

TRANSCRIPT_YORKSHIREGREEN_ISH2_SESSION3_24052023

01:02

Good afternoon, everybody. The hearings now resumed. I'll hand straight over to the scheme's to continue. Thank you Miss pass.

01:10

So I have had a look at the agenda over the lunch break. And I feel that the next two items really, which is mitigation for construction, phasing and management and maintenance are ones that we really do want to cover in the hearing. So I'm not going to move to written questions, but

01:27

I will sort of be trying to keep the pace going. If we need to ask people to submit later, then we'll we'll do that. So just moving on to the landscape and visual mitigation for construction. The first point was to hear from North Yorkshire counsel, whether you're satisfied, Mr. John's, I'm assuming it's you again, if you're satisfied with the applicants response to the points raised in the landscape, in your Li Er.

01:58

Yes, Tim John's from North user council. So we did discuss this last Friday with the applicant item D. So I'm satisfied with with progress on that.

02:09

That's very helpful. Thank you.

02:16

And do you want to elaborate a little bit and just tell us what's

02:20

how the the progress has been made?

02:24

Or maybe Mr. Ferber

02:28

neophobia for the applicant? So yeah, I think in summary, we sort of discussed the fact that construction compounds have been cited away from dwellings and settlements, as far as possible to minimize the adverse effects on residential immunity.

02:42

We also sort of discussed the sort of interaction of Secretary mitigation measures, which related to solid fencing, 2.4 meters high and temporary earth mounds around the construction compounds.

03:01

And when you combine that with some existing planting, that will provide some screening. We think that this offers adequate

03:10

mitigation that would that would reduce effects obviously not eliminate them, but would reduce the effects during the construction phase.

03:18

We also briefly discussed potential measures for

03:24

temporary, fast, growing planting. And I don't think there was any strong opinion that that would be important in any particular location, which I think we've covered in our written

03:36

representations to date.

03:40

You know, that's something you might consider though, when you got to the stage or when the contractors get to the stage of looking at the actual sort of locations and orientations of the construction compounds. I think, as they currently stand, were satisfied that the combination of the temporary Earth storage sort of two to three meters high plus the solid fencing, and then the third measure that I didn't sort of recognize is that sometimes on less sensitive boundaries, the impact can be further reduced by sort of the placement of

04:14

sort of materials or containers along the edge of the compound that then sort of screen activity that's going on inside the compound itself. So I think, as it currently stands, obviously, you know, we, you know, thought matters could be reviewed if things were to change.

04:32

As part of the detailed design. I'm just going to invite the other two local authorities to comment on this and then I'll open it to any other parties in the room. So Ms. Weiss, have you got any views on that you want to give us on the construction compounds and mitigation? They're off?

04:49

No, I don't thank you. Thank you, Mr. Baldry.

04:53

So

04:54

sorry, nothing from Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Does anyone else in the room want to talk about

05:00

At or give any views on the construction compounds. Mr. Fletcher Douglas Fletcher obviously the views from bats Lane looking across the Greenbelt towards where the substation is, once the construction compounds appear there is is there any way that those construction compounds can be sort of camouflaged, and if they're made a timber, because obviously, that prevent the noise breakout, such that the view is not just looking straight for the next three years of a huge, great big construction compound. At the end of the road where you live.

05:36

Mr. Ferber, I presume that the Lumbee one would be one of the ones that would have the fencing, but perhaps you can confirm that

05:43

you had the offer for that book. And there's obviously two construction compounds, the one that sort of directly north of the substation site that's proposed to be largely screened by sort of storage. So there would be wouldn't be direct views into the compound because there would be soil stored quite close to it. I think the the one on the other side of the road, which is possibly less visible because of the vegetation and the way the land form is,

06:16

that one's been identified fought with a solid timber fencing on three sides. So that's actually set out in this CO CP,

06:26

probably give you a reference. So yeah, all of these details are in paragraphs 223 2.3 point 10 To 2.3 point 11.

06:37

In the code of construction practice, which is AP dash 95.

06:44

And that describes the relationship of the source storage and timber fencing.

06:53

I haven't got access

06:56

copies in a document.

07:00

Rich attorney for the applicant, I just wonder is that I think the key the key line is this that the northern western and eastern perimeter of the Western temporary component mountain fryston substation area to the west of Warfield lane, where sores are not available for temporary bands, unlike the compound east of Rothfield lane, where perimeter mounting is proposed. So Solid fencing would minimize adverse landscape and visual effects. So it's proposed to have solid in the in the side of the compounds that you're concerned about, to the west of the Western temporary compound to the west of Warfield lane, there'll be a solid wooden fence. And then on the east of Rothfield lane, there would be bunding.

07:48

I think that Mr. Fletcher helpfully joined us for some of the

07:54

site inspection yesterday, but he wasn't there when Mr. Fowler was explaining very clearly about this, the removal of the existing soil bonds and bringing it forward and then moving it back. So Mr. Fletcher is probably learning that for the first time, this afternoon, so I think it might be helpful if we could just have a diagram, nothing that's secured, that just shows that movement of soil from one band to another band and then ran to the final band doesn't need to be anything terribly sophisticated, but I just think it would help. Thanks.

08:27

Thank you. So I think unless anybody's got anything else to raise, then I think we've concluded on the construction compounds aspects, I'll move on to landscape management and maintenance.

08:42

So

08:45

there's only I think we can take items one and two together. So we're looking at what the management and maintenance replacement for planting would be for the, you know, nonlinear and linear it will land it acquires and areas of essential mitigation, and then

09:03

really to seek your response

09:09

from from your side to

09:12

lead to City Council's point about

09:15

management and maintenance in perpetuity.

09:19

Is that, Mr. Barber, but thank you, I think, Mr. Ferber in the first instance, unless he needs to bring in Mr. Mays as well, who's the abora culturist.

09:32

Mr. Wakefield, sorry, I had to Andes on my last DCO examination. One of them was Mr. Wakefield another was a different Andy just told you the name of archaeologist

09:45

but we can welcome him as well. No further for the axon. So I think in relation to the first question, the differences between the management, maintenance and replacement for planting

10:00

And the other areas of essential mitigation, I think we touched on this earlier.

10:05

And in terms of

10:08

the sort of management period maintenance period that we're proposing it would would, would be the same five years.

10:17

The difference principally is what happens after that period, and who controls it. So in terms of the areas outside the outline, landscape mitigation strategy, in the wider project, that planting which would typically comprise sort of replacement sections of hedgerows and trees, that would be removed as part of the we conduct tree works.

10:47

That would be handed back to the the landowner to maintain

10:54

the areas around the substation and the CSAC. National Grid would retain some control over that land. So if there needed to be

11:07

any further

11:10

works, they have the control to to, to undertake that. But it would, what we propose in terms of maintenance, is that it would be sufficient

11:25

for five years, in both instances, to ensure the establishment of the planting, the planting itself will be slightly different in the sense that around the mitigation, so the planting around the substations and CSX will include

11:47

areas of woodland planting.

11:50

And

11:52

the maintenance, the long term sort of maintenance and management of that has been considered in

11:59

suggesting that the five year period

12:03

and we just sort of draw attention to the differences between mitigation planting for screening, mitigation planting that maybe has public access, which this doesn't, and other types of woodland planting, such as sort of commercial forestry, and

12:24

would like to sort of bring in

12:27

Mr. Wakefield, so to briefly sort of describe what those differences might be.

12:34

I Andy Wakefield for the applicant.

12:38

So just to add, really, that,

12:42

I think it's important to note that for the proposed areas of woodland planting, the mixture of species and the sizes and mature sizes that will be planted, I think proposed to be 30% of kind of larger growing species and 70% of smaller growing and troubled species. So that to some extent, addresses the sort of risk of trees growing in very dense

13:09

competition with one another, where the the initial planting can address that and have a sort of wealth reasonably whilst based, larger growing trees.

