

TRANSCRIPT_VIKING_ISH1_SESSION1_270 32024

00:00

All right. Good afternoon, everyone. It's two o'clock in front of me. And I'm opening up this first issue specific hearing for the application made by Chris So production UK Limited for the Viking CCS pipeline project. We'll introduce ourselves in just a few minutes. But before we do that, please bear with me. While I deal with a few housekeeping matters. I take it I can be heard everywhere. And can I confirm that the live stream and the recordings have started? Thank you very much. Were there any requests for reasonable adjustments? Excellent. Thank you very much. There are no fire alarm drills planned for this afternoon. If the fire alarm sounds, please exit and congregate in the carpark at the front of the hotel. And the toilets are located on my right here as we go through. So, on to introductions, I'm David Wallace. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State for levelling up Housing and Communities. As the lead member of the examining authority to carry out an examination of the above application. I'll hand over to other members to introduce themselves.

01:16

Good afternoon, I am Alex Jack. I'm also appointed as a member of this examining authority. I will be leading on this agenda today with input from my fellow Panama panel members as and when required.

01:30

Good afternoon, my name is John ghost, and I've also been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel. Thank you.

01:37

I can confirm that all panel members have made a declaration of interests responding to the planning inspectorates conflict of interest policy, and I confirm that none of us have any declarable interest in relation to this appointment. Also present today and members of the case team we have the case manager Caroline Hopewell, supported by Jessica Weatherby here in the building. And we have Joe Shanks man in the online forum in teams. If you have any questions or concerns about today's event, please contact a member of the case team. The audiovisual service today is provided by a team led by Nathan Williams. So that's the team on our end, and we'll turn to the other attendees who are here both in the room and virtually. Thank you to all those who are watching the live stream. Thank you for joining us. When I read out the name of a team or members of that team present in person, please introduce yourselves one by one, followed by introductions from anyone else who wish to rely on so to begin with who's here on behalf of the applicant, please?

02:41

Thank you. Good afternoon, sir. My name is Craig Welton. I'm a solicitor at Burgess salmon. We are instructed on behalf of the applicants.

02:50

Good afternoon. My name is Patrick Munro. I'm Senior Associate Burgess salmon representing the applicant.

02:57

Good afternoon sir Paul Davis. Harper energy appear on behalf of the applicant.

03:04

Good afternoon, Sir Nigel Pilkington technical director at a calm and we have the applicant. Good afternoon, sir. Adam Wilson from a calm here on behalf of the applicant.

03:17

Thank you very much and welcome all. And now my ask who is here on behalf of Lincolnshire county council please. Good

03:25

afternoon. My name is Stephanie Hall happy to be Miss Hall as H A to Blau Council instructed by Lincoln legal services Lincolnshire on behalf on behalf of Lincolnshire county council. Lots of ELLs and also to my left.

03:42

Good afternoon, sir Justine proudly from Lincolnshire County Council. Thank you very much and welcome. And whose behalf on behalf of North Lincolnshire Council please.

03:54

afternoon, Sir Andrew law representing North Lincolnshire counsel and to my right. Good afternoon, sir

03:59

Matthew Killian, Senior Planning Officer for North Lancaster counsel. Thank you very much and welcome. And who's here for Northeast Lincolnshire counsel please.

04:08

Afternoon, sir is Martin Dixon for Northeast Lincolnshire out

04:14

much. Next on my list is national highways.

04:21

Good afternoon, Sir Paul Bellingham from national highways. Only intending to have a watching brief this afternoon. Unless I can be of assistance I wasn't intending to speak. Thank

04:30

you very much. Thank you for letting me know. Next on my list, I have VPI immingham. Good afternoon, Sir Mark Francis from VPI immingham. Thank you very much. And finally on behalf of town legal I believe on behalf of Phillips 66. Al.

04:51

You're going to pull on it Senior Associate from Tammany Hall here on behalf of Phillips 66 and a PT and H O TT I'm not expecting to have very much to say, maybe just a minute or so around sort of the request on behalf of both of my clients for protective provisions to be included in Chapter Nine of the award of injury course.

05:14

Thank you very much. Thank you for those introductions. Is there anyone else here have missed off in those introductions? Nope, nothing heard. Thank you very much. And welcome. I will now hand over to Mr. Jack for agenda item two.

05:30

Thank you. So moving on to agenda item two, I will set out the procedure for running the hearing today. I appreciate that some of the attendees will who were here this morning, you've already heard this being set out. But last to everyone bear with me. I must repeat this for the benefit of attendees who have joined us for this afternoon. And for the recordings. First, a few words to acknowledge the format of the event today. This is a blended event. It allows attendance both in person and virtually through Microsoft Teams. It is expected that both blended and fully virtual events will form part of the planning Inspectorate future operating model, we the examining authority, or attending this meeting from stolen for, as are several of the attendees. For those attending virtually. Please be rest assured that you have our full attention at all times, even if we're not looking at the camera. To avoid visual and noise distractions. Please keep your cameras microphones off unless we invite you to speak. Secondly, the proposed timings for the day, we will take a 15 minute break at approximately 330. We aim to finish at around 530. But we will keep this under review. The timings are approximate. If you're joining for a particular agenda item, we recommend you keep in touch with the case team who can tell if the sessions are running a few minutes late or ahead of the Indic indicated timings of virtual attendees. If you decide to leave the meeting during the breaks, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation email. If you're watching the live stream, then please refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session. I'd like it. I'd like to make you aware that this event is being both live streamed and recorded. The digital recordings that we make are retained and published. And they form a public records that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. The planning Inspectorate practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on this development consent order. Consequently, if you participate in today's issue specific hearing, it is important to understand that you will be recorded and that you therefore consents, the retention and publication of the digital recording is very unlikely that the examining authority will ask you to put sensitive personal information into the public domain. Indeed, we would encourage you not to do that. However, if for some reason you feel that it is necessary for you to refer to sensitive personal information, we would encourage you to speak to the case team in the first instance. We will then explore with you whether the information can be provided in a written format, which might be redacted before publishing. The final point is about the substantive

matter of today's issue specific hearing itself. An agenda for this hearing was published on the planning Inspectorate national infrastructure project webpage on the 15th of February 2020, for Evie 3001. Those are the only matters for discussion today. To be clear, it is not intended to discuss today, all matters related to the draft development consent order. Some matters will be pursued through rounds of written questions or at future hearings. Are there any questions at this stage? Okay, that's all for me for now. So now on to Item three on hand over to Mr. Wallace.

