

# TRANSCRIPT\_VIKING\_ISH3\_SESSION2\_170 724

Hello, and welcome back. So continuing our questions.

So if I may, I do apologize for interrupting before you've even finished your first.

Just because I know we're moving away from the national landscape. There were just two final observations, which I wish to make briefly on the part of the applicant. That's okay, if indeed we are moving away from national landscape. There are still a couple more questions on landscape, but go for it.

In relation to

the national landscape, in particular, the examining authorities' questions regarding the compound. Obviously, as was indicated earlier this morning, the basis on which the applicant identified the location for the compound is going to be set out in the node that you requested. So we will address that there. Two quick points that first point to note, because whilst the XA is obviously aware, perhaps not all those attending, will be or not all those under 10 attending will understand that the compound location is itself outside of the national landscape, although within its setting.

The second matter, which may not be clear to the essay is this. And I say we will address this also in the note to be provided. But to be clear, the compound is not a management compound in the traditional sense, where one would reasonably expect there to be continuing activity.

Rather, it is what's generally termed a pipe dump, which is to say, a storage area or sections of pipe that will be stored there until such time as they are

drawn down

to be laid along the pipeline corridor. And it is in fact, of course, the location of this site adjacent to the pipeline corridor, which has in part informed its selection. And I believe, or Mr. Monroe has confirmed to me that, in fact, the XA does, or the examination rather does already have before it a layout for that compound. And just for your note that a PP hyphen zero to three, which serves to confirm that this is not a management compound, it is instead a pipe dump. Just so all parties understand what is the subject of the discussion that we've just had. The second point and I was going to refer to that rather more briefly was simply as regards the route alignment question. And I appreciate that that's not a matter that we've discussed. And I'm not suggesting there be further discussion now. But

the examination will be aware that of course, we do have this small incursion into the national landscape for some two and a half kilometers. That has been a subject of some discussion with Natural England and indeed is the subject of ongoing discussion.

Natural England did ask us for a note or technical note providing further, effectively clarification as to our justification for the route alignment, which we selected as opposed to say, aligning routing, east of laceby. We have provided them with a draft of a technical notes, we've provided it to them.

And we haven't provided it to the examination yet because we were waiting to see whether Natural England had any observations, any comments. But either way, as I say whether or not they provide us with comments, we will be putting that document into the examination at deadline for so the examination has it at that point, but it does not have it now. So I'm just flagging that that become excellent. Thank you though. That will be helpful. Thank you.

So I want to move on now to the out line and ecology management plan the Olymp do any of the IPS have any residual concerns about its drafting or the mitigation that it seeks to secure?

Councils

Okay, thank you.

Will the Olymp need some updating to reflect the outcome of the second change request application that has recently been accepted?

Sir again, you've already gone beyond my understanding and I'm going to have to look to I think Mr. Pilkington in the first instance to see

if

there would be any updating of that document required. But it may be that we have to come back to you in writing if that's not a matter in which Mr. Pilkington can speak to now.

Nigel Pilkington for the applicant, I can't think of anything that we would change in the Olympia as a result of the of the change. I think it's you know, for the most part, it's a reduction in the proposed order limits that reduction of the proposed order limits.

It is not taking away any land that was proposed for mitigation.

And as such, I don't envisage there would be any, any changes to the Olymp.

But I can't say for certain 100% certain I will come back on that point, though. And double check with the team.

Okay, thank you.

Stretching out the Olympian string slightly into ecology matters got there's a couple of quick questions.

Northeast Lincolnshire Council raised concerns about chalk streams and blow wells, leading I believe, to the employed ecologist going out on site with the applicant to review the situation. Can I ask the Council for a progress update and if those concerns remain? And if they do, what would you want from the applicant to overcome these?

Beth Lauren for Northeast links councils so I can confirm that our in house ecologist has attended a survey works to identify short streams and blow wells on this matter.