13:20

I think it's accepted that nine intervention is appropriate on woodland management in some settings, and that the trees should be established after the five years. So really, after that period, your it depends on your management objectives in terms of as Neil and Mr. Ferber stated, is it timber production where you'd be thinning to end up with a crop and maximizing your revenue from the sale of that timber products, the management of health and safety, where there's public access would probably require more involved ongoing management, which doesn't really apply here.

14:02

I think the other thing is

14:05

that the species mix can also help to ensure resilience in terms of ensuring good diversity. So reducing risks associated with things like disease where, like we've seen with him last time back where one particular species might be impacted. Having a good range of species diversity can help to mitigate that.

14:30

Neil phobia for the applicant just to add to that, that as part of the five year maintenance period that there may need to be something that will be undertaken at year four.

14:43

That would include obviously removal of shrub and tree guards, which often is overlooked in planting schemes. So that so there is there would be some towards the end of the period of that five year period where there would be sort of managed, you know, management and a thinning intervention.

15:01

I've got just two, couple more questions for the applicants. And then I'll ask the local authorities for their

15:08

opinions as to what they've heard. So, firstly, so in terms of a five year management maintenance, I hear what you're saying, but what we're being shown as photo montages that are after 15 years. So I just want to understand how if it's not, if there's no management intervention, between years six and 15, how we can be assured that it will reach not necessarily precisely what's shown on the photo montage, but it will be delivering the mitigation or the mitigation that it's set out to deliver.

15:44

Neil Ferber for the applicant. I think that the primary issue with establishing new planting is, is getting through that first few years.

15:55

And I think that we shouldn't underestimate that, you know, we've all been involved in schemes that have failed for different reasons. And I think it's that schedule and supervision of works in the first few years. So it's making sure that when it is starts with soil management, so I think the management plan

would be very closely, the planting management plan would be very closely linked to the soil management plan.

16:22

One of the worst things that can cause failures is obviously having compacted soil that's been handled in at the wrong time.

16:31

And an insufficient mitigation undertaken for that. So what you tend to have then is you plant into a soil that's compacted and is in a free draining situation, which will lead to plants dying. The second issue is, is lack of irrigation. So again, if that's part of the management scheme, including

16:53

within that management scheme about sort of ordering watering to actually happen, rather than addressing the problem later down the line when things have gone too far. So I think all of that would be included within this this sort of five year management plan. So it's making sure that canopy and shrub layer sort of sort of closes over and gets established.

17:13

You'd want that to be really underway within the first sort of three years really. And but then you're adding the extra couple of years to address any other sort of issues that arise.

17:24

I think

17:27

beyond that, that beyond that five years, because national grid will have the freehold on the land, if there were particular issues. So for example, there was a an area of trees that didn't die, and they were in, you know, there's a safety issue with,

17:45

you know, the aid 19, or the roads or equally if there were trees that got sort of struck by lightning or whatever happened, and they were falling over and they were causing issues.

17:56

These are the sort of things that the maintenance contractors for national grid would it's in their interest to address that and not not to, to just sort of leave it as as as it is. So I think it's about the effectiveness of the management strategy in the first few years to ensure the establishment, which then minimizes the need for actions beyond the five years. But not to say that there isn't that there's no, because National Grid retain control. It's not like it's been handed back to the landowner.

18:26

Those areas around the substation, so there's still that ability to to undertake that, you know, additional management, if that's required. The other point that was made was that it wasn't appropriate to carry on

the management and maintenance because certain areas might need to be removed in the future of the planting that has been there as for mitigation. So I just like to understand what sort of future works might be necessary that might necessitate the removal of the mitigation planting.

18:58

The offer of the applicant may draw other people from national burden on on this response, but I think it was more about the proposal to maintain planting in perpetuity, that was the issue in the sense that we may not be able to achieve that in every instance, because of these additional words.

19:17

Or don't, or potential additional works. I'm not sure if somebody else from National Grid could comment on what those words might entail, or I think that would be helpful. Thank you, Richard. And if the applicant I think really is probably just encompassing the situation where future development comes forward, which requires a change to arrangement transit substation, so we've got we already know about developments that have come forward.

19:48

Monk fryston, the battery storage schemes and so on. So it's something of that nature. Coming forward that would require changes to be made to the arrangements for mitigation planting, for new over sailing or

20:00

New

20:01

underground cables going into the substation.

20:05

Thank you

20:10

that I'm going to turn to the well, I think I'll go to Leeds City Council first and was white and just a reaction to what you've heard, because I recognize that you made the point about in perpetuity, management and maintenance. Thank you, Louise whitely city council, I think in principle leads us position is that any replacement and mitigation planting by any developer should be protected permanently, as removal of a day after the five years have expired would, for instance, not be sustainable, and to could undermine the purposes of delivering the mitigation planting in the first place.

20:48

So permanent mitigation planting within leads. If that is the case could be secured within the section 106 agreement with the relevant landowners party to that.

21:00

I think this would be overall in the interests of sustainability. And then moving on to excuse me, planting of any kind should be undertaken. I think only where there is an expectation

21:13

that it can be delivered in perpetuity and not be disturbed in the future by removal or unexpected developments coming forward seeking its removal. Thank you.

21:23

Thank you, Mr. Attorney. Do you want to respond to that?

21:29

Registering for the African I think there's, there's there's two. As you're aware, there's two points about the plant and there's the plant and it's on land that's not within national waste control and the plant and it's on land that is within National Grid's control slightly different considerations apply to each in terms of the land that's outside control. It's really based around

21:51

the principles of reinstating, planting and making sure that

21:56

where there is loss, it's reinstated. And this replacement planting. We don't think that falls within the same set of categories as to being described in terms of permanent

22:09

sort of structural mitigation being provided. In terms of the areas within national grids control around the substation sites, in particular, that

22:22

planting for the reasons were described, it's the maintenance obligation, we think is the appropriate one because it gets you beyond the period when you'd be concerned about the growth. It is focused on woodland planting, rather than on a type of planting that requires more intensive ongoing management to maintain it.

22:42

And

22:44

for the reasons we've described, and in perpetuity obligation is going to potentially impede future development around those substation locations and ensure we don't think it's necessary to address the effects of the project. But I think it's a point of difference that we we understand and we don't see being resolved.

23:05

Thank you

23:11

I'll move on to

23:15

North Yorkshire Council. Now Shall I turn to Mr. John's again on management and maintenance.

23:21

Mr. John's.

23:23

So your position is 30. North Yorkshire Council's position is 30 years for

23:31

for maintenance. And sorry, I just need to go back when you can tell me what your position is

23:38

not able to cancel I'm gonna get colleagues to speak specifically about the 30 year maintenance. But I would just I just like to go back to the proposed mitigation for the substation sites. The

23:53

the advice from the applicants very useful, the landscape architect and the arborist Thank you very much. We did touch on this issue of maintenance beyond the five years in our meeting with the applicant last Friday.

24:07

Granted that you know much of the groundwork of the maintenance will take place in those first five years. Our concern though is after that, we would like to see some mechanism, a clear mechanism in place to ensure there is ongoing woodland management after that five years.

24:25

We we have concerned that screening

24:29

is not always in keeping with local landscape character. And we've been clear about that when our local impact report. So it's just we want to confidence there is a mechanism to for instance, help allow tree canopies to establish effectively, which, you know, might not be achieved in those first five years.