09:15

Thank you very much. I'd appreciate it. If the agenda for today's meeting could be put up on screen behind me please. And just to confirm that this issue specific hearing will look at the development consent order and some strategic matters around that. So the first thing on the agenda today under three A is connections to other matters and scheme benefits. And I'll turn to the applicant for a couple of questions on this just to clarify how the project will work and how it will be delivered. The development promises to transport 10 to 15 million tonnes of co2 per annum. When does the applicant anticipate that that maximum sort of capacity the full working capacity could be realised

10:05

or Davis, or the applicant, the projects will ramp up, where we're anticipating that we'll have 10 million tonnes of co2 through the system by 2030, ramping up to 15 million tonnes of co2 by 2035.

10:27

Okay, and at the moment, we have two what's been called Anchor industries that's been VPI immingham and Phillips 66. For them combined, I seem to remember from the paper where there's 3 million tonnes being produced by them, contributing to your 10 million tonnes in terms of where the other seven or so million tonnes are coming from, do you have any other subscribers as such. So

10:51

PPI produce 1.3 gigawatts of power. And they're going to instal post capture plants to two of their gas and steam turbine turbines. And they anticipate they're being able to capture 3.4 million tonnes of co2 from those two capture plants. The numbers from Phillips 66 have to be fully fully defined, they're still working on a programme. And the way the way the track to sequencing will work is later this year, we will put an application into government to have the anchor emitters sequence to us, and also a build out of potential future emitters. So it's it's not in the applicants hand to choose the emitters, the emitters will be signed to the project by government. And so that that will really define the pace at which the project can move forward. However, I would like to add that the project is not dependent on the future edition of emitters, it's its base anchor emitters that you've referred to, would allow the project to proceed.

12:07

Of course, it was more when with the maximum benefit, if you like of the project would be when it's working at full capacity delivered the most. Now it's just interested to find out when that full benefit would be achieved. Because say for example, it was going to be five years before the full benefit was reached or whether it was 10 years or whatnot. So as far as you're concerned, pretty much within the first year or so of operation you are you're hitting your target. Yeah,

12:35

as I say we're looking for 10 million tonnes of by 2030. And that's that's a fast ramp up from picking up co2 in 2028.

12:48

And I noticed from the immingham facilities plan, that there are other connections within there that other emitters can connect to. I also note that there's some of those same connections at the block valve stations. Now I can I can understand where the industry is located that there will need to be spare capacity for them to plug into. But how will it work at the block valve stations when they are relatively remote from from any industry

13:17

is just leaving the the potential for future tie ins at those at those locations. So that the manifold that you spoken to, to immingham as I believe five connections onto it. So up to five future emitters can tie in each of those valves. One Future emitter could potentially tie in at each of the each of the three block valves that we have on the route. Okay, then also potential for emitters to tie in atomism.

13:53

And in terms of that time, you mentioned about as part of the track to the government assigning emitters to you as such, imagine there's a you know, X industry and government says you're going to be assigned to this project. What would the process be then? Would they have to submit section 78 application to do the connection and so out their own compulsory acquisition to get there? Or would they know how would Christo production actually work with those emitters to connect and Patreon

14:25

rule for the applicant for any future emitters, if there was a need to connect into the vaping CCS pipeline, either at the facility as you've identified or a block file, for example, that would have to be subject to its own consenting process. So there could be for example, a new pipeline constructed to connect with with vaping that depending on where the matter is, would dictate which planning regime or the DCO regime that fell into and they would have to undertake their own planning permissions and obtain their own consents. And at the same time, also do an invite Mental assessment work associated with.

15:02

So the potential future MIPS may have to submit a planning application under the Planning Act, or a DCO. Application

15:11

patrimonial for the application, yes, depending on the length of the pipeline. So one of the, one of the key factors that can dictate whether carbon dioxide pipeline is within the Planning Act 2008 regime, or the turn and Country Planning Act regime is its length. And so if there was an image that was in close proximity to a connection point, and it was to build a new pipeline that might fall within Town and Country Planning Act regime, for example. And whereas if it was a longer distance, it could fall within

the Planning Act regime. And so, to some extent, that will be dictated by what infrastructure is needed to connect those inverters to the Viking CCS pipeline. Okay.

15:50

So just just go back to if you like, my first sort of question about when would the maximum benefit be realised as such, appreciate you've got the anchor industries, and you know, the proposed development, as you say, would not be dependent as such on other industries coming forward. But I'm thinking that to ramp up to those 50 million tonnes per annum, it requires other industries to do another process that isn't necessarily guaranteed, or if it's a DCO will take time to prepare the environmental statement come through the examination process and whatnot. So it could be a considerable period of time, if you'd like before, the full the full benefit of the project could come forward. Is that a fair assessment.

16:39

And Paul Davis for the applicant, I think a way of looking at this is the maximum capacity of the pipeline would be 18 million tonnes. So it gives you a feel for the ramp up to the 15 million tonnes per annum in 2035, is relatively close to the capacity of the plastic of the pipeline.

17:04

batch window for the African effect if I can just add one point is that when you mentioned the anchor mentors earlier, Phillips 66 and VPI. Eminem, as you're probably aware, those planning applications were submitted in March 2023 for their carbon capture facilities. So they are quite advanced in the process. And the planning references are North Lincolnshire Council, Pa slash 2023, slash four to one and Pa slash 2023 slash four to two. Okay,

17:38

thank you very much at which time, I'll come over to the council and say, how are the applications going? And is there a likely decision date that we can expect you in this examination?

17:49

Yeah, thank you, sir. And you'll often often Kentia counsel, yes, the applications are both an advanced stage, it's very likely that decisions will be issued in the short term and definitely within within the period of this examination. Believe at the moment, we're just trying to resolve an outstanding issue with national highways regarding potential cumulative impacts of construction periods, etc. But we're not anticipating that that will, will be a lengthy process to resolve. So yeah, I would say in the next month or two, we would expect a decision to issue

18:28

Thank you very much. That'd be useful for to when it whenever that comes through, in whatever way your local impact report, if it's in time or a future representation, just to let us know what the decision was on those applications. Thank you for that. Have me just one second. I think that completes my questions under that. So thank you just for that, that sort of context and background. Moving to the next item on the agenda, which is to talk about the logs pipeline, and we touched on the offshore consenting regime. And I won't ask too much more about that, because I think you've had the position quite clear

this morning. But just in relation to the logs and federal form itself, let's just dive into those at the moment. The statement of reasons explains that federal form option two would only be required if an agreement over the existing federal foot gas terminal cannot be reached. It is, however, understood that the valve an entry point into the logs pipeline is within the Fed default gas terminal regardless and if you were doing option two, you would need an extension of that logs pipeline. That being the case what are the applicant's options if national gas transmission decided that to prevent sterilisation of the guest terminal, the logs should not be extended

20:06

But when of the applicant, the consideration with national gas, it's not necessarily a concern about logs being extended. The concern about the use of the federal forecast terminal site is more about the above ground infrastructure. And how that might sterilise an area for future use. The following receipt of the representation from Mablethorpe flexible generation limited, which is our Rs 056, the applicant has been engaged in further with national gas and with new for flexible generation to try and ensure that all infrastructure in that area would allow them to coexist. But on the option to point that concern is more with the above ground infrastructure location and living with the other one.