I believe that the positive outcome are ecologist was unable to attend today, and he's on annual leave. So I will be looking to seek progress report when she returned. So I'm happy to welcome that to be outlined on the second questions.

Okay, thank you.

Lindsay District Council highlighted in their own representation that the reptile surveys were undertaken in 2021. And were therefore out of date. Can the app can confirm what is being done on this or if nothing what conclusions the examining authorities should draw from this

module Nigel Pilkington for the applicant

I think in terms of in terms of reptiles, we have in development a reptile Method Statement.

This is typically how reptiles are dealt with what we what we do know from the surveys in 2021 is we weren't dealing with protected species of reptiles.

We had no ads or anything like that. So we envisage that the reptile method statement will be will be sufficient for what we anticipate encountering on site. However, there will be further

ignored acknowledging that the surveys are undertaken in 2021.

You know, we would anticipate before construction that further surveys will be undertaken, but I think they're primarily primarily they would be looking to see if there were any protected species of reptile because I think the reptile method statement will apply to any other reptile species.

Okay, thank you.

So one final question on landscape at deadline three, Lincolnshire county council raised the need to consider the grimm speed to Walpole grid upgrade as part of the cumulative effects assessment. Does Lincoln shell and council wish to elaborate on this point and a particular concerns that they have in this regard?

Thank you, sir Justin Carter for Lincolnshire county council.

Lincolnshire county council have consistently raised concerns

regarding the proposals for other large nationally significant infrastructure projects in the county. And this relates to the cumulative impacts of this scheme. So the Grimsby to Walpole national good upscaling is mentioned as an example where going forward there is potential for significant impact cumulatively, particularly in terms of landscape and visual impact. What's appreciate and we've stated this in our local impact report and representations that we've made to date, and we appreciate that these other schemes are in the earliest stages of the development and DCO process. So I appreciate the weighting of the stage that can be given to the schemes

is probably not so significant.

At this stage, but our request is to keep this under review. Because these proposals are all in process. Their DC applications are all the vendors that have pre application, so but we do expect them to go through to submission. The Viking scheme does come ahead of all of these schemes. But I think it's more a point that we need to be mindful in any decision making further down the line that the schemes will be progressing through their applications and could have their decisions granted, at which point, we would hope that the decisions would take into account the cumulative impacts of the schemes that are coming forward. I think this particular area of Lincolnshire, there's an unprecedented number of large scale nationally significant infrastructure projects. We do have couple of areas in the county, which are also seeing high numbers of these schemes. And generally for the council, that cumulative impact is a major concern for it's not just in the landscape, but also in other matters as well. So I think it's really we want we want it to to sort of put that it's putting a marker that we are concerned about it, and to keep this under review as the the project's progress. Okay. Thank you. Any comment on that may have come?

I don't think so. So not really, I mean, we note that the county council essentially is seeking to put down a marker for future projects. And we understand that we recognize that but I suppose the headline here would be that

as and when and if those projects do come forward in the future, assessment of cumulative impacts will take place at that stage and in the context of those applications. So it's not a matter directly relevant for the purposes of our examination today. Okay, thank you. Does anybody else have any other comments on landscape that they'd like to raise please?

Okay, thank you. So moving on to noise and vibration.

Wait for the seating arrangement, more musical chairs just very briefly?

So just to introduce personnel to the examination to Mr. Monroe's, right are now Mr. Eddie Robinson of AECOM, and also Mr. Mike Williams and AECOM, who are going to be assisting on this topic.

Okay, thank you.

So, I'm going to begin with East Lindsay District Council in and I note the content of the submission at deadline three, Rep. 3034. And I'd like you to invite you to set out any remaining concerns please, and what effects they might have.

Thank you, sir. Lindsay Stewart is Lindsay District Council. I'd like to defer to the council's consultant Mr. Tim Burton, please. Okay, thank you, Mr. Brittain.

Thank you, sir, Tim Britton here.

Okay, so, the applicant submitted

a number of detailed responses to our comments, I have

essentially prepared a note

explaining the kind of outstanding comments that I have on the

application, which I will read if that's okay.

