

TRANSCRIPT_YORKSHIREGREEN_ISH4_SESSION2_19072023

Wed, Jul 19, 2023 2:45PM • 1:22:29

00:07

Welcome back, everybody we are the hearing is now resumed. And just before we were interrupted by the fire alarm here, we were just finishing off on biodiversity, which is item three B. So I will just ask a final question about any parties. Whether any parties wish to raise any other biodiversity matters before we move on.

00:34

And I'm not seeing any hands raised. So we will move on then to Item three C which is traffic and transport and I'll hand over to Mr. Jones.

00:44

Thank you, Ms. Powis. As Ms. Power said previously, this agenda was written before we'd had the deadline five submissions, so please bear that in mind as we go through it. Item one is really an update from the transport workshop that took place between representatives from the applicant and also from North Yorkshire Council on the seventh of June 2023. I've seen some items from the workshop they've been submitted in some extracts in the deadline five documents. For example, in Norwich, North Yorkshire Council's response to further written questions. However, can the applicant please provide an update on the workshop and with an emphasis on any matters that have now been agreed that weren't previously agreed? And also any remaining outstanding matters?

01:40

Chris Appleton for National Grid representing the applicant. Yes, as you've alluded to Sir, the the workshop took place on the seventh of June. And I'm pleased to report that it was a very productive workshop and that generally a large number of the outstanding points were in fact discussed and agreed between the two parties. We gave an overview of the general scheme to the council and discussed various matters including historical engagement with North Yorkshire Council. And we agreed between the two parties, we both agreed that historical engagement had in fact taken place with regards the agreement to adopt speed survey results to establish dmr compliant visibility splays and this was acknowledged by both parties. So we have full agreement on the work that's been conducted to date and the the outcomes of the conclusions drawn within the traffic and transportation chapter. So that's that's all good as far as the two parties are concerned. We discussed future engagement between North Yorkshire Council and National Grid prior to the implementation of a temporary streetworks that will be required as part of the scheme and the draft DCO. And again, it was agreed that an appropriate strategy could be agreed between officers of North Yorkshire Council including liaison are things like monthly transportation meetings and requisite applications for for st works

licenses in future. So, we had we had an in principle agreement on those matters. Future engagement between North Yorkshire Council and national grid on the detailed design of access points was discussed and again it was agreed that there is a general requirement under the draft DCR requirement 14 for the applicant to make the appropriate and requisite applications and discuss details of the design of access points with the council. So again, there was a there was a general consensus that there was an agreement there in relation to that point which was previously outstanding. We discuss discuss the HTV routing arrangements within the construction traffic management plan, specifically in relation to North Yorkshire Council's previous concerns about the a 19 and East lane and explain to the council that there had been a minor misunderstanding on their part and that HGV traffic was in fact not proposed to be routed through the annexing or East Line. And as a result there is there is no cause for concern and there's no requirement to improve the geometrical parameters at that junction. We discussed the management of the Rothfield lane and a 63 Junction specifically in relation to topic discussions that had been had previously about a speed limit reduction on that section of the local highway network. And we went back over the the historical discussions that had been had with the council in relation to things like the traffic flow on that receptor, the previous accident record that had been had been logged within the area and the general necessity and appropriateness of such a speed limit reduction and both parties agreed that the delivery of a speed limit reduction was was not historically appropriate and continued not to be appropriate in the local highway authorities eyes instead, both parties are agreed that the the more appropriate solution is in fact the previously agreed left in left out junction arrangement that would require vehicles approaching the site for construction purposes, to continue to the roundabout due east and perform a U turn before then performing the left hand and the left out. maneuver as discussed previously, so this was agreed with the council and we're both in agreement that that is the way forward and no longer is an outstanding issue. And then we also discussed the HGV routing using the Overton road and station Lane junction up to the north near the Overton compound. We discussed the use of this junction in relation to the existing highway network and the visibility splays, which can be achieved out of existing junctions. And the council was in full full agreement with National Grid and their technical team that actually the the visibility offered at these junctions is appropriate and should not cause highway safety concerns as a result of the horizontal alignment constraints, which typically reduces the traffic speeds on that area of the network to a very low minimum, typically around 25 miles an hour which both the council and National Grid were content with and happy within Highway Safety terms in terms of being able to facilitate the construction traffic numbers that would be sent through there. We had agreement on all of these points, there were only two outstanding points. I think that that council raised which were which were previously on agreed where they requested a little additional time just to consider matters. The first one was in relation to the construction traffic management plan, where the council requested some additional time just to just to review the documentation once more and satisfy themselves of the content within that construction traffic management plan. They subsequently did that following the workshop and I believe have provided a response to yourself as the planning inspector which has raised a few questions in relation to things like the routing strategy that we have proposed. And just seeking clarification really that we've we've fully considered the impact of things like aihl vehicles that will be required to use these. We have in the time in between we've put a response back to the council, which we hope they will be able to consider over the coming weeks and provide their acceptance to prior to the next deadline. So that remains an outstanding point but but one which I believe can probably be covered off fairly easily within the coming weeks. The second point that was outstanding related to the HGV routing of vehicles which

will be expected to use the bots Lane route up through Lumbee off the a 63 over towards Selby districts old area. The council requested that National Grid look at the potential to deliver alternatives to the use of boats lane to facilitate facilitate HGV movements up through Lumbee. And National Grid have agreed to take that away and look at the alternatives. They've made very good progress in the weeks between the workshop and now and have proposed a schematic which would allow them to deliver a whole road which comes down from the north and avoids the use of bots lane. And they are currently discussing this with the landowners of the affected fields to the north and I believe have made very good progress to date. And we're just seeking final sign off of the requisite paperwork to allow us to report back that that is that is a solution that we can deliver content to to commit to hear. So in essence to summarize, we have full agreement on all of the outstanding points I think with North Yorkshire Council. The only two that were outstanding, were they the RE review of the construction Traffic Management Plan and the few additional questions that the council asked in relation to the routing of the AI loads National Grid's request to investigate a an alternative whole road from the north, which would allow us to avoid using bots lane and Lumby. We agreed with the council that this approach and that these conclusions could all be reflected within the most up to date statement of common ground document which has been updated accordingly and should be made available as part of this draft DCO application. And I think the only the only other point of discussion which I'll probably pass across to my colleague definitely kinked and if that's all right, relates back to some of the issues that Luis was discussing earlier on where North Yorkshire Council and city of York council have both raised a few questions over the wording of the draft DCO and the DIS application of some of the acts and how that will have a an effect on the DCR application. So pass over to Bethany quickly that would be that would be helpful.