20:53

Okay. So from your perspective, there isn't an objection to extending the log pipeline westward that would be potentially compatible with whatever if you had to go down that route that would be compatible with national gases? concerns or operations?

21:11

I don't know if that can. No, that's not my understanding of their their objection. Okay.

21:17

Thank you very much. And, on a similar vein, appreciate you've got ongoing negotiations, but you've got the proposed southern construction compound being on the previously developed land within the gas terminal. From the paperwork that I've seen in the environmental statement, it appears that that would be the case, regardless of whether option one or option two, is is forwarded. Are there any concerns that you know from national guests about the siting of the Southern construction compound and any sterilisation of land

21:54

at home and for the applicant know that no concern has been raised?

22:04

By this okay, bear with me one second. Okay, despite my earlier promise of not going into the offshore consenting, it's necessary for me to do so with a particular different twist on it on this occasion, because it was raised by Natural England in their relevant representation Rs 073. And they raised the in the complexity of examining associated N sips, holistically. Now given that the Viking CCS project as a whole encompasses both onshore and offshore elements, but the offshore elements are not before this examination. How does the applicant respond to natural England's sort of suggestions and concerns there

22:52

patrimonial for the applicant, as we touched on this morning, the two aspects of development within the overall project is the one onshore, then there's the separation distance of around about 118 kilometres before there would be any new infrastructure constructed offshore. Both of those projects are being are being developed under the EAA regime. Both have had environmental impact assessments undertaken or will have had them undertaken in respect of the offshore wind. So all of the environmental impacts that might arise will have been assessed in terms of the potential for cumulative interaction, the bridging document that the applicant has submitted, which is a PP one to eight does give consideration for the potential interaction of effects so inter project effects between the offshore element and the onshore element. And it concludes that there's no potential pathway or accumulative effect. Thank you.

24:06

Now, just touching, keeping with the federal fork gas terminal, obviously we had the optionality at the imminent end. And that seems to be resolving itself in terms of optionality at the federal for penned. Do you? We've obviously got the DCO has been drafted, whereby an option could be struck out at any stage, but do you envisage during the course of the examination, that one of those options will be struck out or will that be a a recommendation we put secretary of state based position to reach

24:45

maximum level for the applicant? As was discussed this morning, the African has been engaging with national gas and concerns the discussions are progressing well. The applicant will keep the examining authority updated through the examination if agreement can be reached, and in the event that it is reached, the applicant would tend to submit a change request to remove that optionality from the DCO. And provide certainty.

25:10

Okay, so that would be, if it were to come to that, then we'd get a change request to, in effect, reduce the order land limits. So it'll be a reduction of land, and potentially not wishing to prejudge anything but no additional landowners, potentially, because it's a reduction of land. Obviously, that's an isolated part of it. Does the applicant envisage any other potential change requests coming forward in relation to other parts of land along the whole corridor?

25:53

I don't know if the app can there is one further area of further engagement with a landowner that location has there's been a request effectively for a change. The African is seeing whether that is feasible in engineering terms before providing any modification or we'll be able to take that forward. The applicant is conscious of the guidance on change requests and will advise examining authority as soon as possible if they intend to make that change. Okay,

26:25

thanks. Thank you very much just for clarifying that just give spin ideas as we go forward, what we can expect to see.

26:38

And then just to finish this idea of optionality we've strayed into tree a see on here, it does appear that decision may now have been made on the route and option out of immingham hence the submitted change request application. expunge just summarise the documents that have had to change and how that's been particularly in the DCO in the draft deferment consent order, how that option, if you like has been removed from that from the order.

27:24

Actually, for the African M, just bear with me one moment while I've been caught.

27:39

The changes in in drafting terms to the draft development consent order a relatively minor to reflect the immingham change. The main one has been the deletion of work numbers to a and to B, and all subsequent removals of reference to those work numbers. In sheduled, six part one which relates to land where temporary possession may be taken. Those tables have been amended to reflect that there's been a removal of temporary working areas. And beyond that, the main the other changes related to the change request have been done by reference to the works plans. So whilst the works plans in the Lions fans will ultimately be certified documents, that's not need necessitate a changes in the development consent order itself. And so those those minor changes are the only drafting points.

28:36

Okay, thank you very much. for that. I'll hand over to Mr. Jackson, the next set of questions.

28:42

Thank you. So moving on to Agenda Item three A D, which is limits of deviation. The first question I've got is can the applicant set out what it believes to be an appropriate and proportionate use of the powers allowed under Article Six of the draft DCO

29:03

Batuan rule for the applicant just to initially set the context for the drafting of the limits of deviation. And every major infrastructure project and linear projects in particular face that challenge of striking a balance between how much design work and site investigation is undertaken prior to application versus the post consent stage. And so the approach that the applicants for seeks to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to deal with uncertainties that might be revealed as detailed survey and design works taken forward. And the African considers that the level of engineering and site investigation undertaken to but by the applicant to date is consistent with that of other similar projects. Just turn to the drafting itself. Article Six of the draft DCO sets out limits of deviation and it's drafted based on precedent in the Southampton to London pipeline development can Same order 2020 and is also consistent with the equivalent article. In the recently granted high net carbon dioxide pipeline order 2020 for the lateral limits of deviation are shown coloured as coloured areas on the works plans, and in general they cover the full width of the order limits. And that corridor as we touched on this morning is approximately 100 metres wide at most locations. Within the 100 metre corridor, the applicant in the construction phase would take an hour working with in which construction would take place. And so no matter where that work in corridor was located, the construction work should always be undertaken fully

