

# TRANSCRIPT\_VIKING\_ISH3\_SESSION1\_170 724

Good morning, everyone, and welcome. It's now 10am. And I am starting this issue specific hearing for the application made by quite so limited for the Viking CCS pipeline project. We will introduce ourselves in just a few minutes. But before we do that, please bear with me while I deal with a few housekeeping matters. Can you hear me at the back?

The meeting recordings and live stream started please. Okay.

Were there any requests for reasonable adjustments or arrangements to enable participation in this hearing? Okay, thank you.

There are no fire alarm drills planned for today.

If the fire alarm sounds, Please exit the building via the main entrance or one of the exits to the left and right of the room, and concreate in the carpark in front of the main entrance. Toilets are located to the right when you leave this room. One further thing is quite warm in here today. So if anybody wants to take off jackets or anything like that to cool down, feel free to do it.

Okay, so on to introductions. I am Alex Jack, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of a panel of inspectors to examine this application, I will hand over to the other members of the examining authorities to introduce themselves.

Good morning, everyone. My name is John ghost. I've also been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel of inspectors to examine the application. And I'll be taking action points from the hearing today. Thank you.

And I'm David Wallace. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead member of this examining authority to carry out an examination of the above application.

I can confirm that all panel members have made a declaration of interest responding to the planning Inspectorate conflicts of interest policy, and I can also confirm that none of us had declarable interests in relation to this appointment.

Also present today are members of the case team. The case manager is Caroline Hopewell. She is supported by Jessica Weatherby, here at the venue, and by Joe Shanks online. If you have any questions or concerns about today's events, please contact a member of the case team.

The audio visual service today is provided by a team from production 78. So that's the team our end. So turning to the attendees today.

First, I want to acknowledge and welcome those who are watching the live stream today. Welcome and thank you for joining us.

I'd now like to start with introductions from attendees. When I read out the name of the organization, or members of that team present in person, please introduce yourself one by one, followed by introductions from virtual attendees of that team. So to begin with, who is here on behalf of the applicant, please?

Good morning, sir. My name is Alexander booth, Kings Council and I appear on behalf of the applicant. So I know you've just indicated you'd like to hear the names of all those present from a particular party. You'll appreciate the applicant has a very considerable team and I'm not sure that that will assist the examination at this point. So what I am going to do is just point to my right and say to my right is Mr. Patrick Monroe, of Burgess salmon solicitors with whom the examination is already familiar.

In terms of other participants at the examination, we are going to effectively bring forward personnel to deal with discrete issues as and when they arise in the context of the agenda. And if I may, I'll introduce them at that point. Thank you, sir. Okay, thank you.

So, moving on to East Lindsay District Council.

Good morning, sir. Lindsay Stewart from East Lindsay District Council. Thank you.

Thank you. Lincolnshire county council.

Good morning says Justine prouder infrastructure manager at Lincolnshire county council.

Amy Charlesworth, infrastructure officer at Lincolnshire county council.

Okay, thank you. So as I always have a colleague online as well.

Anyone here from National Highways

Okay. North Lincolnshire counsel.

Morning says Andrew law representing North Lincolnshire counsel. Good morning, sir Matthew Killian from North Lincolnshire counsel.

Q and northeast Lincolnshire Canton. Good morning. Bev Lauren from Northeast Lincolnshire Council.

Good morning, Laura Hutsul from Northeast Lincolnshire Council. Okay, thank you. Have I met

Is anyone who is in attendance and wishes to introduce themselves?

Yes, please. So I have a colleague online publica county council as well.

I'd like to say good morning, sir. Mark knights and Lincolnshire county council.

Gang. Thank you. And

happy Robinson. Yes. Good morning. I believe my colleague, Becky, Rebecca Garrett is representing national highways. I don't know if she had any audio issues, but I am representing GSG V on behalf of the National Highways. Okay, thank you.

Okay, so I now hand over to Mr. Wallace.

Thank you very much. Before I move on, I believe Mr. Tim Britton has his hand raised.

The morning my name is Jim Britton. I'm representing East Lindsay District Council. I work for oil has gotten DHV.

Thank you very much. Thank you for confirming that.

If you could lower your hand. Yes, that's it. I don't think there's any other hands raised. So I'll move on then to agenda item two,

which is just to set out the procedure for the running of the hearing today. I appreciate some of the attendees today would have heard this yesterday. But please bear with me, I must repeat this for the benefit of all attendees and for those who are watching the live stream. This is of course a blending event allowing attendance in person and virtually from Microsoft Teams. The examining authority at least two panel members of that are attending and stored in Brahan. As you can see, I am online. For those attended and virtually please rest assured that the examining authority will give you full attention at all times. Even if we're not looking directly at the camera. Our eyes also may be cast down as we take notes.

We will take a 20 minute break around about quarter past 11. Today, with a lunch break around about one o'clock. Depending on the pace of the question and answers we aim to finish the latest round 4:30pm But we will keep under review.

