. There's a lot of things to balance them with putting the timetable together.

28:46

We've also noted comments made by the applicant in respect for the timetable, again, in your letter responding to procedural deadline A.

28:54

And for those IPS who haven't had the opportunity to see this documents. I'm Mr. SAHNI. If you'd like to summarize those main suggested changes to the timetable with the reasoning. I'm Mr. Sahani. will hear your points regarding the hearings later under agenda five. So this is the timetabling points.

29:15

Thank you, Richard tourney for the applicant again. Yes, we made a couple of points about particular deadlines.

29:23

noted the point that's just been made on deadline to and the potential to move that by a couple of days. We had picked up deadline three on Tuesday, the ninth of May,

29:36

which is

29:39

some of the matters there will be responses to matters file. The deadline to the intervening period has got this year to bank holidays in it because of the made a bank holiday and the coronation bank holiday. So we'd suggested moving deadline three back by a few days to ensure that that sort of loss of working days doesn't have an undue effect on

30:00

On the applicant or indeed any other party. So that was the first suggestion that Tuesday, the ninth of may, for deadline three could become a date later that week, perhaps Friday the 12th of May, or an earlier date that week.

30:15

And then the only the other

30:19

date that we looked at was deadline to six, which falls in the draft timetable on the 26th of July.

30:29

And

30:31

we were concerned there, that there might not be sufficient time. If we have hearings, perhaps throughout the week of the 17th of July, there might not be sufficient time in particular, to meet the requirement to file post hearing submissions on that date. And we suggested that that might be moved back to the 31st of July,

30:59

to accommodate a longer period between the hearings and the deadline, six. And our view is that wouldn't have any impact on the next deadline, which is which is scheduled in September. So that was the suggestion there. The only other timetable point, aside from the point about publication of submissions, and I've already mentioned that

31:23

was consideration of and it's really entirely a matter for the examining authority and not for us. But consideration of whether the examining authorities publication of the release, the report on the implications for European sites might be brought forward from what is the 16th of August. The reason for that is

31:49

the applicant thinks that it may be possible to conclude the examination a little bit sooner than the full six months, it seemed to us that that date, might put that hope at risk. And therefore, if that was brought forward, we might get to a position where we can conclude the examination a bit sooner. So that was the reason for that suggestion. But we appreciate that. So for the examining authority, it's not a matter that's on sort of the African side.

32:16

So those were the main timetabling issues we wanted to raise. Thank you.

32:21

Thank you. We did also note the comments about size of documents swiftly. I don't know whether you want to just pick that up now.

32:28

Yes, thank you, Reg. 20. For the applicant again, yes, it. So again, it's in terms of production of documents, I think it's it's

32:37

sort of a request to pins that they're put on the website as soon as possible. But also, we have I know, in respect of local authorities already mentioned to them that it's helpful if they could send those documents directly to us. And certainly, if parties, perhaps people who are listening, listening into the recording, I think in the circumstances, if they could note that certainly we we would extend the same courtesy, if we're filing documents or deadlines, and they want to see them at the deadline, we can send them directly to them, rather than waiting for pins to publish them. And certainly in other examinations, I've found that to be quite a useful way to avoid delay and make sure people have the maximum time before the next deadline. Thank you. That was a really helpful clarification of what you meant by that.

33:30

So I I'll respond to your points in due course and share some of our thinking. But first, I just want to ask if there's any other comments from anybody else on the timetable itself, or indeed on what you've just heard from the applicant?

33:46

So I'm not seeing any other hands raised or comments. So I'm just take those regarding the applicant suggestions for deadline three, and deadlines. Six, we are actively considering these points before finalizing the examination timetable. I'm sure you're aware for many competing aspects when drafting a timetable, including several internal deadlines for us, as well as publication deadlines, which we have to obviously build into the the timetable. It's quite a difficult task in that regard to draft a timetable with which everyone in fact, I think it's really impossible to draft one that everyone's 100% happy with. But we are taking all the comments on board

34:33

that we received here today and that we received a procedural deadline a when we produced the rule eight letter

34:41

it is ultimately up to us as the examining authorities to decide the final timetable.

34:48

I'm I was going to make a point just briefly about Swift size of the documents but I'm we probably misinterpreted what you were asking. So that

35:00

The point that you made about sharing with other parties? Absolutely, we would endorse and encourage that.

35:06

Like, just jump in there just to make sure that if any documents are swapped in that manner, which does seem entirely sensible, just make sure that they are absolutely the same documents so that

there's no confusion about versions because I know in those last moments of preparing documents, often we've got multiple versions flying around. So just to warn against that.

35:23

Thanks, Miss Paris.

35:25

With regards to your points about the timing of the report on the implications for the European sites,

35:31

which is the item 15 of the timetable, we are in the process of reviewing this, there may well be scope to publish the results earlier if one is required,

35:43

slightly earlier than the date in the draft timetable.

35:47

The question is whether making this change would result in any time savings in the overall program, because we would still need an opportunity to issue our commentary on the draft development consent order. And that happens at the same time. So we don't currently think it'd be possible to bring forward that point in the timetable. Although we are actively looking at bringing forward the publication of the race,

36:14

I'm

36:16

and not being able to bring forward the comments on the draft DCO is because of the relationship with potential hearings in July and deadlines six that we would need time to consider those before. I'm so this is the balancing act that we're playing with at the moment, and we'll continue to consider over the next few days.

36:39

Um

36:44

however, I just taking on board the point that you were making with regards to bringing the race forward and the specific points about completing in less than six months,

36:55

we will now mention that all parties should be aware that at any time after the last deadline or events that are in the timetable, we may decide under Section 99 of the act that the examination is complete.

37:07

This may be before the end of the six months period, which is the statutory period for the completion of the examination

37:14

are thinking at present is that we hope to be in a position to close the examination on approximately Friday the 15th of September. Um, this would allow us to ensure that we've had all the evidence that we need following deadline eight, and it would mean that the examination would close around one week earlier than that endpoint for the statutory six month period.

37:36

Once the examination closes, no further submissions can be accepted. And when the examining authority has completed its examination, examination of the application, it will inform each of the interested parties.

37:50

Mr. Lee, just giving you a sort of opportunity to comment on this. But I'm

37:55

also in connection with this. We've been discussing amongst ourselves what would be the appropriate deadline for us reasonably to be expect to expect protective provisions to be in their final agreed format? I'm I wouldn't put you on the spot now necessarily. Perhaps we can pick this up tomorrow because there are some schedule 15 agenda items tomorrow. But our current thinking is that it would probably need to be deadline seven. But we wonder if there's any potential for it to be deadline five, because that would help us in terms of potential to close early.