Please.

Okay. So,

the assessment applied construction noise level criteria for the onset of potentially significant effects, which is known as the soul in planning language policy

of 75 DB, 65 DB and 55 DB for the daytime, evening and night periods.

These relate to eligibility of noise inflation, and are only considered to be applicable to quite short duration impacts. It's actually 10 days and 15.

The relevant standard is British standard five double to eight. Part One relates to noise. I have submitted it to the examination as a document, but we can bring it up if necessary, but for now, I'll just

quote from it. But the key point from section 6.3 is that the longer the duration of an activity, the more likely it is that noise in the site will prove to be an issue

on that basis,

I

would recommend the criteria for impacts which lasts at least a month, or 10 decibels lower than those that are used by the applicant. And those are taken from

two of the methodologies within the past five to eight, Annex II.

Essentially, which

were a duration of one month or more,

the noise of that level would be likely to result in a significant effect. According to the standard.

The assessment did not identify or account for the duration of the predicted construction noise impacts. So without information to show that the impact durations are shorter than one month,

it is considered that the more conservative threshold values I've identified 10 decibels lower would be applicable. And that would also accord with the approach taken by the design manual for roads and bridges.

Interpretation of vs five double to eight.

adopting those lower values would also account for some very low measured baseline noise levels that the applicant

has reported in their environmental statement chapter.

So that's that's my summary of kind of concerns around the criteria that have been applied. The ies chapter then goes on to include calculations to determine the distance from the works at which this this test all would be exceeded, and receptors closer than this to the DCO site boundary were identified to be experiencing a significant effect without mitigation. So they proposed the noise attenuation barrier.

And that barrier was assumed to result in residual effects, which were not significant. But the applicant did not demonstrate that the barrier would actually reduce noise levels down below the sole

their worst case receptors only five meters from the DCO site boundary. So I do not expect that a barrier would reduce noise levels below the soul in that case.

They have identified other good practice mitigation measures, but they're not anticipated to reduce construction noise emissions. Hence, on the basis of the information in the ES chapter, residual, I can't agree that residual construction noise effects would be not significant.

So to update you, then,

because the applicant organized the meeting between East Lindsay District Council, myself and the applicants, EIA experts, that happened last week,

we discussed the potential construction noise impacts.

In that meeting,

the applicant acknowledged that while yes chapter does not state this noise levels exceeding their identified local which is lowest adverse effect level, so not a significant level.

But a threshold below that from policy

for a long period of time could cause a significant effect.

They provide some information from the project description, Chapter of the environmental statement showing the speed at which the pipeline installation works will progress. And the intention of this is to show that noise impacts will be a very short duration. But I think it's currently knowledge that

that information whilst contained within the project description

wasn't used within yes chapter or within any of the applicants further responses to my comments.

And essentially, more information is needed on the durations of potential noise impacts to determine effect significance.

So that I can agree to provide an updated technical assessment in a in a note to show the likely durations of high noise levels

and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation.

Until I have that technical note, obviously that meeting was only at the end of last week. We can't really conclude whether or not residual effects will be not significant.

Okay, thank you for your very detailed comments.

Come out applicant any comments?

So I think in the first instance, I'm going to come back and then to the extent that any further detail is required then either Mr. Robinson or Mr. Williams can step in

So we

noted what Mr. Brittain had to say in the meeting of last week. And obviously, we've had discussions both before and since internally. First point is this, there is, as I believe the examination may be aware

of a fairly fundamental dispute between ourselves and Mr. Brittain as to what is the appropriate approach to assessing noise impacts in the context of this particular project?

Mr. Brittain relies on the approach set out in the design manual for roads and bridges. We have adopted the approach set out in the association of noise consultants construction noise guide.

So, in the first instance, we do say that dmrB is primarily a tool for assessing noise in the context of highways construction projects.