If the if the

particular agenda item you wish to speak on his later and you want to drop out and come back. Please do keep in touch with a case team who can tell me if the session who can tell you if the sessions are running a little late or ahead of the indicated timings. For virtual attendees during the breaks. Please rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation email. Please also have your cameras and microphones turned off and they're speaking this will afford you some privacy.

In respect to privacy, I'd like to make you aware this event is being both live streamed and recorded. The digital recordings we make are retained and published. They form part of a public record that can contain your personal information to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. The planning and spectris practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order. Consequently, if you do participate in today's hearing is important that you understand you will be recorded, and that you therefore consent to retention and publication of the recording. It is unlikely that the examiner afford to ask you to put sensitive personal detail 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 such personal information or encourage you to speak to the case team in the first instance. And it can be arranged that that can be submitted in writing where it can be redacted accordingly.

The final point is about the substantive matter of today's issue specific hearing. And the agenda for this hearing was published on the national infrastructure project page. Online. There may be time for other matters to be discussed today. But that'd be down to the Express discretion of the examining authority. And we'll review this as we go through.

To be clear, it's not intended to discuss all matters relating to the development consent order, or the environmental matters that we wish to question. Some matters will be pursued a further round of written questions which are scheduled to be published on the 12th of August.

Are there any questions about the procedure for today's hearing? If so, raise your hands.

Okay, nothing heard. In which case now then we move on to Agenda Item three, which talks about the various environmental matters. And I would like to start in the realm of habitats regulation assessment. So I don't know if the personnel need to swap or whatnot. But as we're moving on to that subject, first off,

All start reading Maya. My first question.

Now the applicant provided a revised habitats regulation assessment a deadline to

Natural England had originally pledged a response at deadline free.

But we know from before the last hearings that that is now expected at deadline for

in the absence of any commentary from Natural England, we only have a couple of residual points at this time. So it's likely second written questions will contain most of our inquiries. But can I turn to the applicant first of all, and ask what is the believed current position of Natural England and have they reached a point where an adverse effect on integrity can be ruled out for the Humber estuary designations please?

Good morning Sir Alexander booth for the applicant in a moment. I'm just going to turn to Mr. Pilkington, who is going to provide you with a more detailed update. But perhaps I can just give the following by way of overarching summary.

The applicant has been in detailed discussions with Natural England over recent weeks, we are now at a position where Natural England say they have only minor concerns remaining and further, they do not foresee that any of those consumer concerns will ultimately persist.

We have provided them with a

a draft document,

which is to say a revised version of the HRA, they have in turn committed to provide us with some draft wording, which they propose be inserted to further amend the document. They are proposing that that'd be provided to us in the course of this week, certainly by the end of this week.

That essentially raises five small issues, all of which we anticipate are capable of agreement. What is proposed by ourselves and Natural England is that on receipt of that draft wording from them later this week, we will then provide a further revised HRA to them, hopefully next week, in the expectation that Natural England can confirm that all matters are resolved by the end of the month, that is to say by deadline for

that's the overarching view. But I'm going to now hand to Mr. Pilkington for him to explain any matters further and beyond that.

Nigel Pilkington for the applicant,

that that is a good summary of the position where where we're up to with Natural England.

As Mr. Booth said, We've got some outstanding issues which Natural England have confirmed they consider to be minor. And really matters of clarification and improvement in wording in the habitat regulation assessment. Those matters really are around elements such as

operational, the operational phase mitigation has been dealt with that was point any nine in in their response on the HRA and that was related to the timing of maintenance works. So that has that that issue has been resolved.

The other issues relate to the method by which the ecological clock works will will decide or determine where and noise mitigation is required.

So that these are things that we provided updated wording in a version of the HR report to inform HRA that we provided to Natural England and as a as Mr. Booth said, it's really just they're seeking some some rewording some clarification on those matters.

Okay, okay. Thank you.

So just to confirm that deadline call.

We will have the revised HRA

and a response hopefully from Natural England just to confirm what the five remaining points are. And then of course, you'll be able to resolve those over the course staff to Deadline five, is that fair?

So I just must, Alexandra booth for the app and just to jump in very briefly that is certainly deadline for is the target that we are working to to a certain extent we are in the hands of Natural England because of course we are waiting for

The draft wording from them which they promised by the end of the week.

If And insofar as that stays to time, then we can undertake that we will revert them next week as we have promised. But insofar as you say, sir, that this is going to be dealt with by deadline for, I wouldn't want to provide an absolute commitment from the applicant in that regard, because not all matters are within our control. So subject to that I'm going to pass to Mr. Pilkington.

Yeah, I'd agree with that. We're absolutely in the hands of Natural England, but they have they have.

We've received an email from them on Monday, just confirming that these are minor points. But we are absolutely in their hands. We haven't seen the revised wording as yet.

What I would say is we're tracking these final issues in a, in a, in a table that we've provided to them, explaining what how we've addressed the points in the updated habitat regulation assessment document. What they've said is they're going to add to that table. So it's helping us just to track down and narrow down these final few these final few matters.