38:33

If you'd like to do something now fine. But otherwise, we're happy for you to Congress overnight. We'll take it away. Thank you.

38:44

Are the views from anybody else on this point? On these points really to do with the timetable?

38:51

No, I'm not seeing any.

38:53

So now I'm going to move on to if you could take down the

38:58

timetable document now. Thank you very much for that.

39:03

And I'm going to now move on to hearings and accompanied site inspections.

39:09

So you'll be aware from the format of this week's events that the examining authority is now able to hold hearings as a blended event in person with other parties able to attend virtually if they wish.

39:20

Our draft timetable makes no assumptions about how future hearings will be held. But we will give as much notice as possible regarding whether there will take place places have blended events like this one today or fully virtually by Microsoft Teams and I will seek your comments on that shortly.

39:38

I'd like to remind you that oral submissions in all hearings should be based on representations previously made in writing and not simply repeating matters already covered in a written submission. They should rather provide further detail on issues previously raised to help inform us as the examining authority. Um, you'll have received notification about the open floor hearing

40:00

Which we've mentioned earlier, and that's two o'clock this afternoon.

40:04

I'm

40:06

Mr. Attorney, you've asked in your letter responding to procedural deadline, a how we would like the applicants positively participate in the open floor hearing this afternoon. We're very content with your suggestion, which is presence there purely for clarification, and then written response later.

40:26

At present, as far as people expressing an interest to attend the open floor hearing, we haven't had any names, but we're,

40:35

there are people here now who may wish to come and we really would encourage you to do that. So we would, we would open the open floor hearing in any case, even if there's no one present. And we'll deal with us in an appropriate way up the this afternoon.

40:53

In addition, there's an issue specific hearing on the scope of the proposed development and the draft development consent order that scheduled for tomorrow, Thursday, the 23rd of March starting at 10am.

41:05

And then we've also reserved to further weeks for additional issue specific compulsory acquisition and open floor hearings if required.

41:14

And the draft timetable, these are scheduled for the weeks of 22nd of May and the 17th of July.

41:23

If any interested parties anticipate that you would wish to be heard at any future open floor or compulsory acquisition hearings? Then please notify us in writing by deadline one, which is Wednesday, the fifth of April.

41:36

Um, does anyone have any comments on that at present?

41:43

Um, so just moving on, we would we particularly like to hear views about preferences for future hearings, whether they're blended defense or fully virtual, and Mr. Turney, where you've set out some preferences in terms of future hearings. So perhaps, if you'd like to give the applicants views on that now, that would be helpful.

42:05

Thank you, Richard, certainly, for the applicant. It's, I should say, it's not a strong view. But it's a suggestion that if we were to take advantage of the potential to have virtual hearings, it did seem as though having blended or it will, I suspect blended events in in the May week,

42:22

followed by

42:25

virtual, an assumption of virtual hearings for the next block of hearings in July, that that might better reflect the overall shape of the examination timetable, in the sense that, we would hope that I'm sure the examining authority wanted the issues of greatest concern in May, they may be the points that require the most attendance. And

42:46

the matters that might be held over to July might be better suited to virtual events, such as a further hearing on the DCO, which might have a number of participants but perhaps less desire for in person attendance. So it's just a suggestion that that might be the approach that may is a blended event and that the July hearings, so far as they're required, should be virtual. But as I say, it's not a strong preference. We're happy to facilitate either. Thank you for that. And I didn't watch it, this might be an appropriate time just to you pick up the two points about agendas, full agendas and

43:23

nature of topics at hearings.

43:27

Yes, which is only for the applicant? Yes, it's really just having an idea in advance as to the nature of the topics for the hearings to make sure that the relevant people are available. As the examining

authority will appreciate there's a large number of people who've contributed to the preparation of the application from a range of specialisms. And of course, we need to make sure the right people are available for the relevant hearings. Obviously, we've noticed that propose hearing dates as they stand, but the sooner that we know

43:58

which topics are likely to be considered in which block of hearings, the better.

44:06

They just add on that. One other thing that we're hoping to incorporate into the late version of the timetable of the final timetable is to try and give some indication of what each day in the

44:22

schemes is going to come on to a little bit more on that in a moment.

44:28

Is there anyone present who wishes to comment on these matters further or?

44:34

No, I'll carry on then. So thank you for your comments. Mr. Turney.

44:40

We are considering those requests and suggestions as we finalize the timetable and forthcoming related lessons.

44:48

With regards to the Mi 2023 dates, we do anticipate that we'll want an ASI

44:54

during that week, and so we'll be up in Yorkshire and so therefore blended events makes sense.

45:00

And

45:02

because we'll be required to travel here with regards to the July hearings if needed. Um, this also provides in the timetable of time for an ASI. So we'll again, we'll be balancing the ASI, which I'll come on to more detail about that in a minute. So for further ASI as needed, then it may be more efficient to hold hearings, the splendid events again here in New York, because we'd be ready to present. If no further ASI is required, then virtual events are certainly an option. And we will consider that

45:36

I'm mindful that there may be parties following today's meeting via the live stream or watching the recording after the event who may also have views about this. I'm thinking particularly about the host

local authorities, but also a full range of interested parties in this examination, including local people, statutory consultees, and people whose interest in land could be affected by the proposed development. So I would say to anybody in that situation who isn't here at the moment,

46:02

if you plan to participate in future hearings, and you have a preference as to whether those events are held in person, like this one or fully blended via Microsoft Teams, then do write to us by deadline one and we will take other people's views into into consideration as well in them coming to a view on the nature of the future hearings.

46:24

Regarding full agendas and indication of hearing topics, we understand the points that you make, and we'll aim to be as helpful as possible, as early as possible. As you will appreciate there's a timetabling balance between the number of days between a deadline when the information is received an agenda publication and the level of detail that we can

46:46

prepare into the agenda. We aimed with the scope of development and DCO hearing tomorrow to provide a fair amount of detail to assist hearing preparation. I'm future agendas won't necessarily present as much detail as that one.

47:02

But you asked about the topics for the issue specific hearings and May. Our initial thinking is that we may need to spend some time on issues that will fall into the broad categories of construction matters and defects. And this may well include topics such as traffic and transport. Secondly, environmental effects, which may include biodiversity landscape and visual, possibly flood risk water resources, and potential Greenbelt matters.