10:22

Yep. Bethany Kingston National Grid. Just to confirm we responded in full to North Yorkshire Council's comments about the articles that was submitted as part of a statement of common ground and North Yorkshire council have since confirmed that they're now content with those masters. So as far as I can, as far as I'm aware, everything is now agreed with North Yorkshire Council.

10:47

Okay, thank you. Mr. Appleton. Was Kingston. Quite a bit to go through there? I think firstly, if I can just take it in order, because I did have some questions on access point eight in the potential HGVs going through Lumbee. So if I can set that to one side for a minute, just go just take a couple of steps back in terms of the discussions you're having with the applicant and you said submission it deadlines six, is that internal? Is that discussions between yourselves that won't be submitted into the examination? Or would that be a document that would come into the examination at deadlines? Six?

11:26

Probably best pass it over to Steve Fowler to discuss the specifics of that if I'm honest.

11:32

Okay, thank you. That's fine. Thank you. Mr. Fowler.

11:45

Steve, I'm sorry. Can you just clarify which discussions you're talking about been submitted into examination?

11:52

Mr. Appleton was talking about that there were some discussions. Further discussion based on the workshop that were taking place between your high waist people and North Yorkshire councillors? I was people and then reference was made to deadlines six, I just wondered if that was your internal timetable for your discussions between yourselves to be done or whether that was that was something that we were going to see in it? Deadline? Six.

12:14

Okay, sorry, that makes sense. No. So we're not proposing to submit any details or discussions other than any updates or statements of common ground or any points that may or well would now become agreed to outstanding details of those meetings aren't supposed to be submitted and examination.

12:28

Okay, thank you very much. And just before I move on to the Lumbee issue, in terms of you talked about future engagement meetings, Mr. Appleton with North Yorkshire Council. Now presumably, you would be doing similar with Leeds City and city of York on highways matters? And if so, would those be separate meetings? Or would that be you would try to meet with everybody in one go in these future meetings?

12:56

Chris Appleton for the applicants, yes, the applicant has has committed to facilitating monthly meetings in future between the relevant transportation coordination officers and the council's at the moment I don't believe we've we've had discussions as to the best manner in terms of pulling those together. But they certainly would take place with North Yorkshire and Leeds and city of York. I think the intention at this point was probably to do them separately. However, if there's if there's merit to doing them all together, it may well be that that could be organized as part of the future delivery program.

13:34

Okay, thank you. Mr. Appleton. Just before I move off the issue of the workshop. Was there anything that I appreciate, Mr. Reynolds, that your colleague Mr. Roberts isn't here today, as far as I'm aware, but is there anything you would like to add about the transport workshop in the matters that were agreed and is still to be agreed?

13:58

Not really. So Michael malleus, NYC. The the rundown that we start with Sanjay roo really agree with we've agreed the minutes of the meeting and everything that he said, I think that we haven't gone back formally on the response to the construction traffic management plan. We can do it the next the next deadline, I think we have done informally to Bethany. So I think that was finished. I think it is just the Lumbee issue.

14:25

Thank you, Mr. Owen. So if you can stay on the line, then once we've got the Lumbee issue in front of us. In the latest statement of common ground, you raise concerns about Lumbee. Clearly that was discussed at the workshop. There is potentially a possibility of an alternative route. We're just hearing today. Clearly that's the first where's the XA have heard about it? Can you explain it exactly what your local authorities concerns are about about the issue of going up? slide and then across a long, Red Hill lane, isn't it to access point eight? Is it a highway safety matter? Is it kind of a public kind of disturbance matter? Is it is it? Is it both? And are there any mitigation measures that you would wish to see the good managed to assuage your concerns on that?

15:28

I'll come back properly on that. But I think, because it's something that has been raised by our members as well, I think it's just a very small village, it's not particularly appropriate to be taking that level of traffic through. There's I think there has been discussion of timings of that sort of thing that would that might help. But ultimately, we asked if the service access service could be used, and I think, but then I'll come back formally on that.

15:57

Thank you, missy. Appreciate it's a bit difficult without Mr. Mr. Roberts here today as well, just in terms of the amount of traffic going through this proposed to go through a bus lane and then take a left into Red Hill lane. Mr. Appleton, am I correct in saying I'm putting you on the spot here slightly, but am I correct in thinking that, based on the traffic modeling tables, this would be a duration of approximately four weeks, with about 52 weeks predict 52 He movements to be predicted in the worst week, which is week seven? That's my reading of a pp 148. So unless I've read that incorrectly?

16:42

Yes, yes. It's 62. We said during week seven, didn't we?

16:45

Yeah. So that's, so that's 52 HDV movements throughout that entire week. So that's 26 and then 26. out over a week, which based on a if it were to be a seven day week, that would be three HGVs per day.

17:03

Yes. Chris Appleton for the Applicant As we reported previously, and average of seven to eight movements. So a maximum of four vehicles. Yeah. Okay, seven to eight to two way movements.

17:14

Okay, so in terms of to try and overcome the concerns of the Lumbee residents. We had Mr. Fletcher on the HSI with us and we walked that route is part of the panel. So we we are aware of it. We walked in as far as the entrance to Red Hill lane. Rather than take a potential we'll just set aside the potential route from the North for a minute. Rather than that, are there any traffic management management measures you could propose that would help to overcome that local residents and also their local authorities concerns use of a banksman? Certain hours? I'm just thinking that if we're if we're dealing with relatively low numbers of movements, maybe eight possibly 10 per day HGV movements? Is there

anything you could put in place as regards reduced hours? banksman, that kind of thing that they might you might be able to offer that would potentially overcome the concerns of the local community?

18:20

Chris Appleton for the applicant? Yes, I suppose there are in principle, I think it would, it would relate back to the discussions that we had at the May hearings where we were talking about the traffic movements that would travel on the southern arm at the junction of the A 63. Where we advise that there are there are mechanisms in place whereby National Grid and their contractors can manage the arrival and departures of such trips. So it wouldn't necessarily be the completely random there's the management mechanism and an electronic market management mechanism that could be used to control when trips were to arrive. National Grid are as always more than more than open to the concept of using banksman and delivering appropriate health and safety measures. So they could be discussed with the council if if officers felt like there was there was merit to considering the use of force lane and introducing additional health measures or health and safety measures.

19:23

Thank you, Mr. President. I suppose it's an action point to yourselves. Mr. Reynolds, it might not be you it might be your colleagues are wondering if you could. Deadline six provides some a view if you like on whether there would be any potential measures that the applicant could implement to overcome any concerns around the use of butts Lane in in Red Hill lane and to generally try and assuage the concerns of local residents in that area. So if that could be an action for action point. For deadlines six I'd be grateful and Then in terms of this alternative that clearly this is the first we've heard about putting Mr. Hughes on the spot slightly, would it be possible to bring up the works plan of that area? Mr. Hughes, sorry to throw this one at you. But I think it'd be useful to have that on the screen. Just so Mr. Apple can Appleton could then talk us through what that what that might entail. Mr. Turner, you've appeared on screen did you wish to speak?