within the order limits. On the horizontal limits of deviation, the works plans don't include a centerline in relation to the pipeline works with a specified metre edge either sight, and that is a deliberate choice by the applicant because the applicants view is that a centerline wouldn't serve any useful purpose on the works plans. And the reason for that is that the current preferred pipeline route doesn't always follow the centre lane at certain locations in the order limits. And so it's considered that the lateral limits of deviation are sufficiently clear from the works plans as currently shown. And this is an approach that's consistent with other determined piping VCOs, including the Highland pilot visa that I just referred to, and with other linear schemes such as the Hornsey for offshore wind farm ordered 2023 in respect of the vertical limits of deviation, the Article Six does specify those the upwards Vertical Limit of deviation and being the minimum depth of which the pipeline maybe lead is 1.2 metres from the surface of the ground, except for ground conditions make compliance to this upward limit impractical. In which case the upper limit is 0.7 metres below the surface of the ground and that that limit is chosen because that would largely avoid any interference thought or cultural operations. The downward Vertical Limit of deviation is the maximum that for any pipeline might be installed to and that is included in Article Six and is a precautionary approach to allow for horizontal directional drilling to be used for crossings such as the North back drain your Qb and loathe canal river lug near Alvin them. The maximum limit that is specified is 20 metres, but the actual depth required at those locations will be determined during front end engineering design. I think it's worth saying that there for various crossing types and technologies and for installation technique techniques, although there's no limit specified it would fall within those maximum limits upwards and downwards. And in practice, there are some limitations to what that strip the pipeline can be installed that due to the technology used. So for example, for open cart the downward limits would generally be around about five metres below the surface due to limitations on how low the trenching machine can excavate and for overboard limit would generally be six metres and however the the applicants approach has been specified upper and lower limits and as an answer that is consistent with other recent precedent.

33:26

Okay, thank you. So, you mentioned there about the pipeline depths that's fine Can you set that what ground conditions will make the pipeline barrier at 1.2 metre depth impractical, who would be notified or consulted in that case, whether desirable burial burial depth was not achieved?

34:10

Ashman rule for the African, the main constraint is if there was rock that forced you to be higher than 1.2 metres or and the main constraint that can sometimes force downwards is drains. So to avoid impacts on drainage before going to his limits the outcome will engage with the landowner and seek to agree a solution

34:42

next, what is the meaning of convenient in Article Six C, and Woodstock convenience results in any materially different or worse environmental environmental effects to those predicted in the ES

35:18

I don't know if the application so, there may be instances where as we just touched on the ground conditions may not be favourable, in which case the applicant may seek to, to agree a solution there

that deviates downwards. For example, the drainage example that we just mentioned, that is what that would have in mind that differs from necessity whether, for example, rock, you can't go through it, you may not be able to go through that, whereas drainage might be avoidable or you may be able to relocate drains, but in some circumstances, you would choose not to do so.

36:05

Okay, okay. And one final question on this is the explanatory memorandum, a pp 007. Paragraph one point 6.29 refers to a minimum five metre burial depth. And yet that doesn't appear written into the draft DCO can explain the reasons for this?

36:48

That's one of the applicant, the narrative in that section was, was describing the practicalities more so than the no limit deviation that was included within the DCO. So the African approach was to secure the upper and lower limits, it hasn't sought to secure different pipeline dates for different technologies.

37:18

Okay, thank you. So moving on to Agenda Item three a II scheme parameters. There's only one issue here that I want to cover and that is in ES chapter three, at paragraph 3.9. Point four, it states in the highly unlikely events that larger volumes of carbon dioxide are required to be discharged. A taller temporary vent may be installed and used and then removed again, at either the iminium facility or federal thought facility. In this unlikely scenario, these temporary stacks would be expected to be in position up to a period of approximately two weeks, the exact height of this temporary events that will be determined by detailed atmospheric dispersion modelling, but initial design work indicates that it could be up to a maximum of 50 metres. So, this doesn't appear anywhere else in the environmental statement nor is it allowed for under any article or requirement in the draft DCO were requirement for sets out the maximum parameters can you explain that please?

38:25

That window for the African the maximum scheme parameters set out in requirement for relate to the permanent infrastructure and parameters. So within that, the vent stack at the m&m facility and available facility for example, are both restricted 25 metres from ground level. The African considered the temporary nature of the 50 metre stack, and this was considered in the preparation of EIA. The view that was reached is that due to its highly temporary nature of only two weeks, it wouldn't result in any new environmental effects beyond those that are already assessed in the DCO in the environmental statement, so whilst it's not mentioned again, it was assessed as part of that assessment work in terms of the the powers to do to do that temporary work within the development consent order, the associated development paragraph within RT one of shedule one of the DCO demo, which is for your notes on paragraph 56 and 57 was a range of other works to be undertaken for the maintenance and operation of the pipeline. And one of those works is such other works as may be necessary or expedient. For the purposes of brand purposes associated with or ancillary to the construction operatives, operation or maintenance of the authorised development, and that broad power is restricted to that which wouldn't give rise to any materially new or materially different effects from those assess environmental statement, the applicant considers that that definition of associated development would cover the temporary stack if it was needed.

40:26

Okay, thank you. Yep.

40:33

Thank you just could you just point me into the deferment, consent order where there is a definition of associated development, I found the ancillary works, but I haven't seen the exact definition of what's associated development, please

40:48

add one rule for the applicant. It is at the final paragraph on page 56. Going over to 57. Below work number 48. See there's a there's a definition of works with compromise associated development. I think it's probably and then we're going to come on to this in the next agenda item. I don't know if it's worth me just covering off the approach taken to associated development, no boss role and the point. Yes,

41:20

if you could, actually, because it might help with the next set of questions as please.

41:24

Yep. So part one of schedule one of the draft, DCA will set so the development that will be authorised by the DCO. And within that the applicant hasn't chosen to differentiate between the nationally significant infrastructure project itself and associated development works. In shedule, one of the draft DCO, the approach that the applicants taken is that ultimately all elements of the proposed development either constitute part of the insert, or they are associated development within the meaning of section 152 of the Planning Act 2008. So they can be properly authorised within the DCO. They expire to memorandum. And those are a number of aspects of the development that the applicant would consider fall within associated development, rather than being part of the insert. And that includes permanent temporary accesses, temporary construction compounds, temporary logistics and construction storage hubs and electrical connections for above ground infrastructure. But what the applicant hasn't done is see these works numbers are the end set. And these works, numbers are associated development. Appreciate that. A lot of details do that. And not all of them do. But if that, if that was a concern, the applicant could make that more specific and split out the works numbers.