47:32

This is just our initial view based on the information before us to date. It may be that I'm wanting to deadline to submissions, such as the local impact reports and responses to all first written questions and statements of common ground provide information that we need on some of these matters, in which case, we will not need to have the hearing time where possible, we'll bring topics together to make most efficient use of hearings. So while we're examining each topic in its own right, we're also keen to keep a focus on the effects on places and people. So where several different effects or adverse effects probably might arise in certain locations, then we might take a place based approach to examining some of those topics.

48:18

In any event, we're likely to spend some time some more time on the draft develop consent order, and we may also hold a compulsory acquisition hearing.

48:28

And we've mentioned before a comfortable hearing this afternoon.

48:32

If we were holding the open floor hearing this afternoon, and we'll decide whether a further open floor hearing is needed once we've reviewed the submissions at deadline one.

48:43

So that brings us neatly on to company site inspections.

48:48

I'm so I'm going to run through the second part of Agenda Item five, which is a company's site inspections. And the examining authority has already undertaken an unaccompanied site inspection from publicly accessible land and that was on the seventh and eighth of February this year. inspection was principally undertaken in order to observe and inspect the landscape character of the areas of use from some of the environmental statement viewpoints cites proposed for substations, cable sealing and compounds new overhead line and re conducting of existing overhead line where they were visible from publicly accessible locations. The notes from that inspection are available to view on the project page of the website and the references ev 001.

49:36

Just a little bit about accompanied site inspections. These ensure that we as the examining authority can gain an understanding of the proposed development within its site and surroundings as well as its effects. There's no discussion on the merits of the proposals during the course of the inspection, but the the excess attention can be drawn to points of interest and those could they can move

50:00

pointed out to us.

50:03

The application the applicants suggestions for sites to visit, a company just contains a shedule to in its letter, and that's the examination reference PD, a 002.

50:16

We also note that we've had a request from pathogens that join us on behalf of Mr. Phillip Watson, inviting us to visit his land in the vicinity vicinity of Tadcaster ceiling and compound. This is an area that we would like to view, which requires access to private land.

50:33

So

50:35

Mr. Tony, I'm sure it won't the applicant is required to submit a draft itinerary for the accompanied site inspection at deadline one, which is Wednesday, the fifth of April. So I if the person who's controlling the screen, is it possible to share the schedule two lists from the applicants

50:56

procedural deadline a response?

51:06

Well, hopefully people we have if anybody has anybody not got own, we won't have.

51:12

Thank you.

51:15

panic over.

51:17

So thank you for that. That was really helpful. And it was good to have the suggestions and reasons for site visits to for a company site visits.

51:29

I think the challenge now is if and how this could be accommodated in one day in May.

51:35

In working up the itinerary, please do use the extra USI note to verify where we've already visited.

51:44

And we do anticipate making further us eyes. So in rationalizing where we might go accompanied, you could consider whether any of the locations that do not require prior to private access need to be included in the ASI itinerary. I think we've been to many of them that are on your list anyway. But just a few questions before moving on to the itinerary per se. Turner just got a few questions. So um,

52:12

could we possibly go to the final page of the list?

52:20

Thank you. Um, so can I just ask if the reason the proposed new substation at monk fryston,

52:27

which is the last on the shedule is highlighted as not requiring private access? Is that because it's national grids land

52:34

originally for the African? Yes, that's right. So it is private land in that sense, but it's national grid. So we permit you to get on

52:42

don't need to get anybody else's permission.

52:46

Thank you.

52:48

And then the

52:50

the penultimate location which is on the on the list, which refers to some, some pylons. With that give us the opportunity to view views from columns house farm

53:06

or reticle. Entity views from columns house farm. I think Mr. Fowler might be the best person to contribute on that.

53:14

See, father for the applicant? Yes, that's right. Yeah, thank you very much news from pom poms house.

53:21

And then just a few things about some the, the asis, and we would like subject to landowners agreements, of course to have some sites pegged out, so that we can view the extent of the proposed works. And this would include the new substation at Overton, the new substation at monk fryston, the Eastern cable, cable ceiling and compound at Tadcaster. But bearing in mind, Mr. Watson submission PDA, double 01 It might also be helpful to pick out some of the land associated with the Western cable ceiling and con compound at Tadcaster.

54:02

And

54:10

that National Grid staff were able to pinpoint exactly locations on site of elements of the proposed development that were smaller than, say, a substation so using their laptops, tablets, and rather than picking out it was really helpful and to pinpoint the locations of actual pylons or proposed pylons. And we're just really wondering if that facility will be available. For us. A bridge is only for the applicant. Yes, we can do that in terms of pegging out we'll look at the particular locations and identify that in the proposed itinerary as to where we think we'll be able to pick out but certainly where that's not done, we can assist in locating the infrastructure. Okay, thank you, and we appreciate that picking out is subject to landowners agreement. So you know, we recognize that at

55:00

It's not always possible.

55:04

And then say finally, we just wondered how many days you'd have anticipated. The sites that you'd listed would take in terms of a site visit, originally for the outcome. So I asked that question yesterday,

55:19

we thought that was two days, although it would be feasible as one long day.

55:26

But if the intention of examining authorities to conduct a one day ASI in May, then I suspect with your direction that we need to revisit that list, thinking about what you've seen on the unaccompanied site inspection, or what you could see on further unaccompanied site inspections that we can come up with a fairly comprehensive, one day ASI to propose to you.

55:55

We would bet that you would have seen from your unaccompanied unaccompanied visits that

56:01

the scheme is long, but actually, it's relatively easy, relatively fast road network to get between the various locations when you come off the local roads. So

56:12

it's possible to cover a long,

56:15

whole distance to the scheme in a relatively short amount of time, it really depends on how many individual stops you're making. So we will come up with a one day, ASI for May, if that's if that's the intention, we will exclude locations that you can that you've seen, or that we think you might reasonably do as an unaccompanied site inspection, and then hopefully, that will allow you to cover most of the things without further asi.

56:42

So bearing in time in mind the time of year, we will be willing for it to be a long day. But we just were wondering if

56:52

an alternative would be that you provide us with two suggestions, one, a one day trip, and then a day and a half trip. And, obviously, in that we would probably then be doing the half day in July. But I think just in terms of this,

57:10

there is private land that I think it's really important that we do have access to

57:15

registered if that we're going to absolutely there is private land. And I should say that the specific requests you've received in respect to Mr. Watson's land, that that is included in our list anyway, as a suggested location. But absolutely, there are areas where you want to go onto private land. And indeed, it was on our mentalists before we heard from Mr. Watson.