20:27

We're just getting rejected Applicant. We're just getting that up. I might ask Mr. Fowler to talk that through unless Mr. Upton wants to take it.

20:35

No, I was. Sorry, I was just about to suggest that Steve found that would be the best month to describe the whole road scheme. That's,

20:42

that's fine. You might need that one. And you might need the one to the north of it as well, depending on exactly where you are looking to access it from my guess is it might be the one to the north as well, but I'll leave Mr. Fowler to talk us through it. The alternative, the potential alternative option?

20:59

Yeah, Steve fine, Oscar. So the proposal actually would utilize epi seven. So off the SEC three, where the bellmouth currently shows that would access the pion, XC five to one, which is the string position that you indicate in that that you can see to the northwest if in that kind of area. So what what the

currently is, there is an access track that goes up to this polling position. And then there is a possibility that we're exploring the currently that the x axis track could be extended to connect into the existing access track that goes along but sled kind of where that arrow is currently proposed, there is an existing gap and Gateway kind of in the field that allows connects on to that right of way. So it will be a continuation of the access road with a track track way to track matting, to be able to connect into that point there. And then bring HGVs through that location and not through the Lumbee the use of the lump of Earth with Lumbee. So that's currently what we're exploring or whether that's a possibility and discussing that with the with the London at this moment. It wouldn't require any additional vegetation removal. It's an existing field we've just put out that's currently just left. So yeah, that's the possibility they're exploring currently.

22:26

Thank you, Mr. Mr. Foul, and just just thinking aloud, though, would that firstly, would that necessitate a complete removal of the access point eight along Red Hill lane? Or would you still keep that in as a precautionary measure?

22:44

See, follow. That's good. Yeah. So we will keep that in. So any proposal on this would be for HGVs. So we would still leave APA in for LGV movements. And then it would be then the future maintenance access for the yearly maintenance with obviously minimal use of vehicles in the future. So APA was still remaining them. And then I think what would happen is that we would put into ctmp, that the road of fuel and B would not be used for SUV traffic.

23:15

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Fallon, would that would this represent a change request to the application? And if not, how would you assess the any whether there were any environmental effects of your proposed access in from the south rather than along Red Hill lane.

23:34

So we will be looking to assess that impact before we decided that we would move forward with any proposal. But this would be undertaken to an agreement with a London on the basis that there are no environmental effects on this. So that's the way that we'll be looking to not feel that a formal change request in this area is

23:54

covered step one, with the land plans need to change in order to reflect that.

24:00

No, we don't envisage that a lot in place would need to need to be updated.

24:05

Okay, thank you. And so if you're going to run with this proposal, when when would you be able to submit that and make that decision, submit it into the examination so that everybody can be consulted upon it.

24:18

Stefan osgrid Were hoping in a vision that we can put forward any proposal by deadline six.

24:25

Thank you, Mr. Farrell. I think if I think we would urge that if possible, please, so that there can be a consultation on that and then a bounce down on that consultation as well before the examination closes,

24:38

as they say some virus to say it couldn't be beyond the six. Yeah, I

24:42

think I think I was possibly being a bit a bit optimistic that I think, I think I think it would have to be in by D six, so that we can have two full rounds of consultation on that. Mr. Reynolds, you've appeared on screen. Is there anything you wish to say?

24:58

Now thank you That's the preferred out that being the preferred option.

25:02

Okay, thank you. I see Mr. Turney. But just before I turn to you, Mr. Turney, I don't know if my colleague was Coombs wishes to say anything on this,

25:10

I just wanted to clarify if the, the new bit of access track would be in or outside the order limits.

25:23

Originally for the application, it would be outside the order limits. So the proposal is not to make a change to the CAA request or to make any other changes to the application plans, but rather to seek private agreement to put down track matting, to allow those bits of that track to be joined up to allow us to run those, that limited number of HGVs through that field, rather than using Lumbee. So I think just to be absolutely clear, we're not proposing to promote this as a formal change request in the application. Rather, we're trying to seek private agreement to facilitate it, using somebody's land to run some vehicles over it by private agreement, and then alleviating at least some of the local authority and residents concerns in Lumbee. So we'll certainly update on what's proposed and how we propose to deal with it deadline six, but I think we're not proposing that this is dealt with by way of a formal change request, consultation, etc. So it will just be to update the examination.

26:38

And so in terms of the sort of formal documentation going forward, the place we would see it would be in an updated DCMP.

26:48

That's right. So the CCMP, I think would, would make clear that we didn't propose to run HGVs through access point eight. But as has been explained by Mr. Fowler, we would still be using access point eight for LG TVs, other vehicles, and we would be using it for the permanent access.

27:16

Thank you very much.

27:19

Okay, thank you, Miss Coombs. And whilst you're on Mr. Turney, in terms of deadlines, six, would you be making a definitive decision on which of those options you were proposing by then? Or could it be an either or still at that stage?

27:35

I reached out if the applicant I suspect to be an either or because until we have reached an agreement with the landowner, that they're willing to allow us to run the vehicles across their land for that, for that short extra stretch to join up the two access points effectively. Until we get to that point, we won't be in a position to confirm by whatever formula amendment to the ctmp that the position will be taken out.

28:02

Okay, thank you. Mr. Turney. I think if I could just encourage the the discussions with the local authority on other traffic management measures through Lumbee to be to be pursued as well, just just in case. The other option falls away. So at least then we've got both both things to look at when we come to make our recommendation. I don't

28:27

think so. If I may reach 20 for the applicant just to say on that. Yes, we completely agree on that. And I think it's just important to emphasize that what we're trying to do is to accommodate a local concern. We don't the applicants position is that the use of the rotary Lambie and the use of access point eight is acceptable in highways terms, and is capable of being satisfactorily delivered through the existing provisions in the ctmp. But we are trying to alleviate the local concern. So we will be maintaining opposition that what you have in front of you at the moment is acceptable. And we're trying to look at a way to alleviate the local concern.

29:09

Thank you, Mr. Toby. Mr. Attorney. Yes, I appreciate you're trying to respond to local concerns that have been raised. As regards the use of butts lane. I don't have anything else to add on that. But before I move off that topic, is there anything that North Yorkshire Council wish to say on that?

29:31

No, that's clear. Thank you very much.