24:50

Thank you. Well, you're going to bring up you're going to bring your colleagues Yeah, have you turned over to Michael

24:59

general

25:00

over the North Yorkshire Council. And I just wanted to add to that about the point about the 30 year maintenance was that on the recent appeal decision, which was determined by wherever hearing for the battery case,

25:14

the our landscape consultant at that time, had concerns about a five year maintenance plan, particularly because there was a percentage of larger species incorporated into the landscaping scheme. So I think that the higher percentage of

25:30

larger trees that are going to be incorporated into it, the greater the risk of those failing because there just is a higher failure rate for those for larger species and also adding factoring into that the

25:45

more free frequent, hotter, drier summers that we get now that our landscape consultant at that time, advised that a longer maintenance period should be included to ensure its survival. I think that particular scheme may have had a higher proportion of mature trees in this particular scheme. So it may have been more relevant. But on the appeal decision, the inspector

26:09

required the landscaping scheme to be maintained for the lifetime of the development, which was a temporary period for the batteries, but it was a 40 year period. So Cindy, just just a relevance to point that out. Thank you. Thank you. That's helpful.

26:25

I'll just turn to

26:28

just to get the full picture from the council's to

26:32

city of York now Mr. Baldry

26:35

just to confirm that you are

26:39

agree in agreement with the applicants five years for both management and maintenance and replacement? Yes, that's correct. Yeah. Thank you.

26:57

I sort of I do feel that

27:01

there's a difference between obviously, as Mr. Turner you've you've set out there is a difference between the ongoing management and maintenance where you do have control and where you don't have control. So I can I'm the the point that you're making about the five years for the

27:20

reinstatement mitigation, planting. And

27:25

I don't know whether there's ever any discussions with the landowners about how they might continue management and maintenance. But perhaps that's something that we could just have a note on whether there would be during the negotiations with landowners, whether there's any discussion about how they will continue to maintain and that, in some ways might alleviate Leeds City Council's

27:49

point about the potential to remove it's almost as soon as it had been the five years were up.

27:56

In terms of national grid slammed, then I'm

28:02

it seems to me that woodland

28:06

planting does need some interventions beyond year six. And it's sort of

28:15

I'm not really clear why there's a resistance to putting something into the DCO. I'm and I'm not saying necessarily that it needs to be 30 years or in perpetuity. But whether there can't be some differentiation in the TCO with regards to the two types of planting and whether there could be more of a commitment on National Grid slammed to

28:41

continue to ensure that that planting is

28:46

contributing an undertaking its biodiversity landscaping and visual mitigation. So I we can pick this up at the DCO hearing on Friday, if it's easier to do that rather than spend time today. But I we will be

29:03

continuing to make the point that that planting is there for a function that is strongly mitigation, planting and

29:11

the commitment to something we'd like to see the commitment to something.

29:20

And I think if we don't get any further on Friday, we'll probably ask for some without prejudice wording with regards to that.

29:34

Unless anybody else has got anything on management and maintenance, then I'm going to move swiftly on to good design. Can I just jump in there just to say that we might have a slight change of program just on just for the sake of everyone who's expecting things? What's coming next on the agenda and just to suggest that biodiversity is going to slip down until later in the agenda which probably take it into tomorrow morning. So as long as that doesn't

30:00

cause any problems for anybody in the room or joining us virtually.

30:07

Okay, so the right people will still be present tomorrow appreciate the flexibility on that one, it just helps us to get more of Mr. Jones's topics in while he's with us in person today. So let you carry on.

30:21

I'm so in terms of the applicants

30:25

design approach to site specific infrastructure, which is referred to as the dassie, which was rep 2049. We're just really wants to seek views from the council's present and any other IPS on this approach. So just our understanding is that it's some of the content of the dassie is secured via requirements 18, which is a new requirement. But what is secured is the external color and surface finish of any permanent buildings. And that is all it is secured. So we have a dusty document that covers many other topics, but there's only one or two elements of it that is secured in the DCO. So we just wanted really to get the local authorities views on that. And I'll go to North Yorkshire Council first as you are in the room.

31:17

General wood, North Yorkshire Council,

31:20

I think we're reasonably comfortable with with the contents of this, and it does contain options for different materials, external, the actual materials of the buildings. So that's clearly not not fixed. And I think most of the other elements are,

31:39

you know, engineering or, or different types of equipment, which there isn't really a lot of option for variation in design. So we're reasonably happy with with this document.

31:53

So in terms of fencing, acoustic fencing, access traffic surfacing landform, you'd be content for none of that to be secured in the DCO.

32:09

I think I'd probably like to come back to you on that point. And give it give it some further consideration on those details. Potentially, yes. On some of the fencing and Surface Materials, yes.

32:20

But I think if we could, could we provide some notes? Certainly, certainly, deadline floor if you if you'd like further time to look at that.

32:29

Our feeling is that we've got an entire document, this is focused on design, and we've only got surface and color treatment of one material that is actually secured. So whether there should be more secured in the DCO. Now we will

32:46

we will raise this again on Friday at the DCO hearing, but we'll we'll await your comments deadline for as well. Mr. Reynolds, Michael Reynolds NYC. You know, in other similar schemes where we have

33:00

malware that has been design, guys, we have expected detailed design to come forward in accordance with the detailed design with that design, and it may I just pointed to Georgia to temos razor queries. Oh, yes. Sorry, Mr. Johnson.

33:20

Short, I'm just going to Tim Jones from North Yorkshire Castle, I'm just going to lower my hand. And before I forget, could I just check in terms of the height of the buildings? Is there an indication of the height of the substation substation buildings that's secured elsewhere?

33:35

In the parameter plans, which are part of the design drawings, thank you.

33:42

So I, we, we have talked about that before, and the applicant has amended those drawings. And we're, we're content that that is that it's actually secured. It's the softer sort of design elements that were the covered in the task. The and we're just exploring whether I'm, as Mr. Reynolds has that has eluded whether the entirety of that document should be secured or whether it's appropriate to just be securing the parks that are currently proposed by the applicant.

34:17

But if you prefer to have discussions with your colleagues, then we'll await the response that deadline for

34:25

Mr. John seems to have disappeared. Yes, that's fine. Thank you. Okay.

34:31

So, Mr. Weiss, I'm not sure if you want to make any comments.

34:37

Thank you. I think I agree with you that

34:42

the details need to be up front and in a document with which we all approve, or details to be submitted at a later stage. Either way, I don't think it's fair to leave it open to question. Thank you. Thank you.

35:00

I've just got one, maybe I'll come back to, you know, Mr. Turney on that on that point, but I've gotten to the point, Reg attorney for the applicant ensured that the data is supposed to form a particular purpose, which is to

35:16

give more description as to how the substation CSX will be designed. And, therefore, it's serving that sort of narrative purpose, as well as providing a guidance point for this specific approval. So the scope for the DRC is broader than the specific approval, which we think is appropriate. Why are we limiting ourselves to that specific approval? It is really because of the

35:48

fact that most of the design of these these piece of infrastructure is is driven by engineering.

35:55

But certainly we've we've taken on board your point, that there may be other elements that that really are about color and finishing, which might be for within the same scape as the bill as the buildings on the site. So the those buildings, obviously, we've identified that there are some enclosures that the details could be settled later down the line. But we'll we'll take away your point about whether there's more subsurface treatment type issues that could be dealt with, by way of approvals. The promise, if I just describe something that we saw yesterday, so we were at some columns farm looking over the the gates there, towards the existing substation at monk fryston. And the control building there or the offices are brick, and they sort of merge into the rest of the infrastructure. So you know, you're not really particularly aware that there's a building there. And then on the left hand side, there's a workshop or I asked Mr. Fowler, what it was, which is very bright white,

37:02

metal, and it's sort of it was a beautiful, sunny day, so it was sort of dazzling. So that's what jumps out. And so the reason we're sort of

37:13

doggedly going on about this is that

37:16

had that workshop, I'm not saying it needed to be brick, but if it had been a different color, or a different,

37:23

you know, less shiny materials, and it would blend into the landscape or into the rest of the infrastructure better. And we would just like to ensure that those sorts of matters are covered somehow and can be, we're not asking them to be secured now. But we want something that the local authority can use to satisfy itself when the future submissions come forward. So if that explains opposition a bit better, that's helpful. Thank you. But perhaps again, we can come back to this on Friday. terms, the requirements? Yeah, yeah. And just, I think the final point is just in terms of the the land form, and again, you're the applicant has justified its approach

38:10

for the steep berms citing land, take existing embankment profiles, etc.