57:41

And so for any other interested,

57:45

sorry, I'm just going to backtrack. And so we also appreciate that you will need ASI dates as soon as possible in terms of making those private access arrangements. So I thinking at present is that it will be Tuesday, the 23rd of may, for the long day. And I'm hoping we can fix that under weather.

58:06

And we're not confirming that now. It'll either be in the relate lessor or the case team will confirm it to you relatively soon.

58:16

Is there anything else you need from us on with regards to this discussion on asi?

58:23

Reached out if the applicant day, that's very helpful. Thank you. Thank you. We'll work on that timetable.

58:29

Are there any other interested parties present who would like to comment on this point?

58:36

No. And we could stop sharing the list from the screen now thank you very much. Miss Kim's I would just hop in there just to save for anyone who hasn't read the many pages that we've had put out with our rule six letter explaining about site visits, I would just flag that anybody who wants to come along to an accompanied site inspection is welcome to do so those are not a private visit. We the other companies, site inspections are ones that the examining authority take undertake ourselves with nobody accompanying us. But anything that's comes within the accompanied site inspection. Basket is welcome. Anyone is invited to come along and join that that day. So you can see what we're seeing. And as Miss Coombs has said, it's not because we submissions are invited about the merits of what we're seeing. But indeed, people can point out things like that's the tree I'm talking about that the band boundary that I'm talking about. So if it assists to come along to those you're very welcome to do so.

59:34

So the

59:37

the draft timetable

59:39

is shown in the draft timetable as the week commencing the 22nd of May we've been more precise about which day it's likely to be. And the final itinerary will be published at least five days in advance of the event taking place. So as Miss Perez said, there'll be information on the website about all the stops where the rendezvous places are etc. So, so people can

1:00:00

go in just for part of the day or for the entire day if they wish.

1:00:04

But we will endeavor to give more than five days notice in terms of the the detail of that.

1:00:11

And it should also be noted that I'm any submissions that deadline one doesn't preclude any further requests for site visits, including suggestions of prospective locations. During the examination. This may be after you've had the opportunity to review what's been said at hearings and in any additional documents. However, there should be a good reason for doing so. It may be that the examining authority also decides to carry out further and accompanies site inspections at any point during the examination.

1:00:43

Of course, any notes from an accompany site inspections that we make will be put onto the planning Inspectorate website.

1:00:53

Before we move on, does anyone

1:00:56

in the room have any further questions in relation to site inspections or wish to make any further points?

1:01:05

No, and on, I can't see any virtual hands up. So

1:01:11

we'll now move on to discuss the

1:01:14

examining authorities procedural decisions under agenda item six. So I'm going to hand back to miss Paris.

1:01:22

Thank you very much. Okay, so procedural decisions, but those who aren't so familiar with the process are basically decisions that we have made, or we'll make about the way in which this application will be

examined. So in our rule six letter we had annex F, which set out a number of procedural decisions about the management of the examination that we had already made, and explains the reasons for those procedural decisions. But as I'm not going to go through it in a lot of detail, but we will comment on a few of those decisions before we invite some questions and comments.

1:01:56

So part one of annex F sets out the examining authorities requests for statements of common ground. A statement of common ground should help to identify matters which are not in dispute or need not be the subject to further evidence. But they can also identify areas of difference, and that's the most important function. They facilitate further discussion between parties, which can be expanded upon during the examination. So we as examining authority, find them really useful documents for narrowing the issues between the parties and also for documenting the extent of agreement on matters because ultimately, we need to report on where that has finished by the end of the examination. So full details of each one of the statements of common ground that we requested or set out in part one of annex F, and that lists the parties with whom we would expect the applicant to prepare a statement of common ground. Those include relevant local planning authorities, console teas, and some effected statutory undertakers. And the range of topics that we'd expect to see are also set out and annex F.

1:02:57

At procedural deadline, a the applicant submitted some comments in relation to the list of requested statements of common ground. And these are set out in schedule five of its letter dated the Eighth of March, which is referenced PDA 002. And so I'm just going to ask the applicant now if you could share on screen shedule, five of that letter, which is the statement of common grounds list.

1:03:21

And this sets out,

1:03:23

hopefully, yep, that's, that's the one. It sets out the list of statements that we requested together with that's on the left hand column. And then on the right hand column is the applicants

1:03:34

view about Well, it's an update about whether they're progressing a statement of common ground or a view about whether or not a statement of common ground needs to be progressed. And so we'll quickly run through that list. Now, we'll focus on parties with whom the advocate considers it unnecessary to progress the statement of common ground.

1:03:53

Just a couple of brief points, though, on that first, on page 21, and 22. On those statements of common ground that are being progressed Mr. Turney.

1:04:04

The first is just about a general point about deadlines. We are requesting initial statement of common ground by deadline one, but you'll have seen that there's provision in the timetable to submit progress

statements of common ground or subsequent deadlines to in the examination. But just a comment today that shouldn't take the focus on the off deadline one as the main time to submit statements of common ground so as many of them as possible and as far progressed as possible by deadline one place where that can't be achieved, then draft should be submitted. And if possible, you could you highlight the areas that remain a work in progress. And that's what the statement of commonality partly does. And as we've already said, having timely submissions of statements of common ground may avoid or reduce the need for hearing time to be spent on certain matters if we know that certain matters are agreed. And you have noticed that deadline seven which is currently in it for the sixth of September, that's the very last opportunity to submit final statements of common ground and out of fairness that

1:05:00

needs to be the very last opportunity for those to be submitted.

1:05:05

And they must be signed.

1:05:08

Just on if we could go down to the next page, please, which has got northern power grid, so I think,

1:05:15

yeah, there we are towards the bottom of that page. I just wanted to point of clarification. So, the draft development consent order refers to Northern power grid northeast PLC, whereas the book of reference refers to both northern power grids northeast PLC and Northern Powergrid Yorkshire PLC. We've received a relevant representation from Northern power grid, Yorkshire PLC, but not from the Northeast PLC. So I just wondered if clearly there, we don't have it specified which of those two companies that is and I just wanted you?

1:05:46

Could you explain the relationship between those two companies?