29:33

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Reynolds. In which case, I'll move to Item three on traffic and transport which is the transport effects of the three propose changes. And my question to the applicant is, can you please

briefly explain any traffic and transport effects arising from your proposed three changes and the change application that's now been accepted? And I think in particular, it will be any potential traffic impacts do to firstly removing the access past Skelton springs cottages and new farm and also consequently replacing that with the access overhangs gutter from the north which is which has changed to

30:16

Chris Appleton for the applicant again that's not a problem it will be my pleasure. So as you're aware the change application outline three amendments to the scheme change one which is the ship to North reduction in limits of deviation would have no traffic impacts whatsoever they in relation to transport the impact of any significant effects outlined within the ES chapter 12 traffic and transport what would be unchanged change to a new farm cottage access as you have just touched on there would be the principal point at which there would be some change however, that's still be no significant impacts. So change to relates to access point 93 which is located on the 18th and provides a direct route to SP 005 via the access track adjacent and new farm cottages. Now in response to concerns previously raised raised in relation to the traffic movements at AP 93 National crude gave consideration to the use of an alternative access track between SPS 004 and 005 which would facilitate the new crossing of Hearn's gutter as you as you just alluded to. So, this would facilitate revise access to 00 SP 005 from the north rather than the East now, and change to would result in the large majority of construction traffic which was previously assigned to A p 93. Or is currently assigned to A p 93. Now being rerouted further north up to a P 89 which is the proposed access to open substation. And then along the a new alternative access track two sp 005 ap 23rd Still proposed ap 93 will be retained to facilitate the short term construction and removal of the temporary bridge overhangs gutter. And this is expected to take place in 252 separate five day periods. So five days to construct, and then five days to remove the structure when no longer needed. And we we forecast that this will result in a maximum of six two way trips during each of those five, five day windows. So there'll be six to weigh trips to construct and six to weigh trips during another week to ultimately take the structure back down again. These would be the only HDV construction trips that would be anticipated to use AP 93 and future the rest would all track north to a p 89. As I said previously, following the construction of homes go to a P 93 would then simply serve to facilitate LGV traffic as part of the operational uses in future. So in terms of transport and the changes, what we would in essence see is the the 2258 total two way vehicle movements that we previously forecast at AP 93 across the 2024 to 2027 construction program now reassigning north to AP 89 and adjoining the 54,398 that would forecast to occur up there. However looking at the looking at the numbers and the areas that were considered within the ctmp we would we will propose to amend the requisite tables within the ctmp to ensure that the minimization of this construction traffic routing from a p 93. And up to 89 Has the the required effect and does not impact on the land adjacent to the cottages discussed previously. And the rerouting of the construction traffic would would not have an impact on the likely significant effects outlined in ES chapter 12 traffic and transportation. So during the operational phase, there'll be no anticipated change relating to traffic as the operational access ap 93 would be retained. Bench three if I can move on from change to copy change three sorry change change three is the Shipton cable ceiling and component sorry, compound access change three would again would not have an impact on the likely significant effects outlined within ies chapter 12 traffic and transportation. The change simply involves a P 98 which is listed within table 3.2 of the SI P M P as an existing field gate major access for a permanent Bell mouth that relates to oht LHL works CSAC TCC

and underground cable access and the change would require a P 98 to be relocated approximately 50 meters further than of the position that we showed previously. That would obviously mean it was no longer going to be provided at the location of an existing field gate, but it would instead require a new access point to be created. This new access point would potentially require some hedge row removal of vegetation is there at the moment, however, the existing field that gate would be closed and in filled with new hedgerow provided as a replacement, which will be committed to in an updated version of the code of construction practice. So in in general, very little impact in traffic and transport terms, and it does not change the conclusions drawn within the assessments of the traffic and transportation chapters. Thank you.

35:43

Thank you, Mr. Robertson. And one last question. If we can go back to change to Yes. So in effect in terms of the actual numbers of HGVs, the only difference will be the six two way trips into construct a bridge and six two way trips to take the bridge away afterwards. In terms of the the the overall number of hgB construction movements, it would be the same rather it would just be coming in from the north rather from the east.

36:10

Is that correct? That is correct. Yeah. Across Applicant for the Applicant? That's correct. Okay. Thank

36:14

you, Mr. Appleton. I don't have any further questions. But before I move on from this, I just wondered if North Yorkshire council had anything to say about the impact on traffic due to the change requests.

36:32

Think you might have animals. Monochrome animals and my see. Paul has reviewed it briefly the he said that there's no there's either no impact or is preferable. That's with the exception of change. Number three, where there was some confusion of what exactly that was aware of it was rather, Mr. Fallon has provided some information for us. I don't have the exact I don't have sort of sign up for that if you'd like. But as Mr. Armitage just said, I think it's relatively minor expect wouldn't expect any issues. But we'll come back again, formally. And the next deadline. Thank

37:12

you. Mr. Mintz, I'm just before you sign off on traffic, is it? Do you have any other comments to make around traffic and transport.

37:19

And now the workshop. There's been a lot of work done since we last were in a hearing. And Paul is very happy now. Well, he's much happier now with the amount of control and where that will be going forward. It's much better now.

37:34

Thank Thank you, Mr. Reynolds. And the same and the same question to Miss White. Do you have any comments to make banks? Anything do with traffic and transport before we move on?

37:49

Hello, Louise, my latest Council. Nothing. Thank you. Okay, thank you, Miss White. In which case, if there are no further comments on traffic and transport matters, and I'm seeing no hands up, then I'll move on to Agenda Item three d, which is hydrology and flood risk. So I'll just take a moment for respective people to get ready with that we don't have to shuffle the tables around virtually. In terms of item number one. This was the proposed crossing of Hearn's Gtech clearly we've we've heard heard back from Kyle and Peru's in their response rep. 5105. They stated that they can confirm that this will be acceptable in principle, subject to final design, and the terms being agreed under the statement of common ground for other crossings and structures within ordinary water courses. So my question to the applicant is are you confident that a final design can be submitted for the crossing of Hearn's gutter that would be acceptable to call in or peruse I'd be.

39:02

Rigid only for the outcome? The short answer is yes. If you need more details, sir, then we've got Mr. Anderson, our flood risk expert and of course Mr. Fowler as well.

39:14

Thank you, Mr. 20. Mr. Anderson, is there anything you wish to add to that with regard to the in the technical details across your hands gutter?

39:22

Steve Anderson for the applicants, we have in discussions with Tyler Not peruse the provided with standard conditions for land drainage consents, and we have reviewed those and that has not indicated any concern that we that we would have any difficulty in meeting lots of requirements when we come to make an application for land drainage consent for the crossing.

39:48

Thank you. Thank you very much for showing up. And whilst you're with us Yes. In the latest statement of common ground with NS D, I'd B, which is rep 5051. The only outstanding matter is to do with the clearance distances above the banks of IDB maintain watercourses. I appreciate it wasn't that long ago when the statement of common ground was last submitted. But has there been any update on that as regards any discussions? Or Has anybody seen your proposals or regards to your proposed clearance distances?