38:20

Although I think there was also a caveat about there could be some discussion about sort of local

38:28

design at a detailed design stage, I take your point about the need for height and restricting land take.

38:38

But even within an engineered slope, that can be minor variations. And that something again, that I think the local authorities ought to be able to have a view on to, to work with you at the detailed design stage. So something in the dusty that doesn't restrict your ability to limit the lands that you take out or the applicants the Undertaker's land take and provide the tallest possible bunding to ensure the screening takes place but equally,

39:14

that just to allow some variation, and even if there's planting on it, then the slope with a bit of variation to its topography looks different from a completely engineered slope. So that's just something else we'd like to see if there's a way that something can be

39:30

secured.

39:33

I'm I haven't got anything further on that. And I just look around and see if the local authorities have got anything more Miss Weiss or Mr. Baldry?

39:46

Nothing from me. Thank you

39:49

saying nothing from me either. Thank you. Thank you. So Mr. Cerny, if you want to come back on any of that now, no. Okay. So in that case, I'll hand back to

40:00

you, Miss Paris.

40:02

And I shall head straight over to Mr. Jones. He's going to move straight on. So we're leapfrogging over item seven, and we'll we'll return to it tomorrow morning, I expect. And so now we'll move on to Item eight, which is flood risk and water resources.

40:16

Thank you, Miss Paris. Miss Reynolds.

40:20

I'm sorry to interrupt.

40:22

Is it are we able to confirm if we will be going to biodiversity net gain at all today? I'll do we confirming that that will be tomorrow. I think it will be tomorrow. Would I be able to dismiss our ecologists? Yeah, guys. I think that's right. We will be available for the first hour of assuming between 10 and 11. Tomorrow if that's okay. Yeah. Just the first hour tomorrow. I think the way things are going I think that looks okay. I think yeah, it's fine to let her go today and will bear in mind the fact that she's most likely available first thing tomorrow morning. That's appreciated. Thank you guys so much. And we can flex it to get get it in within that hour. Yeah, something I don't know if you need to rearrange your front bench, Mr. Turney, we've got it's just it's Mr. Anderson's right. He's, he's online. So okay, I was just gonna say we'll probably get through our agenda item eight, pretty quickly. So you might want to consider noise as well in that if anyone needs to move, I'll let people reshuffled whilst you while she makes. Yeah, okay. Because I don't know. It'd be pretty quick on eight. Mr. Anderson. I can see is ready to ready to come on. He's trying to turn.

41:25

Okay, thank you.

41:27

We've kind of touched on this already an agenda item three be anyway in terms of eight a one. And it was really just for an update.

41:37

In terms of the latest statement of common ground with the Environment Agency.

41:42

There were no matters not agreed there were some matters outstanding,

41:47

which are relating to

41:51

the

41:54

permits for the discharge of our take them in order actually. flood risk activity permit requirements,

42:03

permits for the discharge of treated sewage effluent

42:07

reuse of excavated material storage of waste and WF D Water Framework Directive. Compliance. And it was only really, Mr. Anderton for an update from yourselves on where you are with the with that, in terms of the next statement, a common ground with the Environment Agency. That's true. And it deadline five, please.

42:29

Yes, thank you, Steve Anderson for national grid. So we had a very useful meeting with the Environment Agency on Monday afternoon, where we went through remaining matters outstanding from the deadline one statement of common ground,

42:48

we were able to agree that we will be able to move all current matters outstanding to matters agreed the next update of the SOCC with the exception of a couple of details relating to requirements for flood risk activities permits, which will require some additional discussion just to get to the bottom of

43:13

the first of those related to

43:17

whether the environmental agency would want to permit construction activities in the floodplain beyond the eight meter standoff distance from what cost is. And secondly,

43:30

there is some issues to be resolved as to whether all of the overhead line over sales will qualify for the exemption from certain risk activities. permittees.

43:42

Thank you, Mister and attendant asking you to do a bit of crystal ball gazing but are you likely to reach agreement on those matters before the examination closes?

43:54

I would envisage that we would meet

43:57

reach agreements on those matters. Yes, they are matters of detail rather than substance I would say.

44:04

Thank you. I know we've got Mr. Wilcock from the environment agency with us as well. This afternoon. Did you wish to add anything to that Mr. Woodcock,

44:14

Matthew Wilcock Environment Agency had nothing to offer me that's an accurate reflection of where we are at the minute. Okay, thank you very much.

44:23

And if I can

44:24

move on to a different bit related subject.

44:29

In terms of the proposed work set cocked back, what is the likelihood of this being undertaken using horizontal directional drilling HDD, which would be the environment agency's preference? And when will you finally know your construction technique? There?

44:47

Might be one for Mr. File or even a yes. So Steve Anderson for National Grid. I think I'll defer to Mr. Fowler on that one. Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Mr. Fowler, Steve Hall and that works cocked back out of the undergrounding of the night.

45:00

Hold on power grid

45:02

11 KV redline. So we are in discussions with Nonnberg power we're currently as to how they would undertake those works. And they are looking at what a design could look like. So it might be something that we can provide further update at the next deadline following discussion with them, but we are

discussing how their what their construction methodology would be in it around quarterback. And again, Mr. Fowler looking into the future, Is this likely to be successfully negotiated before? Closer the examination? Yeah, so let's we'll, we'll get to an agreed position on that one. Thank you.

45:37

That's all I had on eight, a.

45:42

And then in terms of eight B, which is about the environment agencies.

45:48

Should we say preference for the flood risk assessment in ES chapter nine to be certified documents? I do note your response in rep. 30312. There. So I noticed you've already replied

46:03

in some detail about that. But since we're all here in the room with the Environment Agency as well, is there anything else you would wish to add to that?

46:12

Rich attorney for the applicant? First of all, I think, Mr. Anderson, correct me but I think we've spoken now to the Environment Agency about this. So hopefully, their concern has been addressed through our approach, which is the issue about reference to the FRA was turned on the requirement for a specific design level.

46:36

And

46:38

that has been secured through the through the drawings.

46:42

And hopefully that should be enough to address the environment agency's concern, I think we will get into the same point but in a different means from the one they suggested. Thank you. Mr. Toney. Miss Rhonda, Tim, was anything you wish to add before I revert to Mr. Wilcock.

46:56

Nothing to add for me. Okay, Mr. Wilcox, you've heard what Mr. Turney said. Is there anything else you wish to add to that?

47:03

Marcy Wilcock Environment Agency? No, nothing to hide from me. Thank you.

47:08

Okay. Thank you very much. I don't have any further questions on flood risk matters. Was there anything from the local authorities? I'll start with North Yorkshire, no. Leeds or city of York.

47:25

Mark Baldry city of York Council? Nope. Nothing from us on that one. Thank you, Mr. Gray. is white.

47:33

Please, why no, nothing to add. Thank you. Okay, thank you. Which case, I think we've done Agenda Item eight, in which case, I'll move on to Agenda Item straight through to agenda item nine, if I can, please.

47:48

Which is noise and vibration?

47:53

And I'll start with the question regarding the construction noise and the proposed working hours. Now I've seen

48:03

a reasonable amount of detail on this already. Obviously, I know what

48:08

the applicants preferred working hours are as set out in requirements seven of the DCO. I know what

48:16

North Yorkshire council would prefer. I know what

48:21

Leeds has had to say about this and also city of York.

48:26

But I did notice in the last, the latest statement of common ground, from Leeds City Council, rep 3022. That Leeds now seems to agree with the construction working hours as proposed by the applicant. Miss White was you'd like to provide any further explanation on this or you prepare a content for the SOC do to speak for itself.