1:05:55

Reg attorney for the applicant, we are seeking clarification from Northern power grid. Okay. So which companies should be referred to? So we're dealing with the lawyers who I believe are representing both, but it's a question of who we should be referring to, in her statement, common ground and the debt provisions. Most importantly, so we're seeking that clarification moment, we'll update the examination on that. Thank you. Obviously, that may have implications for the draft development of telemedicine in order to which only refers to the northeast PRP scheme. So do you want to come in? Well, I was just wondering if you might have an answer from Northern Powergrid by tomorrow, because that would be very helpful for us. We will make a call this afternoon. Let's see if we can see if we can get an answer. Thank you. And that aren't they down to attend? Tomorrow? I think they're joining us the the northern part with Yorkshire PLC, so you we may

1:06:45

be so good to them.

1:06:49

Okay, thank you. We'll make inquiries this afternoon. So that we we understand that best we have asked the question, but we will seek to confirm that.

1:06:58

And so of course, when it comes to the statement of common ground, if it needs to be both of those, then they are separate entities, and therefore, they will need to both be included.

1:07:07

On the point just below that on the internal drainage boards. So your table specifies eight D,

1:07:15

internal drainage board together with a Yorkshire consortium of internal drainage boards. But we note that we've also had a relevant representation from FOSS internal drainage board, which states that they're part of that your Consortium. So they're not named specifically in this table. And I just wanted to ask you how the FOSS internal drainage board will be covered by statements of common ground.

1:07:37

So Bethany, Kingston national grid, the works in parks in the FOS are very minor. So we were seeking to confirm that they didn't require a statement of common ground. And I think so far, that's their view, also, what we can confirm that further. Okay, thank you.

1:07:58

Obviously, we have had a relevant rep from them. So we do in the absence of a statement of common ground, we have a sort of outstanding objections, so or at least an interest in the scheme. So yeah, we would appreciate you looking into whether they could be wrapped into the Yorkshire consortium potentially, or if not to have confirmation that they don't think it's necessary to be party to a statement of common ground. That's fine. Thank you.

1:08:22

Okay, and then so just turning to the second part of that shedule five, which is

1:08:28

those areas where you perhaps don't consider that a statement of common ground is necessarily required.

1:08:37

As we said, an oval six letter if there's documented agreement that matters, such as, but not just protective provisions, if those matters are agreed, and there's no other matters of disagreement, then if we have a statement from both parties to that effect, then that would suffice. And we would say, except that we don't need a statement of common ground. But in the absence of such a statement than even if an agreement is expected to be reached, then we would encourage you to progress a statement of common ground just in case that agreement never comes.

1:09:07

Where protective provisions would be required, and a statement of common ground is not proposed. And we'll also return to these in tomorrow's issue specific hearing. As we've said, we've got an item on that towards the end of our agenda.

1:09:19

Just then to take those parties in turn with whom the applicant proposes not progressing a statement of common ground, and Mr. Turney give you an opportunity to explain the applicants position and we'll start with the canal and river trust.

1:09:32

A bridge attorney for the outcome that canal and river trust, we are going to we are sharing the same common ground in response to your request for one. Okay, and you haven't specified when you expecting that one to be submitted? No, I don't know if there's an update on progress that was Kington give yet but when it came to national grid, so the draft statement of Congress has been censored economic interest. They've said they'll get comments back to us this week. So we're just awaiting notice and then progressive and

1:10:00

So we hope to at least a match after the deadline one.

1:10:03

Thank you.

1:10:07

Okay, and then moving on to Sustrans, soy sauce trans. There's a, there's been engagement with sauce trans, in respect of that there's a potential impact in respect of one of the National Cycle routes, route 64. And

1:10:26

we think we've addressed in full their concerns prior to the submission of the application.

1:10:34

And on that basis, we don't

1:10:37

propose proposed to progress a statement of common ground

1:10:41

with them.

1:10:43

And as we haven't heard to the contrary from them,

1:10:48

the difficulty of mass spectre is we I mean, note that that's been documented in your planning statement. But the difficulty from our perspective is that we don't have that confirmation from them, and they haven't made a relevant representation. So in the absence of having something from them to confirm the position, then we have to well, at the moment, we will take what you're saying and in to some extent, the absence of engagement from them, because it speaks to But what we'd ideally like is some evidence that they know. And then that, you know, in other situations, it would be something just in an email or something that you've got from them that confirms that you can submit in

1:11:24

red registering for the outcome? Yes. We appreciate your need to have that confirmation, and we're trying to get a letter from that provide that, that'd be very helpful.

1:11:36

Okay, then moving on to sell next. UK.

1:11:40

Could you just explain your position on that one, please?

1:11:44

I think the originally for the applicant sorry, I think the position in respect of sell next. And

1:11:51

and I think Hutchinson is in the same

1:11:56

situation.

1:12:00

But well, actually, it's not the right strategy to deal with sell next sell. Next is the position is that we don't think a statement of Congress was necessary. Obviously, their interest is as a statutory Undertaker, but we haven't had a response from them in respect of

1:12:17

those matters, so So we're

1:12:20

on that basis that we don't think of statement commonground is, is going to be necessary, but obviously, again, will will seek to update the examination on any communication from them. Do you know, from your conversations with them, whether they would be seeking specific protective provisions or whether they will be content to rely on those generic visions for operators of electronic communications code networks?

1:12:48

Registering for the applicant? I think, I think it's just they haven't responded. So I think obviously, they take the benefits as far as necessary if the general protective provisions okay, but they haven't responded to identify any position. Okay.

1:13:05

And so moving on to Hutchinson, three E, registering for the outcome. So Hutchinson,

1:13:13

we've had confirmation that there's no matters to agree with them. And therefore we say establish common ground not required. And say for them, do you think that then it's clear that they would rely on those generic provisions for protective provisions? That again, they've they haven't, they haven't made a request for any specific

1:13:33

provision? So that's the that's the assumption. Okay.

1:13:45

So national gas transmission limited,

1:13:49

reach attorney for the applicant. So in that case,

1:13:54

we have identified with national gas transmission limited, a need or protective provisions and aside agreement, and we expect to conclude those and in those circumstances, we say a separate segment common ground, but not be required. But we've noted your comment that if they're not concluded, then we need to know we need to have a second common ground.

1:14:21

And we also have received a relevant representation from national gas transmission limited, yes.

1:14:27

Incidentally, side point, but the they are still recorded in the Book of reference is their former name, the National Grid gas PLC. So just as a side point for when the book of references next updated, which I think is deadline, one, just to make sure that those

1:14:41

references are updated.