40:32

Steve Anderson for the applicants? Yes, there have been discussions. We have shared some further detail with NC IDB regarding the clearance distances proposed under the design submitted for DCO. I think probably Mr. Fowler is better place to talk further about the details of this issue.

40:59

That's fine, Mr. Anderson. Mr. Farrell, look, it looked like you were broadly within their parameters with maybe one or two exceptions as regards to the clearance distances.

41:10

Steve, oh, and Oscar. Yeah, that's that's the case. In in all instances, other than two of the existing proposals were based on the design, we meet the requirements based on Canal VHC. Spec. In the other two instances, we actually provide more clearance and those they're currently on the existing overhead line. The key differences that national grid are designing to they're under statutory clearances. They, the clearances required by the IDB are way over the statutory clearances that would have significant impact on on the heights of the red lines, and then and any sort of clearances that we need to provide. So National Grid's position is that we are designed into the statutory and safety requirements that we are required to do under law, that there should be no issues in the IDB be able to cut out their works, because the safety clearances are being adhered to in our design. So currently, it's a point of disagreement between the two parties. But we're hoping that we can have further discussions between now and the end of the examination. And we can come to a more of an agreed position on this, but currently outstanding, but we're looking to have some more discussions.

42:31

Thank you very much. And I suppose as as per the point that was made earlier, as regards the biodiversity net gain metric, if you could provide us with details of the what the statutory guidance says is regards to clearance limits, that would be much appreciated. If you could submit that into the application by deadline six is an action point, please. That would be much appreciated. And then at least we can see what what you're working to in terms of the statutory requirements.

42:58

Sounds fine, we can do that.

43:00

Thank you very much. And then I just wanted to turn to the canal and river trust. I appreciate we've got Mr. Tucker has been patiently waiting. Hello, Mr. Tucker. Obviously, I've seen the latest statement of common ground and aware of the changes to the protective provisions. Is there anything you wish to say just just to summarize the what's taken place? And since since the last time, last time we all met, it is regards your discussions in negotiations with the applicant on the question of the river ruse?

43:42

Yeah, sure. Well, I mean, following following the one the previous Mason's hearing that were informal meeting that we're at, we've had numerous discussions with the applicant, and they were generally very useful. We exchanged you know, centuries, but we've we've got to a position where the latest DCO, submissive deadline five addresses a lot of the issues that we raised, and we're, we're generally satisfied with the position of the DCO president. And I think I don't want to take up too much time at this meeting. But obviously, you know, we're happy with the happy with the latest position. And hopefully, hopefully that comes across in our response to Deadline five.

44:36

That's the way I interpreted it, Mr. Tuck, I certainly will be dealing with protective provisions this afternoon. So clearly, if you wish to make any comments then feel free to do so as well. But I don't

know if the applicant wish to say anything about the status of discussions with CRT or are you happy for me to move on?

44:58

Happy for you to move on. Thank you.

45:01

Okay, thank you, Mr. Attorney, in which case, it's a kind of a similar matter really, is regards flood risk activity permits. And again, I note that the latest statement of common ground with the Environment Agency shows all these matters is now being agreed upon, and the only part of the proposed development that might require a flood risk activity permit is the works to cross cocked back. But that will be a matter for the local local distribution network operator, rather than yourselves. Did you wish to make any further comments on that matter? Or are you happy for us to move on?

45:43

I can I think we can move on from that. So unless Mr. Anderson wants to add anything

45:50

that Steve Anderson for the applicant, just to know that there may be a requirement for a wrap for temporary crossing protection scaffolds of the rivers and the river wharf during construction.

46:02

And that will be something that would be discussed. Outside of the examination, I propose, I presume.

46:10

Steve Anderson for the applicant, yes, we envisaged that applications for these structures would be well as and when required will be made. Post concern the post granting DCR Yes.

46:22

Okay, thank you. I don't have any further questions on hydrology and flood risk. So unless I see any hands being raised regarding that, I'm happy to move on to noise issues. Okay, I'm not seeing anything. So I'm happy to move on to Agenda Item three, II and I can see Mr. Mr. Hines appeared. So I'll just start with a bit of a precis. My take on it is there are still areas of disagreement between the applicant in North Yorkshire counselor primarily over construction hours, and in particular the issue of Sunday and bank holiday working. also potentially some disagreements over noise methodology. So I'll come first to North Yorkshire counselor on the noise assessment methodology issue. Mr. Reynolds, I appreciate that it's you on the spot and your colleague, Mr. Hopper, who appeared it? Issue specific here in two isn't here. But and in your response to the excess further written questions on which is rep 5117 feed your authorities response? You state that I can confirm that the construction noise assessment is satisfactory, despite our disagreement with proposed with the proposed construction working hours. But in the latest statement of common ground, which is rep 5031. You state that North Yorkshire Council do not currently agree with the application of Annex E ABC categories to determine significance for the construction noise assessment. So it first blush these statements would appear to contradict each other that on the one hand, you don't you don't disagree with the noise assessment

methodology. But you're also raising concerns about the application of the ABC categories from Annex E. Is that something you're able to comment on that that apparent contradiction between the two?

48:33

NYC? No, specifically, I would imagine that is something that in a similar program that we haven't updated or picked up following other discussions that were had a few weeks ago. So I would imagine that that's the case and we can update that. But I'll go back to Jack with that.

48:53

Thank you very much, Mr. Reynolds. Mr. Mr. Hein, was there anything you wish to comment on that specific issue around the noise methodology? Obviously, we heard quite a lot of this issue specific hearing to

49:06

John's Hein for the applicant. My understanding is that the council do agree with the methodology and not comment on the ABC method not being applied correctly is a valid credit stick? Inclusion. I think that position has moved on.

49:32

Thank you very much for your time. So Mr. Reynolds, if your colleague presumably would be Mr. Harper could could just have a look at that and just just confirm with us, if that is indeed the case and submit that into the application and the examination. Deadline six, that would be much appreciated. Just just so we're aware of what the current situation is. In which case I shall turn to the issue of the I

50:05

take operational noise next, actually, rather than the construction hours. So again, question to Mr. Reynolds first. In the latest statement of common ground again, you you will presumably your colleague states that you don't agree with the operational noise assessment. And this is classified in the matters outstanding category. However, you also go on to state that in response to local are further written questions and your responses rep. 5117. You state that, whilst you don't agree with that you do agree with the conclusions that have been drawn? This was obviously discussed at some length in issue specific hearing, too. Mr. Harper, was there and representatives from the applicants including Mr. Hein were there? Is there is there anything that the applicant could provide it would help to overcome your concerns on the assessment of operational noise?

51:19

Just to confirm, is this to do with the self assessment? That was done that the Mr. Harper didn't agree with? But he agreed with the outcome?