48:49

Me can speak for itself, but we reached agreement with the applicant on the proposed car working hours because the embedded mitigation, at least in our opinion, and Lee's indicates are significant adverse effects on local immunity would not arise.

49:04

With respect to the working hours of piling, there was a considered to be acceptable, and are typically within the working hours that we originally proposed in the local impact report.

49:16

Obviously, Lee's and the applicant now agreed that the proposed out of our sorry, out of car hours operations are also unlikely to result in significant adverse effects by way of noise and that's justified within the application. But we further that, for certainty, we've identified identify the types of work which could take place out of core hours within the statement of common ground. And finally, in respect to the proposed one hour ramping up time and the one hour ramping downtime.

49:50

at both ends of the call working hours we've been assured by the applicant that works within these periods are unlikely to result in significant adverse effects. Those were

50:00

It's called primarily relate to administrative staffing sites set up by the Site Manager, which given the embedded mitigation is unlikely to result in significant effects on local amenity. Thank you. Thank you, Miss White, in which case I'll

50:17

turn to North Yorkshire Council and I'm looking at Mr. Hopper. Yes, I see a nod from your colleague, Mr. Hopper. Okay. Hello, welcome. Can you explain your concerns about the proposed working hours? And also in particular, which elements or elements of the proposed work in the applicants proposed working hours? Do you have the most concerns about by that? I mean, is it the earliest start time of 7am? Is it the later working on Saturdays? Is it proposed working on Sundays and bank holiday? Or is it a combination of those or all of those?

50:55

Yeah, yep. Jack Harper nasty Archie counsel.

51:00

Primarily, it's the Sunday prank holiday workings for us. Our position has been quite clear from from the start, we'd like to avoid working on Sunday and bank holidays. We can appreciate the the ramping up power and closing down our

51:17

it is purely the Sundays and bank holidays and we had a meeting on Monday this week.

51:25

And I developed it reached a consensus on that.

51:31

Thank you Mr. Thapa. Perhaps the applicant might wish to provide further details of that meeting then

51:37

Giles Hein the BSP for the opinions on noise and vibration matters.

51:43

We met with North Yorkshire Council on Monday to discuss the various works, the embedded mitigation and the methodology behind the construction noise assessment.

51:59

It was agreed that the methodology and the outcomes of the assessment were correct in the council's opinion, but there was a fundamental difference of opinion on the concept of Sunday working hours which from using the code of practice brushed under 5228 We have established that the works can go ahead with no significant impact the threshold of significance is not exceeded by any works

52:35

with the exception of the trouble of sight in mug price than anywhere on the project.

52:45

So, you saying that you would have in effect carve out any works near the traveler site or you would keep going with the Sunday working and there will be a significant effect on the travelers site. The significance effect is from a combination of different works that have been assessed together that that may or may not be undertaken at the same time

53:10

to determine where

53:12

when additional mitigation would be required. And it will require a bit of further consideration on the the actual works to be undertaken in the vicinity of the Trump sites such that the screening and and scheduling of noisy works can be undertaken with minimized impact. And there may be some residual impacts that are significant. They should be of a very short duration and such that in the context of environmental impact assessment, they are deemed to be non significant. So you'd be looking to do those

54:00

through if anything

54:03

variational

54:05

of the noise and vibration management plan rather than specifically put in wording in the DCO to specify the works that couldn't couldn't be done at the traveller site.

54:18

Yes, that would be the case. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Hoppy. Did you have any anything wish to add about that?

54:27

Yeah, so yeah. What I think it's important to note the we were happy with the assessment methodology that Charles has just described.

54:39

The noise levels reported within the

54:45

within the relevant chapter 14 and table 14 to six. The construction night

54:52

inevitably shows we've got some dominant construction knows

55:00

So the assessment methodology is not disputed. But there are limitations to that. So the, you know, the quantified impacts on average. So, doesn't account for, you know, la what we refer to as La Max levels, or clanging and banging. It's an average of the whole day.

55:19

And also low level noise that can be annoying things like reversing alarms, and that we wouldn't get picked up. So

55:29

I don't think it can be disputed that the levels report and will have impacts in in quiet areas, as is the case here.

55:39

And our position is that they shouldn't occur on Sundays and bank holidays.

55:44

We did discuss on during our meeting on Monday, whether there was scope to restrict working hours relevant to the substation in more price than in isolation, because

55:57

there's an acknowledgment that the replacement of the old headlines would be short lived. Whereas the substation itself would be a lengthy construction phase. So we did consider that as an option. But our preference would be no working Sundays and bank holidays, because there is inevitably some impact whether or not it conforms to the standard, there are limitations to the to the standard.

56:26

Okay. So in terms of

56:30

mitigation, is it your argument, then Mr. Hopper, that there isn't really that much the applicant can do to assuage your concerns, if they go into work on Sunday and bank holiday, and then that's likely to remain your position until the close of the examination?

56:50

Yes, that would be looked at that without being opposition, the Mitigation Scheme is, is tailored and designed to satisfy the standard, the construction standard, so that there's comfort that way. But the applicant can reduce the levels to,

57:11

to where we're not getting significant impacts as far as the standards concerned, but our observations are that the noise levels because the standards obviously quite generous, to enable construction to to occur. But the there are some issues with the

57:28

the levels that have been reported and the background levels in the receptors. So it's a quiet, really quiet area, alongside quite high construction noise. So we are going to get some impact, certainly decline in bagging and reversing alarms, things like that.

57:46

That can't really be mitigated in my opinion.

57:50

Okay, thank you. Mr. Harper. Before I go back to the applicant, Mr. Carruthers, you've got your hand up. Is there anything you wish to add based on what you've heard so far?

57:59

Yes, sir, as we've spoken with your cue green about this, and they're proposing some mitigation

58:08

for the traveler site.

58:12

Which, apart from which the travelers aren't that bothered that much bothered by the fact there's going to be noise.

58:20

Okay, thank you, Mr. Carruthers, I'll get the applicant if you can just respond to all from what you've heard, and especially the issue about Sunday and bank holiday work. And please, Mr. Attorney, orig attorney for the applicant, I'll come back to Mr. Hein in a moment. But I just want to emphasize that whilst we recognize the North Yorkshire council have standard working hours, here, we have a site specific assessment, which is applied the relevant British Standard, there's no methodological dispute. And of course, when you're considering whether a requirement is to be imposed, you need to consider whether it's necessary, and whether it's reasonable in its terms. And we say that the evidence here

supports the idea that it's not necessary to further cut down those working hours because significant effects will be avoided.

59:06

And that's in light of the series of mitigation measures in the CSCP. General generally, and then more specifically, in the noise and vibration management plan.

59:18

And the nature of the construction activities.

59:22

There was reference to context in terms of background noise levels, and whilst there may be some quieter, relatively quiet areas in the area, the British Standard and that we're applying in 5228.

59:41

Sets levels for significance of construction, noise effects, and that's guidance which is intended to apply for all areas. So the specific reference to background noise levels isn't one which we think alters the position.

59:58

So in short, we don't think it's reasonable

1:00:00

have to cut down those working hours at such a restriction as unjustified. In

1:00:07

operational terms in during the construction period. For this scheme, we've explained the urgency of the need and the reason why we need to proceed with it. In practical terms,

1:00:20

the project needs to be constructed at pace. There are

1:00:27

working practices which mean that it's likely that there'll be periods where teams are working throughout weekends, potentially bank holidays as well. And that that is standard in the industry and is to be expected, it means that the construction period will be shorter than it would otherwise be. But also it means the project will be delivered in a timely fashion. So we say there's good reason on one side to keep the construction hours we have, and there isn't a good reason on the other side to cut them down, it's not justified to do so,

1:01:00

in terms of any specifics of impacted if miss home wants to come back in,

1:01:06

to assign to the applicant.