We say the ANC guide has a more broad application. And so we note also that insofar as Mr. Brittain has drawn to the examinations attention this morning, BS 5228. And indeed, a copy of that, if not already, before the examination will be provided to it. The text that Mr. Brittain seeks to rely upon, is that set out in Annex II. And of course, we don't say that these documents don't fall to be considered as irrelevant considerations. But so we do know what is stated at the very outset of that annex. And I'm going to read to you very briefly to this annex gives examples only it does not comprise an exhaustive set of revisions regarding noise effects. The examples cited in this annex offer guidance that might be useful in the implementation of discretionary powers for the provision of off site mitigation of construction noise arising from major highways and railway development. It goes on to talk about a pragmatic approach needing to be applied when assessing the noise effect of any construction project. But so, we note that that BS also relates primarily in the first instance to highways and railway development. The ANC approach, which has been adopted by AECOM is one that was effectively derived from the practices adopted in the context of Thames Tideway tunnel, which is a project I promoted in another lifetime. And also HS two,

for example, to it was adopted in the context of

the environmental statement for Manston airport, we say it is a robust approach, and we maintain that a COMS assessment is entirely robust and fit for purpose. As I say, there's simply a difference of approach and professional opinion. As between a common those sat to my right on the one hand and Mr. Brittain on the other. But of course, that's to focus on the differences between the parties.

As Mr. Brittain indicated, there was a meeting last week and further discussion took place and in broad strokes.

The position appears to be that whilst Mr. Brittain maintained that his approach is appropriate, he recognizes that in circumstances where the duration of works is more constrained than he and

sat behind him, he's then the District Council,

maybe content to accept that there are no significant effects. And of course, what we say here is that duration of effects are very important in circumstances where this is not a road construction or rail construction project. It is not a situation where in the ordinary course of events, there will be very slow progress with activities remaining in a particular location for a sustained period. Rather, what will happen is that there will be progress at considerable rates. You've already heard Mr. Cunningham



explain that we're looking at making progress of up to 600 meters a day in terms of the construction of the pipeline in a in a in an ordinary trenchless context.

What will happen is that there will not be one single construction activity it will be a series of activities pushing through. So for example, there would be a noisy activity in the context of excavation as the excavators move through there would then be further noise relating to welding of pipeline and the laying of pipeline. So it will be a question of a period of more noisy activity, then a period of essential mill activity followed by a short period again, further activity

So, what we say is that there will not be any sustained period of activities such as should give rise to concerns on the part of his Lindsay District Council.

What I mean the period that

Mr. Brittain refers to, and indeed the period that is suggested, in a sense, in the British Standard, five to eight is that of a month. And we say that there is no situation where there will be continual sustained activity for a month. That is not how this project will operate. And it's in that context, I go back to the pragmatic and flexible application of guidance, because they quite simply isn't a one size fits all approach. As regards construction activities, one has to look at the particular project and the particular activities inherent in the construction of that project. And we say in that context, that there will not be the sustained period of activity of noisy activities such as should give rise to any material concern.

In an effort to allay the concerns of Mr. Brittain and East Lindy District Council,

the applicant has committed to provide further detail as regards periods and durations of activity. We're going to provide that because of course, what we want to do is reach common ground with Mr. Brittain and with the District Council, so we're going to provide that further level of detail.

What we anticipate is that when that level of detail is provided, that agreement can be reached, but in circumstances where for whatever reason, there was a residual concern on the part of the Council and its advisors regarding let's say, a particular receptor. In those circumstances, there could then be further discussions as to appropriate mitigation in relation to that particular receptor, we do not accept, we do not anticipate that there will be any such problems. But that is a potential way forward. If And insofar as we get to a stage where the two parties are not aligned. But I mean, that's very much a provisional and potential way forward. At this stage, what we say is that we're going to provide that further level of detail to the council in an effort to allay concerns. Now, I don't know whether after that, like, I'm sure I've gambled it horribly. But whether there's anything further, Mr. Robinson, or Mr. Williams would want to say at this point.