1:14:43

And so as we've said, again, until we understand more about the particular installations that they're talking about, and they're relevant representation and on the progress on those particular provisions,

and what the side agreements might comprise them will remain of the view that a statement of common ground is required.

1:15:00

And we will pick this up again tomorrow.

1:15:04

As we talk about protective provisions,

1:15:07

northern gas networks, then please, rich attorney for the outcome. So, as we've said in the letter the we've received verbal confirmation from Northern gas networks that they don't suggest that a statement of common ground is required. There's no protective provisions proposed for them, as I understand it.

1:15:29

I'm sorry, there are I'm sorry, there are protective provisions for them. And they're in the process being agreed. So it's in the same position as the

1:15:39

gas transmission Undertaker. Okay.

1:15:43

And finally, Yorkshire water.

1:15:47

Rich Tony for the outcome. So Yorkshire water, there is an asset protection agreement

1:15:54

being settled between the parties. And on that basis, we say that statement Common Ground is not isn't necessary. So.

1:16:03

But again, we know your broader comment, that's until that's completed, you would suggest that a statement on the ground is necessary? To what extent would Asset Protection Agreement material make it into the examination?

1:16:16

Bridge attorney for the outcome? It doesn't normally it just results in confirmation does that content? Okay.

1:16:24

Again, we might come back to this to our work delve too much further at this point. But as you've noted, your points and thank you, it's, we'll come back to it tomorrow. But it's an alternative contractual means outside the order.

1:16:36

It's just always comes down to making sure that we know that we have everything secured and how it's secured. So yeah.

1:16:42

Okay. And then in addition to those statements of common ground, we've also requested that statement of commonality is submitted each deadline that the statements of common ground come in.

1:16:53

And that's a Document which provides an overview of the position on each statement of commerce, it's basically an update, like you've just done to tell us how far things are away from agreement, where things have now been agreed. And certainly in other cases, it's been very useful to have

1:17:06

summaries of commonality in respect to the main topics as we approach because we still get into the second half of the examination, to start being able to look at topics and say, Okay, on this particular topic, we are only down to disagreement on this particular strand with this particular person. And so that really helps again, in terms of narrowing down the focus for hearings and further written questions, etc. So that's very helpful. And we've given some advice about how that might be presented in the rule six letter.

1:17:34

Before we move off, then Part One, does anybody have any comments they'd like to make about statements of common ground and the statements of commonality?

1:17:45

I'm not seeing any indication of anyone wanting to speak. I will say though, we don't need to see the statement of common ground list any longer. Thank you for displaying that for us. And that case, we'll move on to local impact reports.

1:17:58

So part two of annex F, sets out a little bit of advice about them local impact reports in particularly it requests that those are submitted deadline one, which is an early point of the examination, again, because we're in an effort to try and bring things as early as possible so that we can get through and what about any issues sooner rather than later. So we've asked for a local impact report for the benefit of others present a local impact report is something that's produced by the local authorities, which is supposed to be almost like a Planning Officers report, which sets out the potential impacts of a scheme on all the issues that might it might be within its area and within its control. So it's a sort of meant to be a neutral report that sets out an assessment of the potential effects on a local area. And because obviously this scheme passes through six hosts local authorities, six different authority areas as the District the boundary state standard today anyway. We've asked for those reports to be submitted by Hamilton District Council, Harrogate Borough Council, North Yorkshire county council, Selby District Council, Leeds City Council and city of York Council. But we would also welcome local impact reports

from any other relevant local authorities who may wish to submit one and normally that might be other authorities sitting just outside are bordering those, those authority areas. And we know from the joint relevant reps of the council's that's handled in Harrogate, North Yorkshire County and Selby that they're working on a local impact report, which is great. And our advice note one planning Inspectorate suffice note, one does provide more advice about the production of those local impact reports. The deadline for submission is the first of April. Now it's not it's the fifth of April, the deadline one.

1:19:40

But are there any other points on local impact reports before we move on?

1:19:46

Okay.

1:19:48

Then just flicking through that annex F on there. We're now on point three, which is about site inspections. I don't plan to spend any more time on this because we've already covered a fair bit about unaccompanied and unplanned accompanied

1:20:00

Like inspections earlier in our agenda

1:20:03

heartful refers to comments on relevant rep representations. So these are requested by deadline one. And the reason for putting that into the rule six was just because that's a slightly earlier deadline than we might otherwise be able to ask for them by.

1:20:17

And we've asked for them to be presented in a certain way. And

1:20:22

I would just add at this point in drafting our first written questions, which will be hopefully coming out next week, we've tried to avoid questions that simply say, can you applicant can you respond to this relevant rep on the basis that hopefully, that your, your response to relevant reps will comment some of them reps will do that exercise. And so if it's a sort of a tabular approach, or something that responds point by point, to all of the relevant representations that have been made, and we don't have hundreds in this case, then that will address a lot of the issues that when we might have questions in our minds about so we're going to try not to duplicate in our written questions as what I'm saying.

1:20:56

Yes, but in your comments and relevant representations, it what we do need is to know who has raised a comment or who has made a relevant observation that you're commenting on. So it's not sufficient to just say, noise has been raised an issue and here's our response, we need to know, noise been raised by a resident who lives here or at noises, you know, that sort of thing, so that we can really understand how you've got to grips with the issues that have been raised.

1:21:19

Does anyone have any other comments on that Mr. Turney Richards only from for the applicant, just just to note that we've taken that on board, or what we're preparing is a fairly full response to relevant representations, which we hope might cut short responses later to further written representations. So it's probably fuller than you might see in other examinations, where perhaps has a lot more parallel reps. So we've tried to get to prepare for fairly full responses. So that will be quite a substantial document when it comes to but hopefully that will address what you've requested. Yeah. Thank you. Now that's that is what we're after. So thank you. It's a no, it might seem laborious, but it's very helpful for the individuals who have raised things to see that exactly how things have been responded to. And also when it comes to us reporting to be able to absolutely forensic ly see how things have been dealt with. So.

1:22:10

Okay, moving on, then to Item five, we've already talked about additional submissions that have been accepted into the examination. So I won't, I won't go on about that anymore, other than to say that once the examination begins, which is after this meeting closes, we'll generally take the approach of only publishing submitted documents once a deadline has passed. So if things come in between deadlines, then we wouldn't just accept them as additional submissions and publish them, we would normally hold on to them for the next deadline, because that just tries to keep some kind of order to the process. Otherwise, it can become a very documents flying everywhere. I think we tried to be more disciplined and stick. So anything that comes in between deadlines will be held on to until the next deadline. And then if it needs to be considered as an additional submission, because it's not something we asked for, then we will have to make that decision about whether to accept it or not. And then it would be published after that deadline.