1:01:09

Going back to the methodology, which the council have agreed with our application of it, it's important to understand that the British Standard 5228 Is is not just a standard operating procedure, it is an approved code of practice under the control Pollution Act. So the government have given it the ascent to represent construction noise

1:01:37

in

1:01:39

in this country,

1:01:41

the

1:01:44

the instantaneous levels that might arise are

1:01:51

a context that should be considered, but it has been considered in the siting of the project away from residential areas such that there is a significant standoff distance between most works and most receptors

1:02:14

the average sound level over a 10 hour period or an hour in the way that we have assessed it

1:02:26

is the standard methodology within the standard. So, it would be difficult to to move away from from that to create a bespoke assessment methodology.

1:02:42

Because it would just be different for every single receptor sector every single single project

1:02:51

that we undertook any construction was assessment upon

1:02:56

the underlying background levels are important in Annex E of the standard, there are some recommended levels that are used as the thresholds of significance and they are differentiated by different noise categories depending on the existing ambient noise levels in the local area. And we have considered that this is a very quiet area, and so have selected the lowest category for the for our assessment. And still under those terms, there is no significance. So we feel that

1:03:44

restricting the working hours on the basis that it might cause a problem when all the controls in place with the noise vibration management plan secured by DCO. With the screening secured as part of the noise and vibration management plan should be sufficient to warrant the words carrying forward with suitable control.

1:04:10

Thank you, Mr. Hunt. Mr. Turney kind of preempted one of my questions, but I'll still ask it anyway. I think because you might want to go into more detail maybe Mr. Fowler might wish to add something and that was

1:04:22

what would the implications be for the construction program if, say North Yorkshire councils preferred hours and set aside say the hour in the morning and Saturday afternoon that say if North Yorkshire is no working on Sundays and bank holidays were to be adopted? What practical implications would that mean for your construction program?

1:04:43

Steve financial good.

1:04:45

That could have have have quite significant impacts on the construction program.

1:04:50

We have a very tight construction program that is linked to a large outage sequence. These outages don't need to be able to secured at certain points in the year

1:05:00

As

1:05:01

the network requirements only allow these to be secured at certain points for certain time periods. So we can only switch certain circuits out for certain lengths, which means that we need all of the seven days in the these kind of, in these timescales to be able to meet the outage requirements. But outside of the ocean currents, we have to have the infrastructure ready to be able to accommodate the red lines, and these outage works. And similarly, at the substations, we have eight super good transformers that need to be delivered. So we need to be able to book factory slots, these need to be able to shipped over from wherever they are being manufactured. And they need to be able to land and be ready for installation at a substation or say, a certain period of time when those delivery slots are. These are booked months and years in advance. And they're very difficult to move once these, once we've made those AUTOSAR. any slippage on that would mean that we could have potential if these equipment supports not being able to come to site and that we would miss an outage window. So not having the flexibility to be able to do this work. So that could have seen significant impacts on the program. Thank

you, Mr. ferula. I'll just revert to Mr. Hoppy. Is there anything you wish to say based on what you've heard from the applicant side?

1:06:27

I guess only that there are other things to consider around.

1:06:31

Obviously, when you've got construction site, you've got hive of activity. I'm not sure if we know exactly where the construction compound is yet. I've certainly not seen a site plan. But it might be an overlook on my part. I know there is one proposed addendum for leisten. But obviously that needs some general consideration. And things like traffic, real tins for

1:06:57

construction HGVs and things. So though, there's a wider issue around

1:07:05

potential for noise impacts that aren't that are a byproduct for the site itself and the build itself. So which probably aren't considered so that I guess that is another thing to consider Sunday Bank Holiday working, where you've got these other things happening alongside the build.

1:07:23

Thank you, Mr. Harper, did the applicant wish to say anything on on that child's home for the applicant, the traffic has been assessed and and is negligible in noise terms.

1:07:35

In terms of the

1:07:38

micro siting of the

1:07:42

temporary construction compounds, were confident that the assessment allows for some margin of error with the acknowledgement that any change in the location is not going to be drastic. And if it was, then it would need to be reassessed. Anyway. Thank you, Mr. Klein. I will just make a final point on this. And that is

1:08:06

it doesn't sound like there's going to be a coming together of minds on the issue of Sunday and bank holiday working. And if there isn't, then I think the examining authority is highly likely to be asking for final position statements from both sides setting out your arguments while or why not. And that would be deadline seven.

1:08:31

If agreement isn't reached by then hopefully it will be but it doesn't it doesn't sound like it's going to be so. Yes. We have Mr. Fletcher, I'd like to come in doesn't move off. This does certainly Mr. Fletcher

1:08:46

is just a question in the construction industry. We have a rating of 55 DBS if the noise gets above that, then obviously sites shut down, especially in cities. What BBB rating are you working on?

1:09:03

John's home for the applicant. So Annex II of British Standard 5228 sets out the thresholds of interference and the daytime which covers Monday to Friday.

1:09:19

Seven till seven is

1:09:23

65 decibels, the evening and weekend levels which constitute seven till 11 in the weekdays and 1pm till

1:09:38

11 on

1:09:42

the weekend and all day Sunday is 55 decibels. And for the night time, it's 45.

1:09:52

So one you said was the level above 76 And you just say

1:09:58

no as I said before

1:10:01

Was it daytime? It's 6565. So it's 10 about

1:10:08

this visor, Sandoval. Now,

1:10:13

I know you've quoted quite a lot of,

1:10:15

you know, conditions vary. I was just trying to get down to a simple number such that everybody can understand. I think there's to summarize what you were just told it's daytime is 65. Evening is 55. Nighttime is 45. I think the extra numbers, we're just trying to tell this tell us the times that are that are evening daytime and nighttime. If that helps.

1:10:39

Okay.

1:10:40

In terms of I think that's everything on nine, a we have Mr. Hoppers hand.

1:10:48

Sorry, Mr. Hopper.

1:10:50

Sorry, I just wanted to comment on that just just for context. And Charles will probably default to the standard again, but the 65 DB threshold criteria, the background levels, in certainly around monk fryston substation are around

1:11:09

30 DB,

1:11:12

la 90. That's the predictions anyway, in the operational noise assessments.

1:11:18

I guess what I'm the point I'm trying to make is, is that you've got really low background levels of around 30 DB, then you've got construction noise of the threshold of 65 db. So that's actually a plus 35 dB of a background check not to get too technical. Well, that's that's a 35 dB increase from what you've you've what's existing, is quite massive, really, in acoustic terms. So although you've got compliance with the standard, you've got quite a potential for significant impacts.

1:11:52

Aside from

1:11:55

Thank you Miss sharper work neatly straying into nine beaner, which was the noise assessment methodology. And having heard earlier on that, that's all been agreed.

1:12:06

We are, it seems like we stop has certainly raised a

1:12:12

comment, if not a concern about a potential of up to 35 dB over 30 DB background noise at the qualities period. Mr. Hein, did you wish to make any comments about that? Yes, please. Just home for the applicants. The standard and particularly Annex II of the standard

1:12:33

stipulates that the criteria for construction noise are subject to lower cutoff levels, which we have discussed previously. 65 for daytime 35 for evening, and 45. For nighttime. Those are the approved Code of Practice levels. And the approved code of practice does not make any differentiation between underlying background subject to the lower cutoff levels that we have used the lowest categories. So the the assessment is the most conservative assessment for a construction noise assessment that the code of practice allows. Thank you, Mr. Hall. And just before I go back to Mr. Harper. Mr. Stevenson, did you wish to make any comments? Yes. My receptors if we call them that, were yesterday, I think possibly the

1:13:32

proposed access pass the House passed that there are two properties is the closest on the whole line.