51:27

That That's correct, yes.

51:30

But I suppose other than changing how you've done it, I don't think that there is anything I don't know, if it's just a case of agreeing that you've come to the same outcome. I'll go back and see if he's happy with that. Again, it is not moving. He has provided him a short update outside of the written question responses to me. But only that there's no, there's no update. So I can't I can't say what else can be done. Other than you redoing the assessment, which I'm assuming it's down. As I already said, that isn't necessary.

52:06

Thank you, Mr. Rosati. I'll just give Mr. Hein the opportunity to respond.

52:12

Just time for the applicant. The the important distinction to make here is that the the methodology that was was followed is a three tiered screening assessment, screening exercise, not assessment, the assessment would have been undertaken in the manner that Mr. Hopper was asking for, were the the screening tools directing us to that, that outcome, because the outcome is negligible. It wasn't necessary to undertake the full assessment. And then there's a reason why this mechanism is in place because of obviously the the sheer length of the areas involved and and a number of receptors that would need to be assessed. If we were following the the nth degree assessment that is required. We're the first two screening conditions not met. So as far as we're concerned, the the national grid methodology is in line with the the best form for to methodology that Mr. Hopper would have preferred. It was undertaken under but it's undertaken as a screening in line with many, many previous assessments. It's just an updated version. And so National Grid consider that the what is proposed, the manner in which it's been undertaken is all appropriate.

54:04

Thank you, Mr. Hein. Unless you have anything to add. Mr. Reynolds. I propose we leave the issue of operational noise there. Okay, thank you. In which case we'll turn to the issue of construction. noise but it is really wrapped up in the issue of working hours to propose working hours and I think we are now fully aware that the area of local authority concern North Yorkshire Council concern is regarding the Sunday working in bank holiday working as set out in requirement seven of the draft DCO and some suppose to begin with I'll ask Mr. Reynolds. In terms of your objection to Sunday in Bangkok, already working? Is this? Is this an objection in principle? IE, you wouldn't allow that for any other developer? I'm paraphrasing, you wouldn't allow that for any other development. Therefore, it's not appropriate for this development as well, or their specific operations or specific parts of the entire proposed development, for example, perhaps the substations or in a near any residential properties and their specific areas. You're concerned about in terms of Sunday and bank holiday work and or was it more of a, you know, a blanket, this is this is not something your North Yorkshire council would recommend?

55:44

Michael Reynolds, Northridge Council, I think he's, I think he's both I think that there is a policy that we're applying that we didn't they jack, so the Mr. Hart that doesn't, would always say that it wouldn't want to have Sundays and bank holidays or construction hours. But I think he's also referred to a particular place where it would be where it would be harmful.

56:13

And just to take that one stage further than in terms of those sites, are the concerns about, again, just the fact there's working on a Sunday, or is it something of particular concern within the overall proposed hours of 8am to 5pm? In other words, you know, on a Sunday morning, that should start at nine or on a Sunday afternoon, it should finish it for for example, or was it was it for those the entirety of those working hours

56:50

think it's those working hours that people wouldn't expect work to be taking place on a Sunday and bank holiday? And it was specifically monk fryston substation, I think.

57:00

Okay, thank you and just washed your hair before I turned to Mr. Hein. In the think the rich per DCO in the Hinkley DCO in terms of Sunday work, and they didn't I don't think touch on bank holiday work. And I certainly one of them, didn't. They they proposed and it were in the made orders. You've got alternative Sunday working. So in other words, on one weekend, you can work the Saturday and Sunday next weekend. You can work the Saturday only and then the following weekend, Saturday and Sunday. Obviously that sounds alternative would work. Is that something that whilst I accept your principle of accepted in principle, you don't like Sunday work in full stop? Is that something that you would be more amenable to?

57:50

Well, I think in all of the points where we've got disagreement, we're looking to come closer together that have these details in front of them got Hinkley, so So could you tell me what the first one was? Yeah. The

58:02

first one was the rich bruh DCO.

58:13

Well, on that point, I'll commit and I'm taking action to raise those with Mr. Harper. And, again, we'll come back at the next deadline.

58:24

If you could, that would be much appreciated. Thank you, Mr. Reynolds. I can miss Mr. hungar. You've heard what Mr. Reynolds has said. It's it's a you know, a general. You know, general disagreement was Sunday work in full stop, not necessarily specific time periods within those Sundays. But also they're going to look at the you know, the alternative Sunday option. Is that something that the applicant would be prepared to consider as well, this this issue of alternatives Sunday, so at least every other Sunday there, there'd be no, there'd be no work in.

59:01

In terms of that part. I would like to bring Steven Fowler in. However, in terms of the the disagreement with Sunday, we're going on bank holiday work, being a matter of policy. I understand that it is a matter in a an informative within the planning Developer Guide rather than any written policy anywhere in the council's documentation.

59:37

Thank you. I see Mr. Attorney appeared. I mean, obviously, it's something that I've just thrown out there based based on other DCO is Mr. Turney. But again, if that's something in the same way that North Yorkshire Councillor considering if that's something you you would at least respond to by the next deadline. I think that'd be much appreciated because clearly we need to draft our our preferred version of the DCA Oh, and I suppose yeah, first of all do is there anything you wish to say on that? Just before I move on?

1:00:08

Richard Ernie for the applicant. So the general point that we've made already is the need to deliver this project as a matter of urgency. And it's, it's partly in respect of that, that we don't want time constraints on the construction of the project, which cannot be justified. Our position is that a restriction along those lines to prevent some Sunday working alternate Sundays or indeed all Sunday, working as was the council's position would be an unjustified restriction, we have carried out an assessment of construction noise, we have shown how it will be mitigated. And we say that the effects of construction noise including on Sundays would be acceptable in planning terms. And it follows that a requirement which further restricted that would not be justified and therefore wouldn't meet the relevant tests. So that's our overall position. Rich brand, Hinkley obviously, are comparable projects in the sense that they are new transmission infrastructure. But the particular urgency of this project is, as I understand it was not the same on those cases. So there's a particular pressing need to deliver this, this scheme as soon as possible, and first to be in operation by 2027. So, in essence, we said the justification that was put forward by the Council for restricting Sunday working is is not a good justification, as Mr. Hein said, there's actually no clear policy justification. But there's also no environmental justification in terms of an adverse impact that needs to be mitigated by that restriction. So that's our overall position. And I think, whilst we're happy to provide more detail on that, and the comparison with rich Brent Hinkley at the next deadline, I think I'd make clear that we don't intend to sort of shy away from our request to to allow Sunday working or at least, opposition, that restriction on Sunday working would not be reasonable.