Okay, so I appreciate you probably can't say 100%. Now, although Balasana. But if they're minor matters, then it probably won't strain to this. I mentioned the adverse effect on integrity for the Humber, estuary, Ramza, RSA, CSPA, and whatnot. And that was a key thing. I remember deadline one, they were saying they couldn't roll out an AI. I appreciate him until we see their response. We don't know that they've agreed with you that it can be ruled out. But at this stage with those minor bits remaining, I use satisfied as the expectation that an AI can be rolled out.

The expectation is that that it can be rolled out, I think, if there was any concern from natural England's point that it couldn't be rolled out. They

they wouldn't have provided the comforting email they did on Monday, which sort of stressed that there were minor issues and clarifications. So I don't think we're in a position at the moment where we're, you know,

we're trying to clarify whether there's going to be an adverse effect on integrity or not, I think it's just clarifications on the procedures for, you know, how we deploy noise mitigation and things like that. So, again, similar to what we said before, I haven't seen what their revised wording is. So I can't say for certain.

But I'm, you know, highly confident as our Natural England that, that we will be in a position to rule those out. Yes, I'm just to emphasize, and reiterate really what Mr. Pilkington is saying. And I have seen the email from Natural England, they do talk in terms of they emphasize the term minor, they say that these are minor and they've italicized that term. And they also go on to say that they do not expect these concerns to persist. So in those circumstances, absolutely. We don't anticipate any adverse impact on integrity. But of course, as Mr. Pilkington rightly says, We can't promise until we see what happening and have to say,

No, that's fair enough. The only reason really for

just pressing on that point is I want to be fair to the the applicant, as well over the course of the summer of the remaining deadlines that are there that if there was a sustained objection, if an AI could not be ruled out, then of course, come the end of the examination. If that position remained, we would have to advise the Secretary of State on whether there's imperative reasons of overriding public importance, and whether there's any need for derogation and compensation. So I just wanted to make sure that there was enough time, that if that was coming your way that you had enough time to respond to that, and deal with that over the summer so that then when we report we had enough information, but I'm, I'm happy with the responses you've given there. And we will await natural England's

input in due course.

Absolutely. We understand that and we're grateful for the indication, but we do not anticipate any adverse effects on integrity. And so we do not anticipate that Eero p will be a matter that we have to concern ourselves with. Thanks. Okay. Thank you very much. Two side points. One, in a way is not a HRA matter, but it's related to the Humber estuary. Part of natural England's initial objection also

related to the Humber estuary, triple si decided a special scientific interest. And they suggested that there could be harm. I imagine that that harm is sort of dovetailed, if you like with the HRA impacts they were concerned about, I just wonder if the applicant can confirm that in respect to the triple Si, as far as they're aware, that that to England are at this stage, potentially removing their objection on the grounds of harm to the triple Si.

I'm going to pass that on to Mr. Pilkington, sir. Thank you.

Nigel Pilkington for the applicant.

I think the it's fallen off the radar slightly because we've been so focused on the habitat regulation assessment. And obviously there we're dealing with designations of a higher status. All SPS and sacs

are underlined by Triple S eyes. But obviously, the higher status is really those European sites. So that has been the focus what I what I will,

in speaking again to Natural England, which will be probably a few times over the next week, I will certainly raise that again and just seek assurance from them that that matter has been overtaken by the updates to the habitat regulation assessment.

Thank you, thank you very much.

Let me just check my notes here. Now, there was a point raised by Natural England

in rep 2041 And it goes on to this onshore offshore elements and they suggested that a holistic habitats regulation assessment needs to be completed it later down the line.

Examining authority notes from previous responses, the applicant does not believe this is necessary, because offshore works would take place some 120 Odd kilometers offshore.

The examining authority does have one query in this regard that may require a holistic HRA.

Looking at the onshore elements, there is the definition of maintain in the development consent order that allows for the alteration replacement or diversion of the proposed development. Now, we assume it's an assumption might be wrong on that basis, we assume that a similar clause would also apply to any marine license or any offshore licensing covering the full extent of the logs pipeline.

And in that respect, work number 48 A in the DCO talks about the laying of cables for electronic purposes along the length of the existing logs pipeline, which of course goes out to mean low water springs.

Such an operation if that was to take place in the sort of the the mean tidal area, the tidal area, from my experiences like to require some sort of vessel jacket vessel or whatnot to be able to get the pot the cable was down to the pipeline. So there may be a greater degree of interactivity between the offshore and offshore works than then what is believed or what at least is presented. Good the applicant is give me any thoughts on on that and natural England's proposition all together on that place.

So, as to that point of detail, it may be that Mr. Pilkington can offer a view or indeed Mr. Monroe can offer a view at this point. But I think it may be that that is something that we would need to take away in order to provide you with a considered response. It may be that the optimal way of dealing with that query would be for the XA to include it in its next rounds, written questions and we can provide something by way of written response.