42:40

Okay. I think it might help with just the legibility just having the title though associated development so that it can differentiate I appreciate what you're saying that you you believe it's either part of development or that it is associated. I think just drawing that distinction, that'd be useful. But it's

42:56

actually without going yes, that we can incorporate that into the next version of the draft dcl. Okay,

43:02

thank you for that. Now, one aspect of associated development where you say is associated, or maybe even part of the project. In the DCO, there is a Deaf version of fibre optic cables, but that term is only

used once in the order. An alternative term telecommunications cables then appears throughout the order but no definition is provided. And the explanatory memorandum doesn't really offer any clarity on that. Can you explain what is the nature of these telecommunication cables proposed to close

43:37

back from North Africa and a description of the telecommunications equipment that would be installed and set out in paragraph 3.7? Point 27 of the project description chapter. EPP 045 There's no more deed. A bit more detail on this in this section on pipeline construction. And that is paragraph three point 12 point 134 onwards. The main piece of infrastructure associated with the telecommunications equipment is the fibre optic cable, and there is some other ancillary equipment alongside that, and the telecommunications equipment provides information relating to the communications between the m&m facility and federal facilities. It has some critical telephone CCTV and other detection systems along the pipeline route. With respect to the reference to telecommunications in the draft, development consent order, having seen the agenda this morning, they have reviewed that and would propose to make them more specific reference to the equipment rather than the broad definition of telecommunications and again, would meet that amendment to the draft development consent order.

44:50

Because it would certainly know from an initial reading of it I could understand that fibre optic cables are needed for the monitoring of the of the pipeline and for electrical connection to the various facilities. It just, I saw the term telecommunications and immediately thought that there was potentially some other some other development going on here and whether it was truly associated or not, but you're, you're confident that that's not the case here.

45:15

I can look for their opinion, yes. Confident in this case.

45:19

Okay. Yes, do please do amend the DCO accordingly. Now, the next question that I have on this is in relation to shedule seven, with the draft consent order, and it sets out various plots and the various purposes for which acquisition and rights are being sought. It is noted in some instances that the purpose of acquisition that is stated is, and I'll give the description is to instal construct, maintain, use improve, cleanse, repair, replace and remove cables, conduits, surface media and associate apparatus for use for the purposes of transmitting or distributing electricity and communications within that part of the land. Why would this proposed development which is for the collection and safe disposal of carbon dioxide, require the ability to transmit or distribute electricity and communications,

46:23

back and move the applicant the electrical connection works, works numbers 01, C, 07, B, 14, B 21, B, 31, B and 45. And what they relate to connections from the local electricity distribution network, to above ground infrastructure and block valves. And those are from locations generally, in the road or verges of the road, where there's already a distribution network electricity cable, the above ground infrastructure and the block valves will all lead to an electricity connection of some kind. And the size would be the same scale as a standard sort of business connection. It's not a large scale up electricity,

cable, and those those cables will be buried in the ground. Again, that the applicant would intend to review the reference to electrical connection and the DCO and make it clear what the infrastructure as it's being installed. But that's, that's the purpose is to power those those facilities. It

47:31

just seem to me apologies and being a bit dense here. But in terms of if it's sort of a standard connection to be able to operate, why would you need to acquire the land to be able to transmit or distribute electricity, if anything, it's just purely connecting to the grid to allow your facility to operate. And I think my my concern is the words for transmitting or distributing, they just seem to be at odds with what you're actually seeking the electrical connection for.

48:03

pattern over the app can take that point and recognise that those words have specific meanings than other legal regimes. So we'll take that away, I can review that.

48:13

Thank you. Thank you very much for doing that. That's much appreciated. I should say that we've we're racing ahead with the agenda here. And it does seem to be an interrogation of the applicant at the moment. By all means, if anyone either online or here wishes to jump in, conscious from looking that way, but by all means no signal or raise raised too much attention to the panel's attention. So don't don't mean to exclude anyone from from this. Though we'll we'll with there's no further queries on that. We'll we'll move forward to Item three see on the agenda, which is to look at some specific articles and requirements. Whilst a lot of our questions will appear in written questions. So I think that's more appropriate to do. There's several terms here that I just want to explore with you. And in particular, the draft development consent order provides the term abandon within the definition of maintain. Now, from a practical sense, or my basic understanding of abandon is basically that you can just walk away from something and not do anything further with it. Can you explain why abandon is in the DCO and what are the implications upon the applicant in terms of decommissioning?

49:51

Patch one of the African the, for the pipeline that the decommissioning aspect would ultimately be determined What was most appropriate at the point of decommissioning? There is, I think that the base case is that the pipeline would be made safe and left in situ. That that is generally the reference to Bandon within that section. Appreciate that probably doesn't quite.

50:24

To me, decommissioning is a conscious four to conscious act of saying, Okay, we've looked at the pipeline, we're going to clean it, and the best thing for it is to leave it in situ. But to me, the word abandon basically means that at any time, regardless of any decommissioning at any time, you could just walk away. And with reference to a high profile abandonment of a recent railway scheme, there was a lot of people who have been subjected to compulsory acquisition, who were therefore left very shortchanged. And I'm just worried about the term abandon here, how you would envisage if it was just abandoned, and you walked away? How would that interact with compulsory acquisition regime or any other implications for other people?

51:18

I don't know if that can. I'm not sure I can take that much further. Just now, if that's okay. And there's a point that we could maybe add as an action to respond to you in writing on

51:27

if you were to please, there's just a concern of mine on that. So if you could take that away. Thank you. And then thoughts,

51:40

just while we're definitely hold Lincolnshire county council, thank you. So sorry to interrupt, just while we're on the definition of maintain. That is also a point that the county council had picked up about the tension with the word abandon, but also to, to aligned points to that. One that the definition of may have three points I've pulled out. One, the definition of maintain includes sort of dismantle, demolish, abandoned and Decommission. There's therefore some tension between that and having specific decommissioning provisions in the DCA. So there's a power to maintain which go, which cuts across then the later requirements to decommission. There's just it's possibly just a drafting tension more than anything else, but it's not a happy result. So that obviously, the points about abandonment that you raised, we endorse. Thirdly, the obviously the the advice 815 on drafting the sorts of provisions, it's paragraph 18.2 gives rise to my last two points in this. One is that there really ought to be some clarity that through maintenance of the project, however, so defined, the applicant don't get permission to do anything that hasn't been part of the environmental assessments, they were that it doesn't go doesn't permit anything that would have significantly different environmental effects are with the Yes. And finally, a 18.2. Well, 18.2 provides specific endorsements for the for the first three points that neither should the power to maintain, permit the construction of what is effectively a different project. And also that really, they ought to have engaged in sufficiently early consultation with the appropriate bodies to agree this definition I EOS and had that happened, we would have raised those points. So thank you. So those are my points on on the definition of maintain.

53:48

Thank you very much any immediate response from the applicant to that?

53:58

I don't know if the app can. There's no immediate response from the outcome that again, we can respond to the Ventura County Council's concerns which build on your own. So thank you.