1:13:41

And I would like to

1:13:45

withhold my position on putting on revisiting the working hours on their behalf dependent on whether we come to an agreement with with

1:13:58

national grid on the construction going past the houses or not. Okay. Thank you for your concern. Your comments are noted. Mr. Harper, did you wish to say anything else about the note? I mean, our next series of questions was on noise assessment methodology. But obviously, I heard earlier on that that seems to have been agreed, but there still might be some residual concern. So is there anything else you wish to add about any concerns you had about the the assessment methodology the applicants used?

1:14:27

No, not on the construction side? I believe moving on to operational at some point. We will be indeed Yes.

1:14:40

I just had a question.

1:14:43

Probably again to Mr. Hopper.

1:14:46

And then back to the applicant it was regarding the temporal criteria, the applicant is applied that comes from Annex II of BS 5228.

1:14:56

I noise impacts are only considered significant if they occur for

1:15:00

10 or more days, in any consecutive 5015 days or 40 days in six months.

1:15:06

Did you wish to make any comments about that temporary element to the consideration of significance?

1:15:15

No, I don't think

1:15:17

it's quite unpredictable. You can make

1:15:21

better best predictions that you can to the construction phase, but

1:15:26

I think the assessments sounds as far as we're concerned.

1:15:32

Okay. And before I just add a question to that to the applicants, I'm jumping ahead a bit, but in terms of your latest version of the ES consolidated a router document, which is by my reckoning rep, three double O eight, you've made some changes to the wording of paragraph 2.1. Point two of the acoustic screening strategy, which is a PP 1532 part question. Can you explain the reasoning for that? And I wasn't quite sure, because you could read it either way. Does this mean that screening would be applied if the temporal temporal criteria were not met? But if the predicted level was 10 dB higher or higher?

1:16:15

Just fine for the applicant? The reason behind the amendment was it it was a hangover from a previous

1:16:26

methodology that had been superseded.

1:16:30

So it was just making it

1:16:33

tally with the rest of the assessment? And to your second question, it means that if the noise is such that, even with the disregarding the temporal

1:16:50

element to the assessment, the noise levels were over 10 decibels higher than the respective threshold or significant significance, that screening would be applied. Yes, this reading would be applied even if it

was less than the temporal criteria. Okay, thanks. So that's clear language COVID. The travelers site. Right, thank you that that clarifies that point.

1:17:14

I've jumped around a bit. So I'll just see if I have any more questions on B to ask.

1:17:20

In terms of operational noise, then

1:17:27

actually, Mr. Harper of North Yorkshire Council,

1:17:32

in terms of the statement of common ground, it was a in the earlier iteration.

1:17:39

It basically said

1:17:43

it was the operational noise that seemed to be the concern by notice in the latest iteration of statement, a common ground that's now being crossed out in the Track Changes version. And so in the clean version, it just refers to noise and vibration assessment methodologies, being a matter of not not agreed.

1:18:02

So is it your case that it's the operational noise that you're still concerned about? Or both? Obviously, I've heard what you said about the working, working on Sundays and potential concerns about the low background levels? Is that it in a nutshell, or and also, do you want to expand on your operational noise concerns at this juncture? Yeah, we discussed this again on Monday. Other meats, I'm not sure when the amendments have been made, whether it's post me post on there.

1:18:34

We've got issues with the assessment methodology, the the assessment for operational noise, itself adopted, not aware of any peer review or consultation or anything. And there are some issues around

1:18:49

the way that receptors are just screened out, without any proper assessment

1:18:55

began without going into too much detail. But having discussed with the nice consultant Giles,

1:19:03

it's likely that the conclusions would be the same.

1:19:10

Even following the relevant standards, but I think it needs highlighting that the assessment methodology

1:19:18

shouldn't really be agreed, or relied upon both conclusions if carried out within our own party or methodology would probably result in the same conclusions.

1:19:29

But because it's, it's, it's drilled into the

1:19:34

relevant, Approved Documents.

1:19:38

I sort of feel it should be an under that's because I'm not sure I'm only speaking on behalf of the Salvy locality within North Yorkshire council. So that view might be different for other areas of North Yorkshire and wherever your headlines are going.

1:19:55

I think the class has receptors for us

1:19:58

around 100 and see

1:20:00

estimators and it's a replacement of an existing line.

1:20:04

So that there is so that I think we've been reassured on the the the outcomes of the operational noise assessment.

1:20:13

But other methodologies is not agreed if that makes sense.

1:20:17

I hear what you're saying is that likely to be swept up in the next iteration of the statement of common ground?

1:20:25

Yeah, as I say, I'll probably a non agreement on the assessment methodology but agreement with the outcome of non significant impacts. Thank you, did the applicant wish to comment on anything Mr. Hoppus just said

1:20:39

jail time for the applicant, just that the methodology or be it a new iteration of is an evolution of of a document that has been around since 1993. And his route is referenced although not

1:20:58

by name in the policy statement for energy number five,

1:21:05

as a method for

1:21:08

assessing the overhead line noise

1:21:12

there are many reasons why one would not use British standard form for two, which would be Mr. Harper's third option

1:21:23

for measurement in a a wet period of time, which is generally speaking, when the overhead noise would originate.

1:21:33

And in BS form or to the scope section, it also says that the standard should not apply if there is a more representative guidance available. And we would contend that the the national grid

1:21:54

document for assessment to over headlined does form a more appropriate methodology.

1:22:02

And what status does that have in terms of planning? Wait, is it just your is it kind of your operational guidelines? Or is it is it gone through some acknowledgement government validation process, Reg attorney for the applicant so

1:22:20

this time referred you to the National Policy Statement en five, paragraph two point 9.8 explains the problem with applying BS 4142. And then two point 9.9 says that therefore an alternative noise assessment methods deal with rain induced noise as needed, such as the one developed by national grid as described in what was then TR t 9490 93. And then explains what that is. And it says the IPC as it then was, is likely to be able to regard it as acceptable for the applicant to use this or another methodology that appropriately assesses these particular issues. And the point Mr. Hein just touched on was that that document TR t 94, has been updated. And the method that we now use is effectively the successor document to that.

1:23:13

I don't have anything more to say about how that's been tested.

1:23:20

Okay, the, if you do need more information on how that method has been developed, then that's for National Grid's internal annoyed noise expert to provide for a set of some companies not in the room. So if you do need further information on how grid has gone from TRT 94, to the current methodology, then we'd be happy to provide that I think it's an action point, just a brief summary of that would be useful. I'm not expecting chapter and verse but I'm told that he's online even better, we can hear it now and ready.

1:23:58

This is Mr. Morris. I didn't realize who's here. Sorry.

1:24:03

Hello, can you hear me all right.

1:24:06

Can Mr. Morris, Richard Morris, so I work in the environmental engineering team, or national grid. So as always been set out the the new methods to assess overhead line noise are funded fundamentally an evolution of the previous method, which was the TR t 94. One that's been

1:24:27

already mentioned. So it's true to say that this is the first if you like public usage of that method of the new approach. It is or has also been used on a couple of other dcl projects, which are actually running behind this one. During the development method. So the method was development carefully took into account all of the guidance that is available through legislation and World Health Organization, organization guidance. And he's very mindful of the fact that overhead lines themselves are

1:25:00

have a fairly unique noise source, they're linear. And also, they're not inherently noisy. So noise is fundamentally based on external factors. So to use BS four and four, two as the primary assessment method is not really the best approach in order to assess them, the screening approach uses is based on absolute absolute noise levels. And built into those screening criteria

1:25:29

is a lot of conservatism both in the fact that elements of 4142 are used to form the outset, which includes the

1:25:40

penalties that apply to noise levels to take account of character. So if a noise is out of character with an existing area, so a redline noises, is a crackle effectively, it includes those on the outset. And it also uses a noise prediction method, which we know

1:26:02

protects slightly higher levels than we would have done previously. So the screening is very conservative. And therefore we're very confident that were, if we were then to screen in to be as formal for to the outcome. We've been conservative and getting to that point. And we I think we demonstrated that in the response to the previous at the previous deadline, where we did do a very high level BS for two type assessment are one of the receptors for the project.