1:02:18

Thank you, Mr. Attorney, I hear what you say. And I also hear what Mr. Reynolds says, it sounds to me like this might well be because before I wrap up, I'll revert to sorry user. James,

1:02:30

just to add in coming back to us on that particular point, Mr. Turney at deadlines, six, it would be very interesting to understand what might you might see as the implications of having that kind of provision in requirements seven, what would be the implications for the timetable of the overall program for construction? I remember, right back in issue one, I think it was we talked about potential delays to consenting for example, if, if we made a recommendation on time, but this, this, the Secretary State took longer than three months to make the decision. And we were told at that point that a delay of

number of months to that decision wouldn't affect the overall ability to meet the 2027 connection deadline. So that that implies there is some flex in the overall program. And I just I just want to understand, but we understand exactly where you're coming from in terms of the assessment outcomes, but we're balancing that with a clear request from the local council when they're local on behalf of the community. So we would like to understand exactly what the implications for the construction program would be should a comparable provision be inserted into requirements? Seven, I think it's for the sake of examining it fully. We need that information.

1:03:45

registered for that period. Thank you, we will make sure that we we explain what the consequences would be of of that restriction. Thank you.

1:03:55

Thank you Miss powers. You took the words out of my mouth, just this as I was about to wrap up. What I was gonna say was, I think this is potentially an area where we're not going to get agreement between North Yorkshire Council and the applicant, in which case, we will need final position statements from both of us for both North Yorkshire counts on the applicant on this matter. And as Miss powers has indicated, that should include the implications for the construction program of no Sunday work in of all Sunday work in and also have alternate Sunday working and that would be clearly from the applicants point of view to look at the time, time and implications but from both the applicants and North Yorkshire Council, if we can have your final position statements on this whole issue of construction work in hours and clearly it's going to central round Sunday and bank holiday working. I don't think there's anything more I need to say on that matter. I think we're we're perfectly aware of both of your positions. But again, I said final position statements please on that on that matter unless there any further comments I see a hand up from that your hand up Mr. Hein is it

1:05:12

it is indeed Jazmyne from for the applicant, there is one further out standing issue on the matter of working hours and and that is in the draft DCO there is a restriction on piling hours and in particular on the Saturday hours, the proposed working hours are for nine o'clock till two o'clock the British Standards Annex II 5228 3% five to eight and exceed in part one gives typical working times and for Saturday, the standard daytime working hours are between eight and one o'clock we consider that the starting off the piling at nine o'clock instead of eight o'clock will be better for the immunity of restaurants in in the vicinity of the works. But that means that there is an hour at the other end of the period which would if if you took the standard strictly poke into the the weekend period between one and two o'clock, what we would seek to ask the local authorities is if they are prepared for the matter of piling alone. And, and only in the case of piling to relax that one hour requirement to be equivalent to the standard daytime. And if we cannot get that agreement, then the piling hours for Saturday would need to revert to eight to one to accord with the standard hours, which we believe would be less good of an outcome for the receptors.

1:07:30

Thank you Mr. High not wash. We've got Mr. Reynolds here. I'm not asking you to comment. Comment on that today. But again, if in your when you're considering the matter of the alternate send days in

your deadlines six submission if you could also consider this in effect shifting by one hour of the pilot and under requirements seven Part Two from nine nine to two o'clock rather than eight to one o'clock. Again, if you could comment on that what your authorities preference up for that would be I'd fully appreciate your preference is not to have it at all on a Saturday. But also if you could comment on on the two scenarios you've just heard from the applicant eight till one or nine till two. That'd be much appreciated as well. Thank you.

1:08:17

Yes, Michael Reynolds NYC if I could ask Mr. Hein just to put that to us in writing. And then we'll we can submit that question and our response to the next deadline. That's okay. Trying to paraphrase into this.

1:08:32

Okay. Thank you. If you could send that to the North Yorkshire tanks on this time so that they're able to respond by deadline six, that would be much appreciated.

1:08:43

Yes, we'll do.

1:08:44

Thank you. It's fairly I mean, I understand it quite clearly, you've effectively shifted it shifted it back by an hour. That that makes sense to me. In terms of what you're proposing. I don't have any further comments pertaining to noise. So unless I see any hands up, which I don't I'm going to move on to Agenda Item three F, which is going to be potentially quite a quick matter, because we largely discussed most of this yesterday. For those of you who weren't here yesterday, we took a lot of the site specific matters to do with socio economic impacts on specific farming operations. We took those yesterday for the simple reason that we had we had people in attendance yesterday that we knew wouldn't be in attendance today like Mr. Watson. So I don't have any further questions on any of the social economic matters. But before I move on, was there anything out of arising out of yesterday or just any general points relating to socio economic issues that anybody wanted to raise our turn first to the applicant?

1:10:04

Thank you, sir. Okay, thank

1:10:06

you, Mr. Turney. And was anything from any anybody else's regard social economic matters they wish to raise. If I don't see any hands, then I'll move on to agenda item 3g Not seeing any hands from any bodies. So I'm happy to move on to Agenda Item three G, which is climate change. And I'll pass over to my colleague, Ms. Powers.

1:10:32

Thank you, Mr. Jones. I'm just looking at the time, and it's one o'clock, which is normally the time we would take a lunch break. However, we don't have a lot more to cover under item three altogether. So

I'm tempted to say let's plow on and get that finished so that we can let people experts be released this afternoon, I'm getting a nod from Mr. Turney. So we have a couple of questions under climate change under g. Very little to nothing under H. So I think I think we'll do that we'll plow on and then and then we'll go to a break slightly late for lunch. So just a couple of matters, we wanted to pick up under the banner of climate change, just coming back to the MPLS as we regularly do, just to make sure we're covered in terms of what we need to report. And picking up a point firstly, under para five point 15 point 12 of MPLS. Em one, which refers to the move toward a more circular economy in particular, applicants being encouraged to source materials from recycled sources, and also making sure that material is reused and recycled on site, etc. So we're talking here about the commitments to a sort of circular economy principles. And we note there's a commitment in the code of construction practice, references CCS 01, and table three point 11. And we can also see that mirrored in the embedded measures shedule relating to embodied greenhouse gases. So just so we understand just a quick question to the applicant. The ies chapter on climate change covers the use of existing structures where possible, but it doesn't say anything about the reuse of steel from dismantled pylons, although it does refer back to the Environmental Action Plan that national grid are committed to. So just so we understand what this would mean in practice, what would happen to pylons that will be dismantled?

1:12:31

Steve Hall and Asha goods so the proposal for the pylons are to be dismantled is they will be, they won't be reused in new pylons. I mean, the pylons are, they're designed and they've been up to been up for a number of years. And they're specific to that pylon. So they're not possible to reuse on on other pilots, because they'll have different sizes, different members. So they will be taken down and they'll be taken to a suitable recycling center, or they'll always facility that can deal with his birthday. Well, it's not possible to reuse it on new pylons.