54:11

The next article where I want to just to raise some concerns, so respect of article 29 that allows for the acquisition of sub soil and airspace. On a number of occasions, the acquisition power spill over for the sub soil only, particularly in agricultural land, it's just the acquisition of sub soil to lay the pipe. And it has been said that by doing so doesn't burden the surface with any rights, which on the face of it sounds reasonable. But with the airspace, potentially being acquired as well, which article 29 seems to allow. It seems to me that the applicant still has control over what happens above to the surface of the land, so I suppose it's a two part question. One, where does the airspace actually start above ground

level? Is it one metre, two metres five metres, where does the airspace start? To? Why does the applicant needs such airspace? I lied, it's a three part question. And then the third by having that article, does that unnecessarily burden the owners and occupiers by placing a restriction on what they can do on the surface?

56:14

Turn off the app and the the outcome isn't intending to acquire any of the airspace above land. The statement of reasons to do so the rates and land that the applicant is seeking to acquire and in respect to those the applicant has included restrictive covenants over various parcels which would suitably control a development that might or activities that might impact the pipeline. That is the app gets intended way to control a potential interference of the pipeline and to restrict that from taking place. It's not the intention to inquire that the airspace

57:02

so that being the case, how would that article work, if you like?

57:17

The in respect to the reference to aerospace, I think that is included because Well, partly because it's the article was drafted based on Article 24 in the model provisions. And was based on the precedent in other pipeline DC was included, including Southampton to London. Now, if we can give it a little bit more thought on whether that reference should remain.

57:51

Okay, yes, if you could take that away and just see whether it a allows you what you need it to or what you want it to also whether there is any, unforeseen if you'd like impacts upon upon landowners that are not fully been explained at the moment. That'd be that'd be good. Thank you. Just a couple more questions under this item before we take an adjournment for a break. The article 44 is obviously the list of certified documents. And I noticed that the planning design and access statement is not one of them. Is there a particular reason for this?

58:43

Planning and Design and access statement isn't one of the controlling documents than a development consent order. It wasn't felt necessary to include it for certification.

58:56

Okay. Having had read, reading the plan design access to me there's obviously some guiding principles in there about how the design of certain apparatus is going to look and how it's going to feel on the site. So it's it has some not so much a parameter but a control over the appearance of certain apparatus. In that regard. Do you think it has any any input and any need to be a certified document when it provides the the overarching design principles for the project?

59:33

X one rule for the app kill? No, I don't think that is the case the there are a number of controls within the development consent order already on how the infrastructure would be laid out. So the main one being

requirement for scheme design, which requires the various works numbers the above ground one works to be carried out in accordance in general accordance with a general arrangement plans, which would be certified. And those plans are a PP 019 to a ppsu 20 a PP zero 21 AAPs zero 27 EPP, zero 28 and a PP zero 29 those those set as they say a general arrangement. So, broadly how those pieces of infrastructure would be laid out and how they would look and that is what has been assessed alongside that, the main other controlling factor on the block valve stations, the admin facility and failover facility, for example would be would be landscaped and screened would be dealt with through the landscape and ecological management plan which is secured and required. A draft has been submitted an EPP one to seven, I think the section and the climb design and access statement is trying to explain in the in the context of a good design an obligation and the National Policy Statement set out that the applicant should try and demonstrate how they've had regard to good design. That's what the planning design and access statement is getting towards rather than am trying to be a constraining document on how it would be built.

1:01:35

I'll just pursue this just a little bit further. In the sense of two examples, if you like in the planning, design and access statement, it says that the equipment kiosks are to be clad in metal panels, for example. Now that doesn't appear in requirement for and certainly there's some talk about colour in there. But again, that's not mentioned in the DCO in terms of that as a control. But then also there is a tension between the development consent between what is written in the development consent order and what is written in the design Nexus statement. And I'll give you just bear with me one moment in the DCO. At requirement four, it states the height of perimeter fencing would be 3.2 metres. But in the planning, design and access statement at paragraph six, point 3.21 It states the fencing would be 2.4 metres in height. And that's if you like what I'm getting at in terms of is a control document, because at the moment there is that tension between the two. And obviously 2.4 sounds better than 3.2. So if you could just sort of confirm any comments on that

1:02:54

pattern of the outcome. Given there's a discrepancy and a request, we take that away and check whether one is an error in the first instance.

1:03:05

Okay, fair enough. Thank you. Thank you very much. I think what we'll do now, because we've we're coming close to the end of this particular agenda item. Before we take a break on this, I just want to throw it open to the floor, as it were and just see if anyone has any comments on what we've asked to date or any burning issues they want to get off their, their chair, so I'll look around the room first.

1:03:37

First, definitely hold Lincolnshire county council, I've got a reasonable list of burning issues, I'm afraid. So just to put you on notice If you were looking for a moment for a break, happy to do them now. But it would probably put us back a little bit. Or happy to take a break now. And I'll give you my list of burning issues afterward.

1:03:55

Not a problem at all. I'll just continue around the room. Does anyone want to raise anything? There's anyone on the online? Want to raise anything specific raised? So raise your hand? Okay, none, none that I've How long is this long list of issues? 15 minutes? 20 minutes? Yes. 50. Okay, then. Let's hear your burning issues. And then we'll take it. Thank

1:04:25

you. So definitely holding on to cancel the fit the first point, which wasn't previously on my left foot now is so just just in terms of picking up on the design points that you've just been discussing with the applicant. I think having heard the discussion today. linkage is probably of the view that if you we understand why as a matter of convention, you wouldn't include the DAS on list of documents, but without it in this particular context. There is no then mechanism for having good design parameters in that in that broader sense and protect Usually when the plans are said to provide that mechanism, it includes such encouraging notations as 3.2 metre high prison, a tight mesh. And as being the, you know, that is not aspirational in its design intent, to say the least. So it's missing then that that encouragement towards good design and having a design guide or design parameters. So I leave that there and return to my list of issues. So they fall generally into three categories. One is highways point on articles eight, 912 13, and 16. The second is on trees and hedgerows. So that's articles 39, and 40. And the final grouping is about requirements, but mostly the procedure for discharge. So by the time we get there, you'll know the time they're stopping having to talk in terms of the highways point, I grouped them together, and then perhaps the applicant can can take it away. The broad points is something that happens quite a lot in DCA is that and I recognise that the applicants are in a in a bind about to what extent you provide all the detail now or to what extent you push it off to a later day. But if the detail is to be pushed off to a later day, there has to be an appropriate consenting mechanism for that. Here, we have very broad powers to undertake works both within the order limits, and notably, outside the order limits. That's what articles, I think it's eight and nine theeek Express expressly, they say, Well, we've got the power to do things listed in the schedule, but also to do anything else for the purposes of influencing projects, whether or not within the order limits. And that that phrase appears a few times books, one references, Article eight, three. So we do find it difficult to agree to such a broad power without justification. If it's the case that they just don't know quite yet what needs to be done, then that's understandable. But the way to deal with that is to provide for the highway authority to have proper oversight of it after the order is granted. And at the moment, the provisions don't allow for that. We are given Amiga 28 days to consider all requirements and consents thought under the DCO at the moment. And to say that at the short end of what I've seen, is an understatement. They're just for comparison, we're also dealing you'll be aware that Lincolnshire county council have gotten I think we're in when it often nearly we're over 20. Now TCAS are in the pipeline. And at the moment, we've got the sorts of rolling agreement agreement with the solar DCO promoters that it should be 10 weeks that we get to discharge requirements and matters under the DCO. So you can see the 28 days begins to look incredibly tight, particularly when one understands that Under the TCPA regime, you get 21 days to consult statutory consultees if it wasn't CIA development and 30 just to consult on applications crossing our desk. If it's the IAEA development, to do the consultation process, consider those consultation responses and go through an approvals process within 28 days. It's simply not not not plausible. What was happened in reality is if that was approved, all of the applications would just be refused. And you'd have to go down the appeals process, which is just it's not doesn't help anybody. So we'd prefer to have a meaningful amount of time to consider all of these applications that are going to come across