1:23:03

I don't know if there's any comments on that. It's not not seeing any signs. Okay. Yes, Miss Powell had a question.

1:23:13

Mr. Turney, just one thing that would be very useful. If you're cross referencing back to a document that's already been published in the exam library, as if it's well as your document reference, you can also give the EI references while it just makes life a lot, much easier for us to find it as well. Obviously, that's only something that's already been published, but that that will be much appreciated. Thank you.

1:23:35

Registered if the applicant, yeah, so we'll make sure that's done.

1:23:40

Thank you, Mr. Jones. Okay, so part six of annex F.

1:23:45

Now comes on to some additional information that we requested from the applicant. And again, this was things that having reviewed the application and having seen the site we requested from the applicant.

1:23:57

I don't plan to go through this in too much detail. I'm part a was a that we requested a cross section illustration of the proposed work. So it's a request for a schematic diagram, which explains the constituent elements of the proposed development, because it's not as straightforward as having a single site with a single building locked on it. It's a cat. It's quite a it's a long scheme with various different parts. So it's just a schematic diagram that we've asked for there by deadline one. You haven't put any specific comments about that in your procedural deadline a submission. So can I assume is there anything you'd like to make raise now? No, we're concerned with that. Thank you. Okay. And then on the point of additional photo montages, I'm going to hand over to Miss Coombs to lead on this point.

1:24:42

Yes, perhaps if we could share the two plans from the applicants response. So it's shedule for IE page 21 and 22. So, for 21 Fast

1:25:01

Yes, perfect. Thank you. Thank you for submitting these plans to check if the locations for additional photo montages have been interpreted correctly. I will caveat comments that I might make Lisa with a request that your official impact experts chooses the precise location using their professional judgment to ensure that it's as full of you as possible of the proposed development.

1:25:25

Regarding viewpoints a

1:25:30

it looks about right I'm it's quite difficult to pinpoint exactly from the scale of the plan that is submitted here. But I feel that we were very precise in the instructions that we gave on that one, it was foot pass junction, bridge stream, etc. So I as long as those

1:25:50

details are followed, then I will be satisfied with with that location, that we do recognize that the best view from public lands but we're going for private land, so there will be a hedge

1:26:05

interrupting some of the view.

1:26:08

And then if we can turn to the second page of the plans

1:26:12

with regard to viewpoint D, I'm, I think we were probably a little further east along whitecoat lane when we stopped, but this is a very long distance view. And we're not asking for photo montage, we're just asking for

1:26:29

wireframe really to understand the extent of the views of the monk fryston substation and the new pylons and gantries.

1:26:37

So really how we define the precise location is not as crucial as selecting a place which demonstrates what would be visible. So it's you know, the the higher part of that road looking down onto the substation.

1:26:53

I'm all the other viewpoints look as we set out. So thank you very much for that it was really helpful to have that plan included in your in procedurally deadline response. Any further questions on that? Originally, if you haven't been there, that's that's very helpful. We'll feed that back to the people who are preparing that information. And it's noted that, of course, that there's an element of judgment when they're there as to where precisely to locate the photographic equipment. Thank you.

1:27:22

So I'll, we're finished with those plans. Now. Thank you very much for displaying those. And I'm going to now pass back to miss powers.

1:27:31

Thank you.

1:27:33

The only other point I wanted to raise here because it's related was about the ES Addendum

1:27:41

which is relates to the inclusion of the travelers site at the junction of the A one M and A 63 in the landscape and visual impact assessment, which I know

1:27:53

it's something that was raised in your procedural deadline, a submission. This is an addendum. So an additional piece of information to support the environmental statement that I understand you plan to submit that comprises an assessment of that visual impact on receptors in the vicinity of the traveler site.

1:28:10

Mr. Turney, I'm aware that the inspectorates case team has provided some advice under Section 51 yesterday about that, and understand that will be published on the project page today, maybe even already is I'm not sure. But by the end of the day, it should be published.

1:28:24

Would you like to explain the matter briefly, and if you're in a position to perhaps you could give us an indication of how you plan to proceed? And for our procedural point of view,

1:28:32

Richard any for the applicant? Yes, thank you. Just to briefly explain as we set out in our letter, in response to the rule six letter we we identified an emission in the landscape and visual assessment relating to the presence of the travelers site at or near monk fryston, which had not been identified as a sensitive receptor for assessment in the visual assessment.

1:29:01

And

1:29:03

we considered in respect of other topic areas that the travelers site, although it's not a present lawful,

1:29:12

should be regarded sensitive receptor for the purposes of assessment on a precautionary basis. And we did that assessment for other relevant topic areas. It was omitted from the landscape and visual assessment as a sensitive visual receptor. And therefore, once the issue was identified, we concluded that we should submit

1:29:37

a short agenda which addresses that matter and provides that assessment.

1:29:44

And there's a couple of other small inconsistencies in the landscape and visual assessment that we are going to address at the same time

1:29:57

and

1:30:04

We have,

1:30:06

as you've noted, we sought the advice of the planning Inspectorate as to how best to deal with that. And hopefully, the advice, as you say, came back yesterday, which advise that

1:30:20

the, the correct way to deal with this is through the examination process and to submit the relevant document

1:30:29

at deadline one, to provide assessment, and then there'll be an opportunity for interested parties to comment on it.

1:30:37

So whilst we don't anticipate any separate formal process of advertisement, because the relevant regulations under the EIA regulations are not engaged,

1:30:49

we will make sure that those who are likely to be concerned on this issue will be directed towards the document that we prepare. So that will certainly encompass the relevant local authority and the occupiers of that site through their agent. So we'll make sure that, that those parties are aware that that's what we're doing, and that they have to document. And then of course, they have the opportunity to make submissions on it if they if they want to during the examination process. So that's the situation and the proposed means of dealing with it. We're grateful for pins for providing us advising confirmation that can be dealt with in that way.

1:31:27

Thank you, I would like to, especially because we are at this end of the examination that then there are opportunities for there's several opportunities for written

1:31:37

views to be made on that material. And because we will have time for hearings if we need to, to cover any of that material and further written questions. If we were at a later part of the examination, then we might be tape suggesting a different way. But

1:31:50

yeah, we have time at this point.