But pending that headline, I'm going to pass the Mr. Monroe



pattern over the applicant. Just one point of clarification on work number 48. A that runs from the judon valve which is work number 48 to the proposed federal facility at work number 44. So that's where the electrical cable would be installed rather than through the intertidal area.

Okay, thank you for that

so did Mr. Pilkington want to come back on anything? Yes, Nigel Pilkington for the applicant news, just really to confirm that that electrical cable

is the installation of that would be via a mold plow and that is considered in the report to inform habitat regulation assessment. So that is already that is already

COVID

Thank you. Thank you very much for clarifying that. That's, that's useful. Let me just see here.

Yes, just one further point on habitats regulation assessment, if I may, you mentioned know about a noise fencing to be erected to protect on ufology interests in the area. And that is under discussion as to where that is required. We will come to the construction noise later in this agenda. But just as an indication how tall and what type of fencing is required, and what its noise reduction performance to be sufficient to drop disturbance level was below known thresholds for bird disturbances.

In terms of the height of the fencing, my assumption, and I have to say is an assumption is that it would be similar to the height of the fencing for

reducing noise related to residential properties. The biggest issue with the fencing is that it that it breaks the line of sight between the noise source and the receptor. And what we're talking about here is birds that are foraging in fields, and therefore I wouldn't anticipate it being you know, a substantial height, I would imagine similar height as I say, to sort of Harris fence.

Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

realized that I didn't answer the second part, we are confident that it would reduce the noise levels to such an extent that we would remove the risk of disturbance to those foraging birds

back there, so it almost cutting you off, but thank you for confirming that.

Okay, that completes my questions on HRA in the absence of Natural England does anyone else either online or in the room wish to say anything about habitats regulation assessment?

Okay, nothing heard, in which case I will hand back to Mr. Jack for the next part of the agenda.

Thank you. So moving on to traffic and transport.

During the accompany site inspection, the examining authority asked for clarification. Might I just because we've got different personnel on to have a quick shift around 30 seconds, go for it switch some personnel.

Thank you sir. Okay. So, during the accompanied site inspection, the examining authority asked for clarification on site as to whether HGVs would use thoroughfare to access to block bow station and associated pipeline construction.

In our area, the applicant at the time stated that HGVs would use the whole road within the construction working corridor.

The draft sim, rep 30112 submitted a deadline three states on page 61 item H 11. That the quote, use of thoroughfare by HGVs will be limited to vehicles required to construct the block bow station, no pipeline deliveries will be made via thoroughfare unquote. This wording suggests that some HGVs will use thoroughfare

I haven't seen anything that was submitted at deadline three that contradicts this and I think Lincolnshire county council raised similar concerns so can the applicant confirm the routes that all construction related HGVs and other vehicles would take to reach the thoroughfare block Bab station and the nearby pipeline construction works.

Jeremy

Could you introduce yourself? Good morning everyone. Jeremy bouche transport planner for the applicant.

Yes, we are. We agree that some deliveries construction traffic will use thorofofare.

And we have a strategy in terms of passing places or using the wait for the right we recognize there are constraints along for a fair, but we have a way forward in terms of allowing passing places and keeping any disturbance to a minimum

Thank you for that. That's helpful. I mean, are you able to confirm the type of vehicles that we'll be using Thoreau will HGVs be using it for example.

As I understand there will be some HDV movement in terms of delivery of the pipeline. But this will be fairly sort of minimal and a short period of time during the construction period for that location and said we will

be respectful of the, the capacity along that route. We appreciate it's narrow, and we will come up with a suitable contingency plan and how on the rare occasion HGVs will need to pass each other. There are some passing places, but we will come up with a plan of how that will that will work we've been guidance.

Okay, thank you

know, Cunningham for the applicant. Just to clarify on Jeremy's point, there will be HTV users, there'll be limited to flat fixed body trucks, low loaders and construction plants will come down the whole road. So it'll be a very limited lot smaller HTV vehicle that can navigate down that road. The passing places have been put in place so that they don't interfere with any other traffic they meet on the road. That low loaders Heavy Construction plant will not be delivered via thoroughfare. Okay, thank you for that clarification. And then I'm assuming that the traffic will be managed in some way into

Provide a name for the applicant? Yes. Who the manager and how we go about installing that and manage that sequentially are the Escort vehicles or traffic light systems. Okay, thank you.

Lynn, Lincolnshire county council you content with

what's just been said.

Thank you, sir. Just seemed proud of the Lincolnshire County Council.

We had some discussions with the applicant very recently regarding the the issue. And there were two points that refer being one there's another another route as well, where we have similar concerns about HGV traffic and the width of the roads and passing bays. And our discussions very recently with the applicant, the applicant has committed to us to provide us with details in plan form of oppose passing based on thoroughfare and for the other location as like a bank, which is where the two areas where we had outstanding concerns following the last submission deadline to which we set out in our deadline three response subjects of receiving those details and the Highway Authority being happy with those I think that would satisfy our concerns that remain in that respect. So hopefully we will receive that information soon. Okay, thank you. That's helpful was good. That has been progress. So when back to the African Air do we know when the

information is outstanding will be received.