our desk, particularly when the detail isn't provided at the outset. And allowing the point is the mechanism for that consenting. Today, you'll be aware that obviously, we have procedures and statutory procedures in place for both works in the highways and the signage and temporary traffic lights and signs and things like that. So there's a permitting procedure for signs and traffic lights and things like that. That attracts a particular fee and a particular process is triggered at the Council. The same is true for physical works in the highway under Section 278 of the Highways Act, that there are particular teams As the council is set up to deal with these processes, they all attract a particular fee. So it is about trying to align documents that come in to the council and the DCO. With existing teams and processes. We're not saying that it can't be done. And we're not saying that you would necessarily have to go down a 278 route. Given that we understand the purpose of the DCO is to bring all of that consenting within one document. That's true as far as that goes. But when you don't have the detail at this point, and this document is supposed to supplant those procedures, it needs to do so in a way that properly allows for the same kind of level of consideration to take place at the authority level. Noting Of course, that it works in the highway a proposed that is potentially significant and has significant highways impacts and safety impacts if they're not properly scrutinised. That leads me on to my next point on this, which is about deemed approval, at the moment, the applicant seeks deemed approval for works in the highways. So article eight, five, gives us 28 days to approve or refuse failing which deemed approval. Our standing position on every applicant seeking deemed approval for this is that it's not appropriate to have deemed approval for something as significant as how physical highways works, that could have serious safety implications. It needs to be done properly. And you know, a mayor deemed approval isn't isn't appropriate given the potential consequences of an unsafe highways access. So that those are my points on on highways. I think I'm on to chapter two of my list, which is hedgerows and trees. So that's articles 39 and 40. So unless you wanted me to pause there and let the applicant respond,

1:12:09

if not happy to take the pause that

1:12:13

portion of the applicant accept the points that have been made, which, again, the applicant is very happy to engage further with currently counsel on this on on the drafting and the DCO itself. The powers that are saw reflect those that have been granted a number of recent linear projects including the high net added carbon dioxide pipeline DC yield last Wednesday. There are mechanisms that the applicant can enter into future agreements with the highways authority, so article 14 expressly, article 14 expressly provides for that. There are also controls on when they are concluded could undertake construction of any permanent or temporary means of access to the highway under requirements seven, however, that know that the timescales have been raised as a concern. I'm grateful to the county council for having flagged this point in advance of today's so I think what proposed to the outcome does have further engagement, the current Council on this and then it can be reported, in fact, the examining authority through statement of common ground and how those negotiations are progressing. Thank you,

1:13:34

Stephanie. Hold Lincolnshire county council, we welcome that it is something that we've managed to negotiate successfully on other projects. So we have some hope that negotiations and would bear fruit here. So thank you. I'll move on then. So if I may say it's my second chapter to tree trees and hedgerows. So just mindful of the good practice advice now track 15 on drafting for this, they were looking at paragraph 20.1 and 22.2 and 20.3. And comparing what that advice needs encourages us to do with what we've got at articles 39 and 40. In short, the point is a lack of specificity at this stage failing which an absence of later consenting. So it's the same sorts of point if there's not going to be specificity at this point, there needs to be adequate provision for a detailed approval later down the line. This is a point at which the the advice note 15 recommends that a precautionary blanket provision is not sought. So we do note that and compare that with article 40, which does seek essentially an ability to do anything to TPO trees if needed, Did and removes the duty to replant. And we are not told what trees may be within the audit limits or what might happen to them. And in my submission says contract countries the advice note, a similar point applies in relation to Article 39 and hedge raise 22 Point paragraph 22.1 of the advice note does encourage to assist the examining authority that a shedule and a plan should be provided to detail the extent of headway removals either in full or in part. And it says well, if you can't do that, then this needs to be subject to later Express approval by the planning authority. And I think we'd be entirely accepting of you know, some details now but subject in the outline land but subject to approvals later on in in the in the lamb, which, which is a common way of dealing with it. But what we would expect at this point is at least a rough idea of what we might be expecting to get in the lamp. And I just at this point, the outline lamp doesn't propose to give us plans for hedge Ray removals doesn't include draft plans, doesn't actually even say what they will do that. In fact, that lamp says they'll they'll replant what's removed, but doesn't say how extensive the removals would be in the first place. So there's, there's just a little bit of work there and I'm sure it's something that the applicant can will pick up

1:16:37

to do personal FIAP can the accept the power in article 39 is drafted in broad terms, that broad drafting is consistent with article 39 of the model provisions. Drafting confirmed a number of recent DC O's clean article 34 of the Hornsey three offshore wind farm article 2020 article 35 Norfolk Borealis offshore wind farm ordered 2021 I think that the the applicant's view is that that broad power is constrained by the requirements and shedule to have the DCO in particular the requirements requiring the requirements five requiring a construction environment management plan to be submitted to in discharge by the planning authority and then thereafter complied with and requirements 11 the landscape and ecological management plan that just for your note the draft, construction environment management plan is EPP 068 and the draft landscape and ecological management plans EPP one to seven as part of the construction environment management plan, The Undertaker will be required to prepare a tree and hedgerows protection strategy. And a draft of that strategy is within the arboricultural report, examination Library Reference EPP 086 And that that document does contain various details about hedgerows or trees that would potentially be impacted. And the general commitments that are within the Construction Management Plan and the landscape and ecological management plan do include requirements and minimise the number and extent of hedgerows and be removed to reinstate them to an improved standard and various controls requiring the applicant to adopt a range of good measure practices. So although a little bit power in the article is drafted in broad terms, and the

applicants view is that this is sufficiently constrained by requirements at the moment and bylaws management plans, again, with the council having to engage further the Council on this point.