1:31:54

So we noticed that you've advised that the additional assessment is expected to identify likely significant effects for those visual receptors. We won't stray any further into the detail of those findings in this meeting, but I did want to explore whether you might be able to be in a position to give an update on any preliminary findings from that at tomorrow's issue specific hearing, possibly

1:32:17

registering for the applicant? Yes, I think I think we should be able to, and our

1:32:23

landscape and visual assessment expert is going to be in the room. So we'll ask him if he can provide at least a short update on where he's got to. Thank you, we'll probably put that somewhere towards the end of item three in tomorrow's agenda that helps in terms of timing.

1:32:38

Does anybody else have any comments that they would like to raise in connection with this matter?

1:32:46

Okay, then we'll move on now. I'm looking at the time and it's about the time that we would normally take a mid morning break, however, we are quite close to finish a meeting. So if I'm my view is probably that we carry on and see it rather than taking a break, and then we can release people. So I'm not seeing any objections to that approach, I think we'll carry on. Okay, so parts 789 and 10 of annex F, they mainly relate to the presentation of examination submissions that we're requesting from the applicant. That's namely, the guide the application, National Policy Statement sheduled of compliance, the way that updated drafts of the development, consent, order and book of reference are presented and submitted and planning obligations and commercial side agreements tracking list. Nobody has raised any substantive issues in relation to these matters. So I don't think we need to discuss them in detail, but I will just give an opportunity for anybody now, to make any comments on those requests. Mr. Turney bridge attorney for the applicant, I just wanted to know that in respect of the NPS, sheduled of compliance, the shedule of schedules compliance themselves are related to the

1:33:54

existing NPS is under which these This proposal will be examined. So even if there is a designation during the examination, we wouldn't anticipate that that will be dealt with through updating the schedule of compliance because you'd still be examining under the proposed transitional provisions, you'd still be examining under the desert under the current NPS suite.

1:34:16

So that's our just to note, but we would, of course, if there is a designation, deal with that through way of a further submission, that, as you know, the way we've done it is the planning statement addresses the draft energy suite of national policy statements. And but the shedule of compliance is focused on those the 2011

1:34:38

MPs and so I don't anticipate that that document itself would change if there is a designation, but we will provide a further submission on the new MPs is because the Central States obviously will will consider those important irrelevant. And assuming the transitional provisions stay as we think they will, then that's the other point. Let's

1:35:00

Let's hope so all sorts of priests.

1:35:03

Thank you. That makes sense. And it's useful to have had that as part of the submitter too often we don't have as part of the applicant submitted application. So it was useful to have that from the beginning.

1:35:14

Part 11, then the final part of annex F, which is just about what is the flag really for any statutory parties who might follow this recording. Just as that that is a deadline, they're specified that deadline one

1:35:29

or any statutory party who has not submitted a relevant representation, but they wish to be considered as an interested party, and there may be a few, then there's that that deadline set out as deadline one for them to let us know that they'd like to be an interested party.

1:35:44

Okay, I'm now going to hand over to Mr. Jones, who will just take us through any other matters this morning.

1:35:51

Thank you, Miss Powis? Yes, we're onto an agenda item seven, any other matters? I have had no other matters notified to me under this agenda item that people wish to raise at this meeting. But before I move on, are there any other matters in relation to procedural or other relevant matters that anyone wishes to raise after what they have heard today? And I'll start with members of the public organizations, does anybody wish to raise anything else based on what they've heard today?

1:36:22

Not on seeing a shaking of heads in the room. I'm not seeing any virtual hands. So in which case, I shall

1:36:30

move on and revert to the applicant, Mr. Turney or any of your team. Is there anything else you wish to raise today?

1:36:36

Which attorney for the applicant? No, thank you. So the only issue we were going to raise into this agenda item we've already dealt with, which was the ES addendum.

1:36:45

Thank you, Mr. Turney, in which case, I shall hand over to Ms. powers for our last item on today's agenda.

1:36:54

Thank you, Mr. Jones. The only other thing I would just mention is that my case team colleagues have mentioned that the live captions still haven't been working, I think from on the live stream. So anybody who's been trying to follow the live stream with captions won't have been able to do that they, however, we are assured that those captions will be added for the recording. So there is anybody who needs to follow captions for following this meeting, the that will be fixed in the post production and so what gets published will be will be displaying captions, so

1:37:24

Okay.

1:37:26

Well, all that really remains then is for me to thank everybody for contributing so fully and usefully this morning. And also thanks to those joining us remotely. And to say that we look forward to working with everybody in the examination of this application,

1:37:40

we a written note of this meeting, and a digital recording of the proceedings will be made available as soon as practicable on our website. And I would just remind you again, of the next stages in the process, then we have open flow hearing one commencing this afternoon at 2pm. And as Miss Coombs has said, we would very much welcome those even if you haven't notified in advance that you want to come you're very welcome to come along, we normally allow people slots of around 10 minutes per person up to to make any points and we will just listen. And the applicant is will be here to provide any points of clarification. But it's just you know, if you if you can stay on and you'd like to do that, you're very welcome to do that. And if you could just let my colleagues know, though, that you're planning to be here, that would be really useful.

1:38:21

And then after that we've we've mentioned we're going into issue specific hearing one tomorrow on the scope of the proposed development and the draft DCO. So that's in two parts, firstly, to discuss any points of clarification on or sort of expansion on the points about the actual description of the project, things that we've seen on site and have queried or things that we've read the application documents aren't quite clear to us. And then the second point is to go through the detailed points on the DCO. Again, time is relatively limited. And I would just flag that we've got a lot of written questions on the DCO as well. So tomorrow, we'll focus on core parts of the DC that we really want to talk about. And then there will be there will be further questions in writing.

1:39:03

And then next week, we say as soon as practicable. We're aiming for the middle of next week, we will issue our our rule eight letter, which will have the final examination timetable. And once that's out, that doesn't change unless something significant happens. And that will include well, it will be accompanied by our first written questions, which will cover all the topics that we might have questions about. And then draft deadline one, we don't plan to change deadline one because we've already notified quite a few people about it. So deadline one will will be confirmed in the rule eight letter as Wednesday the fifth of April.

1:39:38

So unless there's anything else that any final points anyone would like to raise. Thank you, Mr. Jones for coming back on screen as well. If there's anything else not seeing anything, so in that case, I will just say it's 1140 and the preliminary meeting is now closed. Thank you