Now Joe Pilkington for the applicant. We're very hopeful that we'll we'll have deployed a team to look at both soccer bank and thoroughfare and indeed, Washington's lane, and to firm up the proposals for those passing places. We're hopeful that that will be within the next two weeks.

It's we're just dealing with some annual leave.

Okay, thank you.

Sorry. And it just just to come back on that. The next two weeks, we've got deadline for 12 days away. So are you saying before deadline for or are you saying it could be after deadline for because we'd really be hoping to see this by deadline for

Nigel Pilkington for the applicant

completely notes that you'd like to see it before deadline for and I will do everything I can to progress that so that we can deliver for deadline for

if it's okay, if I could confirm 100% that we can do it by deadline format? I'd need to go and speak to the team in question and make sure that they could deploy the correct resources out on site

within those timescales.

Okay, thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Yes, thank you very much. Just a couple of points there.

In terms of drawing up a passing base strategy, and in terms of what you said there about traffic lights during traffic management on thoroughfare to allow vehicles to cross

haven't obviously seen much of that in the construction traffic management plan. So that would need amending. And then also in terms of the passing places, obviously you've got to work out how many and where, but they would probably be out with your

limits. So how would they go about being provided? And what in the DCO, if anything would help secure that strategy and the provision of those spaces place?

So I'm going to ask Mr. Monroe to speak to you as regards Article Nine, I believe it is, and how we say the DCA would facilitate

fashion over the African? Yes. So Article Nine of the DCO is the provision on the power to alter the layout of streets. And that includes the ability to seek consent of the streets authority for any streets outside of the order limits to modify the roads, and that includes the provision of passing places.

My understanding is that some of the passing places proposed would be within the order limits.

However, they are not streets that are currently listed in shedule. Three as areas where St. Works are proposed. And so in each case, their local authority would be approached, and their consent would be obtained to carry out that work.

Okay, thank you very much for that.

Okay, back to Mr. Jack.

Thank you.

Staying with our,

the exit point that was shown, shown to us on the accompany site inspection, appeared close to a chicane, in thoroughfare with visibility to the east wasn't great. How would a banksman be used to assist ATVs crossing over the public highway? Or how will the traffic remain managed in that interface location?

I think that's really one for Mr. Doubt. You're alternatively Mr. Cunningham. So I'll pass that to my right.

Jeremy doubt for the applicant, also, and I lost my colleague, Mr. Coming in to add if required, and we are looking at that junction, we were going to obviously take on board, so visibility, splays, and so forth, and look at a design that satisfies the council, the authority, and we will if required, we will look to see if it's suitable first and foremost. If there is some traffic management required there, then that will be our sort of fallback position. But until we've done this sort of detailed analysis, which we will we're currently undertaking, we can't give an answer now. But we what we do know is this a solution? Either it works as it is, or we put some traffic management in place to make it work.

Yeah, I'll concur with that statement. No kidding. It would be managed at the time depending on the level of severity and the level of traffic on that road and an agreement with the local councils. Okay, thank you both.

So during the complete site inspection, it was confirmed that the entrance immediately adjacent to swallow Park wouldn't be physically widened, but visibility splays would be provided involved in cutting and facing back of trees on under work number 48 B in the draft DCO. It describes this as improvement of an existing junction

could the draft DCO be made clear as to the actual work taking place? Because the word improvement might cause misunderstanding?

fact one of the app can yes it can certainly take that point away and revisit the wording there.

Okay, thank you.

So, some questions for the counselors now. The applicant has revised the transport assessment resulting in a lot of the forecast traffic figures, rising uncertain links, whilst the examining authority expects a full response from IPS at deadline for to the revised document. At this time, I'd like to ask the council's for any comments or concerns arising

in light of the proposed increases. Does the ctmp Need any revision? Or is the mitigation still appropriate?

Start with Lincolnshire county council

thank you so just being proud of Lincolnshire county council

the position it for Lincolnshire and I

I'm from the highway authority at the moment stands as submission, we made a deadline through and we didn't raise it as an issue. At that time. We will of course be reviewing the latest version of the document. And we can provide with you with further comments at the deadline for submission if we have any further comments to make.

Unfortunately, I was office hours yesterday, he wasn't able to attend the hearings this week. So I do apologize that can't get any more updates at this moment. But we will we'll look at to provide that deadline for Okay, thank you.

Have any other councillors got anything they'd like to comment on? Gone to their transport assessment?

Tim Britain.

Hi, there Thank you, Tim Britain for East Lindsay District Council, the only point I would raise is I'm a noise specialist. If the applicant has revising their construction traffic numbers, then I would suggest that those would need to be accompanied by revised assessments of the associated environmental impact, for example, noise, but there are also other effects that they would need to consider which aren't specifically within the

transport assessment documentation.