First, Mike Williams on behalf the applicants, no, I think that was a perfect summary of the situation. I mean, we had a very cordial call last week, and we've got some clear actions agreed to close out these issues. I think, as Mr. Booth said, if any of the issues still remain, then we stand by our assessment. And we believe it's robust in the way that we've done it. But we accept that we could lay out further

information on the duration of different activities and how they were assessed. And that's what we intend to do.

Thanks. Okay. Thank you. So, obviously, bearing in mind, we've got a deadline fast approaching, what sort of timescale? Can we be looking at all this getting numbers, a resolution, Mike Williams to the applicant, so we're going to work hard to try and get this note prepared for deadline for and submitted to the examiner.

Okay, thank you.

So, a few more questions on this.

I think I don't think you've got any, have you got any other sort of technical reasons as to why

the noise assessment hasn't been done in accordance with dmr? Because I think all everything that's already been set out there is, is that your full argument there? What I mean, so that is essentially it we say that there is no it's not a question of justifying a departure from dmr. I mean, we say that dmr is not the correct approach for this project. We say that there is well established precedent for using the approach that we've adopted consistent with the ANC guidance. So unless I'm, there's nothing really, I think that I can add to this point.

Okay, thank you.

Mr. Brittain, I was wondering if you've got any comments

in response

Sure. Okay. So also there was an echo.

I guess I would know that Mr. Booths, quotations from BS five

are slightly selective. I'd like to

provide

quotation, which says that for environmental impact assessments, most major developments now need to be assessed in accordance with the Town and Country planning regulations and this is where the development rights reserved and significant effects upon the environment, therefore, criteria are needed to allow these assessments to be undertaken.

So, in my opinion, that is implying that the standard is providing those criteria in order for an assessment be undertaken using them. And irrespective of the

whether the scheme is highways or anything else.

Now, I do, the meeting we had last week was was cordial and we do have an agreed way forward. But I do believe that the criteria I have suggested the ones that I guess five to eight says should be used and best five minutes away because fundamentally the recommendation within the legislation for how construction issues noise and vibration issues are resolved. So, it's essentially the guidance, the dmr and the agencies.

Documentation are essentially different interpretations of BS five double to eight, but BS five double to eight is the primary source of guidance in this matter, in my opinion.

So, in my opinion, the submitted

assessment

that is to come. If there are any long duration impacts, for example, associated with any construction compounds, often sequential activities

should use the lower values that I have

outlined.

I have provided some recommendations for this revised assessment

based on my comments on a comp previous

noise vibration assessment. And they I believe, were submitted to

a comm directly,

possibly yesterday by email.

So

I'm happy to have further discussions directly with AECOM on those recommendations.

But that's probably the limited my response.

Yeah, thank you. It's good to hear that you're working together. But I think what we move on to the next question now

does the ES assess the change from the baseline noise environment resulting from construction of the proposed development is the construction noise assessment compliant with requirements set out in MPs em one.

Eddie Robinson for the applicant. So the construction noise assessment provides

a prediction of noise levels that would would occur

due to the temporary construction activities of as a result of the works to lay the pipeline. So

in addition to the construction noise productions, we've also undertaken baseline surveys,

sensitive receptors to determine what the representative baseline ambient noise conditions are. So we've we've provided that information within the noise vibration chapter. And

in that context, we we show how

temporary noise levels will change as a result of construction activities.

Okay, thank you in the event of exceedances

what further mitigation works

that might need that are required as a result of noise monitoring, identifying that thresholds have been exceeded what mitigation measures could be implemented immediately whilst instructions taken place.

Eddie Robinson on on behalf of the applicant. So as part of the additional work that we've agreed with East Lindsay and their consultant Mr. Brittain

And we, we will update our noise assessment to provide more realistic construction noise predictions. So, at the moment, we've only looked at what the level of noise would be if it was construction activities were taking place at the closest point on the order limits to receptor, so we're looking to provide

more realistic levels of construction noise that will occur during Janetta day.