1:26:33

In terms of its check, there aren't really many ways that we could fully validate or

1:26:43

ask for feedback on a method because it is quite unique. There are not many people with the specialisms to fully

1:26:52

comment on the method. But we do have a portfolio of consultants, which includes Mr. Hein, who's there on our behalf, and other consultants who work with us on other projects. And we have a during its development, we did seek feedback from them on a formal basis about whether the message was likely to be a valid method, when we receive almost always constructive feedback that it was an appropriate method. So we're very confident in it.

1:27:24

And just to bring the point and Mr. Harper's questions about Selby, where his main concerns are, I think the the 275 kV line in almost all circumstances would not be a signal noise source because of the voltage. And as you mentioned, in the southern part of the project during the Soviet era, it's a replacement of an existing line. And in fact, it will still be 275 kV, that's 275,000 volts. And there's a line there now, and there will be a line there in the future, which will in effect operate in the same way. So for that part of the project, there's really no no issue about operational noise in the planning context. And particularly in the context of discussion here.

1:28:07

The foreigner kV line to the north, where we gave the example demonstrated that I think quite clear that appears former to would predict a negligible outcome. And that's the aim of the message is really is to

1:28:20

screen is to screen out the necessity to do a bit formatter, particularly on a long linear project. In the future, there may be a case where it does greening in which case we will do in those circumstances. A big one for two assessment

1:28:37

is good for this project that we've been able to screen out because it shows the operational noise is not going to be not likely to be significant. Hope. Hopefully that answers the question, Does it I'm not sure if eventually we will. Thank you very much Miss moss. Yes, I'm a you even answered the question. I was going to ask about peer review as well. So thank you very much for that. Just before we break, I'll just see, Mr. Hopper or I'll start with you first. Did you have anything else?

1:29:08

To add?

1:29:10

Just just some reservations in what's being said, I don't think there's unless you really want me to go into a lot of detail. While there's if there's been the main issue with the with the methodology is the level at which receptors are screened out, which is 37 db. So obviously, if you live in an area where your background levels are less than 37, there's gonna be some impact before you're even screened into

1:29:39

into the assessments.

1:29:42

And I appreciate and agree to some extent that maybe there should be some

1:29:48

specific methodology and a national standard. A classic example would be wind farm, knows where

1:29:58

there's assessment methodology for

1:30:00

Even for wind turbines, because noise increases when with wind. So that's linked to weather conditions in similar to what's been said here, where in increases

1:30:13

background noise levels.

1:30:15

I do feel that this there are

1:30:19

some issues and concerns with the this particular methodology. And it would be good to get some national guidance agreed. I mean, for example, the residential receptors in the in the in the methodology are considered to be medium sensitivity, well, I would say the highest sensitivity residential receptor,

1:30:42

which obviously changes the box at the port in in terms of significance of impact. So,

1:30:49

you know, that's just my view,

1:30:52

very much in the interest of residential immunity. And

1:30:58

so there's the surface a

1:31:00

difference of interests.

1:31:03

I think because the conclusions drawn between both parties are the same. I don't really think it matters unless you, you'll feel that it needs to be discussed any further.

1:31:15

Yes, thank you, Mr. Harper. Mr. Morris, do you have anything to add to that before I revert to your colleagues? Yeah, so I can just come back at one point, Richard Morris, for the applicant.

1:31:28

Mr. Hop, as I mentioned about the 37 DB screening criteria, and which is in the first screen, I think it's the second screening point.

1:31:40

When we're doing the screening, we are assuming that noise is occurring from the line because, as I mentioned earlier, overhead lines aren't inherently noisy. They make higher levels of noise during rainfall, which is Yeah, which we've discussed, which is quite a difficult area to assess, particularly with poor four, two. And that noise does not occur all the time, it occurs for a percentage of the time. And therefore that 37 DB level takes account is assuming that it's occurring all the time. Cause if you were to prorate that down for the time, when rain may occur, it would, it would

1:32:16

be a different look below level. But because we're assuming it's happening all the time, that is why the screening level is set as it is because it's assuming you've got, in effect, worst case, wet noise level occurring.

1:32:28

If we were then to take that through to a full assessment, because 412442 has within it some guidance on how you basically take account of noncontinuous noise sources or noise that noises that don't occur for your full assessment period. My red lines are really looking at years at a period of a year to prorate the currents of noise. So it's it can be a bit we presented noise charts in the technical Appendix for the screening. But they are not really the charts, he would use for BS form for to assessment as because they assume noise is occurring, when for the majority of the time, noise will have that level will not be occurring. So that's, you know that why the 37 DB threshold is set where it is it takes account of that, to take those into account in the initial screening. If it was set lower, you wouldn't screen anything out. So there wouldn't be any point in having a method that does screening. But there are benefits to a method

of screening because it allows you to focus on on where you need to. And most importantly, for National Grid, it allows us to

1:33:37

ensure we were putting forward the appropriate designs from the outset.

1:33:43

And protecting ourselves as well, because we don't want noise complaints in the future. And we don't want to be managing noise issues in the future. You know, we need to make sure we take account of those in the design, particularly with overhead lines, because once they're operational, there's very, very little you can do to mitigate noise. So it's important that you have the design right in the first place, which is what has been done on this project. Thank you, Mr. Morris. Did anybody else in the room online wish to make any comments? Mr. Fletcher because he was asked if you took a noise reading you know, adjacent to the substation with the existing cables. Now, what is the increase in noise within the larger cables that are going to be installed?

1:34:34

Question You got two sizes. You got the old cable, which has been left there. And then you've got some new cables being installed from the substation, which are bigger capacity. Are we talking about? Monk fryston? Yeah, so what is the increase? So overhead line noise is fundamentally a function of voltage and geometry of the overhead line, the higher the voltage. So when we're talking about 400,000 volts

1:35:00

That's the highest voltage that we currently operate, the higher the voltage, the higher the noise may be. And the larger the geometry, the lower the noise may be, because in effect, it's a, it's a factor of the electrical stress on the conductors. So for the same voltage with larger conductors, all noise prediction models and all the physics tells us that noise will reduce. So I think near monk frighten the foreigner KV lines have been diverted

1:35:26

will be the triple arrow carrier conductor type. So 333 conductors per set of wires, if you like, in a triangular formation, and that's The Quietus that we actually use anywhere for under KV. And just to put that in context, there's a project has been accepted by planning spectrum today, which is proposing triple our carrier conductors on the line. And we've said we've scoped out operational noise from that on that basis. But it's important to note that it has to be you have to have the bigger lattice towers, the bigger conductor system in order to be able to do that. So there's always a balance to be met between the size of the towers and the size of the conductors and the capacity requirements and noise. So to answer your question, would expect the noise to actually reduce slightly depending what the previous conduct has were, but without specifics in front of me, I can't read make more any more detailed comment on that?

1:36:28

Okay, you say it's gonna decrease. Thank you very much. Mr. Morris. I don't have any further questions. Mr. Jones, I just have could be if Mr. Carruthers is still there. I just wondered if we could come back. There's something he said quite near the beginning of the section about the traveller community. Mr. Crothers? Are you still and I can see you in the meeting. But are you currently listening?

1:36:51

Possibly not. We might try again, later. I know we're covering under cumulative. It's just something he said about the construction noise and the traveler site. We'll come back to it. We can pick it up under 12. In which case it's

1:37:04

1537 by my clock.

1:37:08

20 minutes.

1:37:11

Okay, by the timing of the policy when we leave the room, okay, if we if we break now and back at

1:37:19

4pm and we'll be moving on to Agenda Item nine. See, it's 4pm Thank you.