Okay, thank you for that.

Gap couldn't respond to that?

Well, so I can just say very briefly that to the extent that the numbers are revised upwards, the applicant is aware of the potential for there to be effectively associated impacts. I'll need to take instructions as to the extent to which we recognize there to be a need for further assessment or whether or not in fact, the impact for example, in terms of noise, which is Mr. Britain's area of expertise, would be material or not, but I'm going to need to come back to you on that. Okay, thank you.

Okay, so a question. So for national highways the same sort of question, have you been able to review the document the revised transport assessment and, if so, can you speak about the robustness now of the transport assessment given your original concerns?

Hello, good morning. Hi Robinson for national highways.

We have reviewed the revised transport assessments. We would note that national highways require that the draft DCO refer to national highways as an approving console t for the forthcoming construction traffic management plan. Also referring to national highways as an approving console t for the forthcoming decommissioning environmental management plan.

Security that the northern compound proposed by

proposed boundary treatment will be submitted and approved by national highways before construction commences to safeguard the safety on the roadway from any impact caused by the compound site.

Ensuring that the construction traffic management plan will provide details of the Northern compound especially regarding the form of access with details to visibility and design a vehicle maneuvering, including any abnormal loads.

Also ensuring the construction workers shift Change Overs as scheduled outside the peak periods of 7am to 10am and 4pm to 6pm. Answering the 858 forecast at arrivals and departures do not coincide with the peak network periods. And as discussed in May in the May 2024. Meeting providing guarantees and the construction worker travel plan secured against the DCO to secure the minibus service to mitigate the potential impact for worker trips using private vehicles.

Okay, thank you.

So if I may come back on behalf of the applicant,

Alexander booth for the applicant. So we are aware of national highways position on these various issues and you won't be surprised to hear that we've had discussions with them in recent weeks.

Our position which we have indicated to national highways and which we maintain today is that it is not appropriate that they be identified as an approving console T for either the Construction Management Plan or the decommissioning management plan. So we say their appropriate role is as a console

tea to be consulted by the relevant local authority.

So that would be the position where there's to be a planning application or an application for approval of reserved matters pursuant to condition. And in the same way, it would ordinarily be the position for the purposes of the 2008 Act and development consent orders. So that is well established practice national highways, no, it is well established practice. We are aware that they have indicated recently that a particular applicant for DCO has agreed. I think it's my memory serves as the mem row row project, that the applicant has agreed that they'd be an approving consulte in the context of that project, obviously. So we know very little about that project. We don't know why that agreement hasn't been given by the applicant. Indeed, it has in the context of that project. But certainly, sir, we say that in the context of this project, there is nothing that would justify a departure from the ordinary course of events, quite simply, it is not an efficient administrative practice to have multiple approvals. Rather, the process would be that we submit to the relevant local authority, they seek

the views of national highways as a console T, and there is a single process, single line of application submission, and then approval or failing approval, potentially appeal to the Secretary of State. That is the way that the process ordinarily works. And we say it should work on that basis. Here. Also.

National Highways also refer I think, to the compound I think they've asked that they be console T

and approving console T in relation to the particular compound that was referred to and they refer there to drainage matters and so on. So, I mean, this is a compound that was previously used by national highways, I believe in the context of construction of the A 160.

Again, we do not see any basis on which they should be accepted as a or identified as an approving console T. For the construction worker travel plan, that plan will be bound up in the c temp, and they will be a console T in that context, but not an approving console T. What I can say is that what we can look to do is perhaps tighten the wording in the contract in the draft of the construction worker travel plan. As regards this question of the arrival of workers, we appreciate the national highways don't wish to see shift change, either between 7am to 10am in the morning, and I believe it's four to 6pm in the afternoon.

The shift pattern will not provide for workers to arrive during those peak periods rather than many buses will be arriving before and departing after those relevant periods. So I can offer some comfort and assurance to national highways in that regard. But as regard to the principle that has just been spoken to the question of there being improving consulte so we don't accept that. Okay, thank you for setting out. So firstly,

on the revised wording, the tightening of wording, as you said the construction workers travel plan would come out that at deadline for

so I'm going to say yes, I'm not making myself very popular with Mr. Monroe or others because I keep promising things by deadline for and it's not me that's going to have to deliver them. But we're going to seek to do that. So I will the team will do its utmost Yes.

Thank you.

So in light of the information in the revised transport assessment relating to increased traffic flow forecasts, can the applicant provide details of the latest position with Metro Rail, given their concerns about an increase in ATVs and other vehicle movements affecting the operation of their level crossings?

Sir, I must confess that's not a matter that I've engaged with in advance of this hearing either position visa vie Network Rail, I'm going to ask if Mr. Monroe has anything to add or he or any other member of the team, but it may be so that we need to come back to you in writing and again, perhaps the best way of dealing with that would be for the XA to include that matter in its written questions unless Mr. Monroe is going to tell me no, he has the answer.