1:18:42

Say Thank you Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire county council it will take will take them I call them cell phone relish. We'll have a look through again, they're now we're in schedule two, and it's probably the point that we can reach the third chapter of my paper earning points. I've got a very short point, which is that requirements five, we'd expect to have seen Express reference to it ecological measures, and we don't have that, but I think it might be that there's somewhere else or that it's missing, but there's a very, very small point. The bigger point in relation to requirements relates to part two and the procedure for discharge really made the point in relation to highways but it applies here in relation to the 28 days being wholly insufficient and out of keeping with timescales that we have agreed on or the DCA owes. Ditto the fees we consider to be unrepresentative of the extent of work that is required. When if there is to be a read across to the to the Town and Country Planning fees regs, then we consider this to be in line with either and reserved matters approval, and over a large scheme or it or a large a large consent, not a very easy, quick approval following an outline permission this is. So their fee of 117 pounds is completely undervalues the extensive of work. It is something that we've been able to successfully discuss with other applicants. So I'm sure it's something we can take offline with the applicant and go from there. But just to raise the point broadly in this forum, that obviously there's a huge amount of work coming through to Lincolnshire county council. Just on that point, and then I'll probably pause and let the applicant respond. While we're dealing with this charge of requirements and what is coming across Lincolnshire, County Council's desk, there's probably a body of work to be done between the applicant and the other, and the district councils in terms of identifying the relevant planning authority for discharge for each. And we certainly would like to be specified as a particular console tea in relation to a number of requirements. Even if we are not the discharging body, say for example, in relation to the landscaping ecological management plan, we doesn't it's probably best to stick with the District Council. But we would like to be consulted on things like that. And obviously matters going to highways or without county matters, we consider should come to us as discharging authority. And again, that's something that we've been able to work through with other AP DCA applicants. And we're sure we can have a chat, but it's just a body of just to put it on your radar. So there's probably some work that we all need to do to get together and decide who discharges what. Thank you.

1:21:51

Just one quick question before the applicant responds. You mentioned there 10 weeks is what you've agreed for the discharge on the other DCA owes. Can I just confirm in terms of what you mean by you've agreed has? Are there any made development consent orders, where the Secretary of State has agreed with that timescale? Or is that yet to be put before the Secretary of State for determination? So

1:22:17

the most advanced one is the gate birth and DCA in Lincolnshire, which is only just reached deadline stakes were the final statutory instrument compliant version of the DCO has been submitted to the Secretary of State to the DSA. That includes 10 weeks. So it's not it's it's not going to get evolved beyond that, but it hasn't been made.

1:22:44

Okay, so we I'd take full note of your suggestion, and I absolutely recognise the pressures that you're under, you know, it seems to be DCO central in Lincolnshire at the moment, just conscious that if, if that has been agreed on other projects, during the course of the examination, there still remains the opportunity for the Secretary of State to disagree with that and modify that. So just need to bear that in mind. So as you say, they're at deadline, six. So I'm not sure we'll get a resolution, we might get a resolution before the close of this examination. But I'll come to the the applicant on all the points that you've just heard.

1:23:27

pattern of the applicant, the RTO of sheduled, two relating to the procedure for discharge of requirements, the process that was selected and timescales was effectively borrowing from other development consent orders for linear schemes can serve to London pipeline being the main one, I'm very happy to engage with the local authorities on timescales. And it's a point that I know has also been respect Environment Agency, and that we're engaging with them on through their relevant representation, do want to manage expectations slightly on the timescales, that the applicant is under a lot of pressure to deliver this project within a certain timescale. And discharge of requirements and timelines associated with that may not be able to be as long as 10 weeks, for example, but certainly take it away and discuss it as local authorities.

1:24:21

And in terms of the obviously, you'll be discussing this, but in terms of the request, if you'd like to get rid of the deemed approval mechanism, if you like Do you have any immediate comments on that?

1:24:37

Again, the applicant is under pressure, as I said before to deliver the scheme and so there does need to be a point where for some revisions, even approvals take effect. And we propose to review that in the road alongside the timescales and the two tend to fit together to some extent after certain period is, is we Isn't that appropriate in the applicants view to have a deemed approval process there? And whether the team skills and how they work, the local authorities were very happy to discuss further.

1:25:11

Thank you very much. Thank you.

1:25:12

Leave, we

1:25:14

had all three of your chapters, as you call them on that. Was there anything further, even from yourself or from anyone else in the room?

1:25:24

Thank you, sir. Under Law for Northeast Council, it's nothing new. I just wanted to make the point that we share the concerns around timescales and fees with regards to discharge requirements. So I think

the applicants already committed to it, but if we could be involved in in those discussions, that would be appreciated. Okay. Thank

1:25:41

you very much. And so a hand raised there. So imagine the same point. Martin

1:25:45

Dixon northeast linkage Council, I think he was right. I think we went up in unison there with Andrew. Yes, Ditto with that. I must admit, in terms of protocols. I thought maybe we'll be getting on to this after the break. But the few points in terms of the requirements agree with that experience. I would say the reason that I get the CEO, this point was raised at that DCO hearing that the timescales were not realistic. They're not realistic, you just couldn't do it. So you'd be in a position where you wouldn't be able to discharge it because of the consultation time if possible. In your localism, it took about 24 days for consultation sometimes. So you need to bear that in in initial accounts as well. So it wouldn't be proactive if it wouldn't be doing what we need to do over experienced Hornsey. PPAs. So we've done PPAs. With, we've all said, in terms of the Hornsey cabling that worked well, very pragmatic, and so forth. So there's way to do that we could do it into the into consensual about a green, a process of doing that. And the timescale, I can agree with the applicant in terms of not long drawn out out, but equally with any discharge or determination of any application. What you want is the end result, and you want the right and resolve not knee jerk and to resolve that no one wants. So we need to build in timescales, clearly many weeks is the standard one, as we know, in the regulations, or as agreed for an extension of time, which you can do through the normal regulations. So I think that word income can be agreed with the with the African. I added a few other more points. I'm happy to wait till after the break on those or or did you want to?

1:27:38

I would say, yeah, we've got an hour and a half. Now. So if you don't mind just sort of holding on to those minute if you could, just for the moment, and we'll take a brief sort of comfort break for everyone and to those watching. And what's it now it's 25 past three. So if we're to come back here at say quarter to four, and then we'll resume with your points then, but thank you very much. We'll resume at quarter to four. Thank you