1:13:06

Okay, and presumably, requirements that deals with submission of a site waste management plan. So presumably, that would be picked up in that scenario, those that the disposal of or recycling of those materials will be picked up as a as a recycling issue into the site waste management plan. Is that correct?

1:13:27

It is Yes,

1:13:28

thank you. And then just moving on to the question of carbon measuring and reporting again, the MPs en one para five point 3.4 refers to the need for major energy infrastructure projects to include a greenhouse gas assessment as part of various and measuring the embodied greenhouse gas emissions. So we can see that again, in the COC P ref. CC 01. There's a reference to carbon measuring and reporting being undertaken, with a view to reducing the embodied greenhouse gas emissions associated with the raw materials. But again, just so that we understand how this might work in practice, what would this carbon measuring and reporting involve? Who would be responsible for it and what would happen to the where would the reporting go essentially?

1:14:24

Steve is road yet but that's fine. I can touch on this. In the initial stage when we design forward as we currently have for the for the DC application, we have an assessment of the carbon footprint of that design, which point we go out to the tender stage, we submit that baseline as a part of the tendering package and we submit a carbon interface tool that then goes up to the contractors as the baseline that we've provided in our assessment DCO and then they are tasked with looking at how they could be Heat and enhance that. And there's a real focus of sustainability within the tender that we go out with a number of kind of points in the tender assessment is terms of how the carbon can be vetted. The design portfolio by the contractor is inputted into the carbon interface tool. And this is reviewed on a quarterly basis throughout the construction period. And so with the principle contract in a sustainability workshop, and we kind of capture the changes in the carbon, as we go through to the contracts, and then on completion, we provide a final carbon calculation from the contracts to national grid. So we have a way of tracking the carbon as it moves through the delivery through this, this tool that is a part of the kind of development and delivery stage.

1:15:53

That's very helpful. Thank you. I suppose the point is, then that that useful information isn't anywhere in the current documentation. So it's currently not a particularly firm commitment to doing those measures, which they actually are probably ingrained in what National Grid does and has to do by its under its various duties. So my question really, is whether there needs to be a little bit of an elaboration of that, in the probably the code of construction practice is the place.

1:16:23

Yeah, Steve is really Yeah, that's certainly something that we can have a look Take. Take away and give consideration for deadlines. Six,

1:16:30

thank you, because I think that the things you've just told us do provide some comfort on those commitments, which I guess they've done automatically for you. And therefore, you may not have thought to put them in, but we didn't, we didn't have them before us. So thank you. And then the final matter under Part G was just in relation to kind of the wider issue of energy security, given current global events and making sure that the relevant parts of the infrastructure to be constructed had adequate security measures. So I'm talking here mainly about the proposed substations presumably, The Undertaker would need to make sure that there was adequate security measures in place, for example, to to resilience purposes and to ensure that there wasn't an interruption to the security of the energy supply. So can I just ask the applicant, what measures are proposed to ensure ensure security at the substation sites themselves with a view to wider energy security matters?

1:17:33

That's the foreign national grid. So the design principles when we're designing substations on any overhead line take into facts this these matters. They're designed to askew assess compliance, which I think we can set out a little bit more detail what that is. But basically, it looks at the way that if a loss of circuits happens, and how the substations then can accommodate them, the loss of any circuit. So the safety factors are built into the design as the standard. So it's fundamental for the design in the way

that we build up these, these solutions. But I think that's probably better. So we are invited, to be honest, but it is fundamental to the design of these projects.

1:18:15

Thank you. And we can see that in the description of the works. Obviously, we have things in there, like the perimeter fencing and the lighting, etc. So we know there are measures in there, but it's just a statement of what you, you know how those measures are kind of brought together to secure the substation sites. Mr. Turney did you want to come in?

1:18:32

I know you'll know this. But I just wanted to emphasize that, obviously, in the broader context of energy security, this is a project which its purpose is to support energy security in the sense of their existing constraints on the network, we can overcome and reduce those constraints through this project, and also enable the delivery of other sources of energy to the grid. So in essence, it sort of what the project is all about, notwithstanding the sort of micro question about the security of the individual sites, but it is what the project is all about.

1:19:03

Thank you. That's quite right. Mr. Powell. Are we coming back in?

1:19:08

Yeah, so the foreign national just to add to that, in terms of individual security to each site as well, so National Grid have very strong standards in terms of security substations to prevent unauthorized access. So yeah, that is in within the design of substations as well in terms of the perimeter fence in any sort of gear and security requirements, any cameras that is needed so there is quite strict standards and what needs to happen each individual substation, but we can set that out.

1:19:33

Thank you that would be helpful at deadlines six again, these are matters that you do with your eyes closed, probably but we just need to make sure we've got them documented in our in our examination library. Okay, that was it on climate change, and I will now pass briefly over to Miss Coombs on three F which was the traveler site.

1:19:54

We discussed this from a public sector equality duty yesterday and I think we Focus on the agenda today in case Mr. Coronavirus was here. And as he isn't really unless anybody has anything to cover. We don't have any further questions at this stage. But we'll pick it up again under requirement 19. So I can't see any hands. So I think back to you must pass.

1:20:22

Thank you. And then that just leads us into Part I, which is just a scoop up any final environmental matters. Mr. Jones, do you want to cover anything on heritage? Are you content?

1:20:34

I think now we've got the letter from Historic England, actually, to miss McDonald. Now that's been submitted into the examination. I'm content with that I know what historic England's formal position is to us. So I'm content on that. So again, unless anybody we don't have city of York council here, but if anybody unless anybody from Leeds City Council or North Yorkshire Council wish to say anything, specifically on heritage then on content.

1:21:02

Excellent. And the only other matter I wanted to very briefly touch on was Greenbelt, which obviously, we heard in some detail at issue specific hearing, too. And we haven't covered again today, which is an intentional decision, principally because we were told at that time that the respective positions were unlikely to change. And we can see that in the in the written submissions too. But just mentioned that we have noted and we welcome the commitment, I think it's in the statements are common ground to a grant or Greenbelt final position statement to be submitted at deadline seven, which should assist us to have that deadline set, we should help us to tease out the issues for the purposes of making a recommendation. So just to note that welcome mat. And, of course, we've seen your North Yorkshire Council's further response to our written questions on Greenbelt matters. So we'll be interested in the applicants response to that, which I assume will be a deadline six. Unless anybody else anybody wishes to come in on that, then I think we will swiftly move into a lunch break now. So I'm going to suggest we return at 10 past two. And when we do that, we'll go into item four, which is the draft development consent order, returning at 10 past two, thank you