But one of the African



In recent discussions with network bill and over a month ago we did provide some additional information to them in respect of traffic that we'll be using level crossings it hasn't been a topic of recent discussions

I'm not saying that means that it's the concern has been resolved we can certainly pick it up with them and if it is included in written questions we can all add them to the folder that will be that will be coming as well. Okay thank you

so, although not wholly released, wholly transport related the applicant prepared a technical note for the UK HSA in relation to air quality impacts arising from construction traffic movements at this stage do councils have any comments to make regard this aspect of traffic and transport matters?

Okay, okay

so Paul move on Are there any other comments on traffic and transport

okay

so now moving on to landscape do you need to have a reorg

to reorganize?

And just to introduce the relevant personnel again, I anticipate that

Mr. Monroe will be assisting but in addition to Mr. Monroe, to down from him is Mr. Nigel ware of a calm and beyond him Mr. Pilkington, with whom the examination is already familiar, and they will be speaking to landscape matters also. Thank you, sir.

Thank you.

So, my first point is around the so in your Lincolnshire Wolds national landscape technical note, rep three zero to five. It states that there was no other option than to route the pipeline through the AONB and gives reasons for that.

In looking at chapter two of the ES site 13 was chosen as a location for the central compound and answers to XQ. One question one

dot 13.8 suggests that this was a balance to avoid impacts on villages.

The technical notes states that impacts would be temporary and short duration amounting to seven months per kilometer. What it doesn't appear to do is stay the duration for the central construction compound. So firstly, how long will construction compound have an impact on the AONB?

So in relation to that matter, it's perhaps Mr. Cunningham that would be best placed to speak to that point. So just to my understanding is your concern is specifically with reference to the compound.

Roger Pilkington for the applicant,

my colleague Bill Cunningham as suggested that a compound would need to be there for six to eight months

okay

So secondly, to what extent was the site selection for the compound influenced by views from within the AONB looking east? So, for example with the undulations and cops locations taken into account to minimize the minimize the visual effects

again, that's probably one for Mr. Pilkington. But to the extent that we can't we don't have a detailed answer now we can come back and writing Mr. Pilkington can deal with it, sir.

was Nigel Pilkington for the applicant. It was a consideration. But similar two points, I'm sure we'll come to the the temporary nature of the of the compound was was considered to be a mitigating factor.

As you noted, we did have a run an exercise to look for compact potential compound locations and we do typically look for brownfield sites in the first instance. However, in this instance, we were very concerned about the potential impacts at those locations

and concluded that the temporary compound in a less problematic location for local communities was was preferable. But that's that's a high level answer and I would be happy to provide a more detailed response.

Okay, thank you. Yeah, you can do that by that line for that be appreciated.

So thirdly, on this subject that the technical notes suggests that the special quality of peace and tranquility for the AONB is already disturbed locally because of the 18 corridor. During both on accompanied and accompanied site inspections, the 18th didn't seem to be particularly heavy, heavily trafficked outside of peak times. Sometimes, it would take quite a distance before we encountered other vehicles. So it would appear to the examining authority that a permanent working compound and associated via color accent activity would cause sustained noise throughout the day. You have assessed the impact as a minor significance, but is this actually appropriate? Given the status of the AONB? Is there not a cumulative effect here, with other insects using the AC in combining increased traffic alongside the compounds presence?

Knowledge, excuse me, Nigel with the Africans. The reference to the 18th. Influencing the national landscape in terms of peace and tranquility, is in fact taken from the AONB as it was then management plan. Were under the chalk walls LCA characteristics.

It is noted that the 18th locally affects peace and tranquility within the national landscape. So the reference in the technical note is essentially drawn from

the AONB management plan.

And

therefore, that's what we relied upon in terms of thinking about the effects on peace and tranquility.

Okay, thank you that's helpful.

So in Natural England written response, rep 1079. They request information on mitigation measures taken to reduce harm to the AONB, particularly that of trenchless methods. In paragraph 3.2 point five of the technical note, it is stated that individual mature trees within the AONB will be avoided using using tenseless construction as set out in the Olymp

without putting words into the enemy's case, was HDD or equivalent, considered for the whole section of pipeline within the AONB to reduce the visual impact of trench defects? Understand that a long HDD could be up to about two kilometers which is broadly the length of direct impact on the AONB.

So I'm going to ask Mr. Cunningham to come up and assist with that in a moment. But what I would say is that, as you're clearly aware that that is approximately the length I think my my understanding of the length the incursion into the Airbnb is two and a half kilometers. Certainly, my understanding is that as regards that issue, there does have to be notwithstanding the question of

national landscape or AONB, as was and the various weightings to be applied as regards preserving the special character. There does have to be a judgment a a sense

possible and realistic judgment taken as to the effect and in particular, the duration of effects on the one hand, and the desire to preserve on the other,

in particular in this regard in terms of the construction period, that is to say that period during which construction activities will be taking place within the national landscape to lay the pipeline for that two and a half kilometer period, it is anticipated that it will be six to eight weeks, I'm going to turn that say to Mr. Cunningham, to speak to that in more detail in a moment.

Potential best case scenario five weeks.

That very limited duration of effect, we do say would have to be balanced against the very much more significant activity that would be involved

in an HDD, or of say, two and a half kilometers.

It isn't simply a question of

reverting to a trenchless technique and all matters being resolved happily and on that basis. So I'm going to ask for some technical input from Mr. Cunningham.

Now coming in for the applicant, just to build on what my colleague has just said,

considering a two and a half kilometer trenchless crossing, you also need to consider you need another two and a half kilometers, or you do multiple pull for this HDD string, which means your time in the area is significantly longer. And your visual impact will be significantly longer from the LMB. But if you'd like to put the question in writing, we can come back and further detail

with regard to optionality in that location. Okay, thank you, Mr. Wallace, your question?

Yes, thank you very much for that it was just in relation to what I heard there about the construction period of six to eight weeks.

Looking in the technical note, on the area of outstanding natural beauty, which, again, is rep three, zero to five. I've scrolled down to paragraph 3.2 point five. And it says impacts would be temporary in of short duration, with a total anticipated duration of seven months at each kilometer from initial fencing through to reinstatement. Now, obviously, this isn't

subsequent if you'd like it probably is consecutive. But a no, no, for two and a half kilometers. One could say that's no seven months per kilometer, you're looking at 14 months or so I know that's not the applicants case. But I was just concerned as to where that that six to eight weeks came from, in light of that seven month timetable stated there as to the nature of temporary effects if the applicant could just assist me there, please. Thank you. So yes, and again, you're going to hear it from the horse's mouth or the organ grinder rather than the monkey in a moment because Mr. Cunningham will assist. But so there is an important distinction to be drawn as between construction and my six to eight weeks or best case scenario five weeks relate to actual construction activities, that is to say,

excavating trenchless the trench welding and laying the pipeline backfilling there are there as a six to eight week construction period. But of course there are further activities outside of actual construction which serve to lengthen the total period during which there will be if you'd like a presence in the location. Certainly the suggestion at seven months per kilometer, meaning that we're looking at, I don't know, 14 or 17 months that that is in no way representative of the position. But Mr. Cunningham can provide with you further detail.

Now coming in for the applicant, the seven months looser, it's as if the first person turned outside your kitchen window to the last person at the very end I the surveyor setting out the route alignment, the next individual come along setting out the market posts the next person setting out the fencing, then the bulldozers turn up at the top soils and the initial route alignment etc. So this is consecutive events that happen one after the other. The actual construction event around the when you see the most productivity is around the main line welding area just we only open up the trench just ahead because you don't want an open trench is going to flood. The excavate will come along open the trench to pipe

will have been strong, been welded, there'll be lowered and laid it will be backfield. That is be aiming for around about 600 meters a day on a semi automated welding. That's how we come down to

sorry 600 meters a day.

Five weeks topple start in that area.

Okay, so just a follow up to that then in terms of the technical note and the assessment of the effects and the on the AONB has first precedence to last presence in taken as the as the worst case impact. Bear in mind as you say there'll be all these pre construction works going ahead in terms of alignment, fencing, whatever else. They all have an effect on the AONB and its appearance and its tranquillity, you know, visual obstacles, noise, obstacles, whatnot, has that seven month per kilometer idea been used as the basis for working out the worst case in terms of impacts on the AONB, please. So I'll refer to Mr. Pilkington in a moment to provide formal confirmation. But yes, this isn't a scenario where effects have been effectively

identified by reference to the actual construction period, which Mr. Cunningham just referred to visa vie five weeks. Rather it is the longer period because the applicant has had regard to impact on the national landscape by reference to the totality of the presence in that location. That is to say the longer period, but perhaps Mr. Pilkington can confirm.

Now, Joe Pilkington for the applicants, I'd actually like to pass to my colleague Nigel Weir to answer this one.

Just nodule we're for the applicant. The ies chapter that deals with landscaping visual impact assessment does refer to and rely upon the period of seven months when considering effects on the national landscape, which we considered was in its totality, and worst case.

Okay, thank you very much for that. I just wanted to reassure myself of that position.

I'll hand back to Mr. Jack.

Thank you. So do any of the counselors have any comments on the AONB issue?

No. Okay. Thank you. So, in that case, I think we'll take a break now.

If I may, just very briefly, before we leave the national landscape issue, there is a there is a policy consideration which we would wish to draw to the examining authorities attention in this regard. I appreciate that the examining authority may feel that today they are so concerned with policy matters and what they're concerned with his impact. And it may be that if you would prefer it, we can set out the position. It's not a long position, but we can set it out and summarize it in writing. But I don't know whether you would wish to have that put to you today or whether you would wish to see it in writing instead.

I think

put it in writing on the

deadline for that'd be the best way of dealing with that. Okay, thank you very much.

Okay, so in that case, we'll take a break. It'll be a 20 minute break and we will restart at 1125