So, in that context, we are going to revisit any requirements for additional mitigation, and this will be discussed with Eastland Z and Mr. Brittain in a meeting after we've submitted our additional information.

Okay, thank you.

So one,

one further question for the applicant here is around some example, the CEOs that were provided as other DCA schemes where the noise assessment was carried out in the same way as has been done here. I'm just wondering why those are the correct ones to be comparing biking to please.

Anyone swim for the applicant? Sorry, could you repeat the question? I didn't quite.

As I understand it, what you're suggesting is, is that what you're what you're asking rather, is the basis on which certain VCOs have been identified as being absolutely appropriate. comparators. So I have to say, I'm not quite clear as to the particular schemes that were identified, appreciate I've not been present throughout this process. It may be so that that's something that we can better respond to in writing in the context of a written question. Okay. That's fine. Okay. written question. Thank you.

One more, couple of questions for East Lindsay District Council, Mr. Brittain?

Are there any specific receptors that you are concerned about?

Microphone

microphone.

Okay.

The app, the app has identified

some receptors, including ones that are the closest is five meters away from the works, which are from the site about DCO site boundary, which does strike me as very close.

Now, what the what the ES doesn't do is produce predicted noise levels. Receptors, it only identifies the

those which are within

the distance bands to that significant adverse effect level that establishes

I trust. That's clear. So without that predicted information, it's it's not possible to say these are the ones that I'm particularly concerned about.

But obviously, the closest.

Okay, thank you.

So just perhaps very briefly, on that point, and to pick up something that Mr. Robinson said earlier on, I mean, I think what he said the term he used was that he was going to provide a more realistic assessment. And I, in one sense, he's right.

But in another sense, perhaps helpful to clarify that. What is meant by that is that the applicant will provide a greater level of detail, as opposed to something being realistic and unrealistic. We're going to provide a greater level of detail in relation to noise levels having regard to distance

Um,

between receptor and activity and duration of activity.

Mr. Britten's just referred to one particular property being some five meters from the order limits.

All of these matters will be the subject of discussion about subject of comment in the further note, which is going to provide this. If you'd like greater granularity of detail in relation to duration, and distance.

I wouldn't want the examination to be going away with the thought that what's been provided thus far is unrealistic and pie in the sky because of course, that's not the position. Thank you, sir.

Okay, thank you. It's helpful as anybody else any party's got any further comments or questions on noise and vibration before we move on?

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

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. And the next item on the agenda that we're going to talk about is the major hazards and accidents.

Some matters relating to that just allow the applicants team moment to switch over if need be.

Spirit would you like to introduce

Thank you.

In terms of this matter,

of course, in the ordinary way, Mr. Monroe and I will be doing something of a double act to Mr. Monroe's, right is Mr. Paul Davis of harbor who you've heard from before, and indeed heard from yesterday, on this topic. To his right is Mr. Toby ledger. Also have harbor who will be assisting on this topic. And then to Mr. Pilkington, right is Mr. Nigel cousins of pens Ben consultancy, who will also be assisting.

Thank you, sir. Thank you, thank you very much.

First question then, is in some questions rather related to venting of gases in the venting technical note, which is rep 3029.

It is stated that block valve stations may not require to have permanent venting stacks erected

can the applicant update on whether they are or are not required at the block Vale stations please?

I'm instructed that they are not required. So

thank you very much.

Two questions then.

Obviously, if there's not venting stacks at the block five stations, there's a lot of gas in the pipeline that can be staged in terms of its release. What are the safety implications of not having venting stacks at the block rail stations.

So I'm going to pass that to Mr. Ledger.

Toby's ledger for the applicants, the

events are there for purely for maintenance purposes, for

relieving pressure from the system in order to work on it.

We don't envisage in the lifetime that will be any that major works on the block valve stations are very unlikely. And so we don't need a system of

you know, so depressurizing the pipeline in that area

where we to ever opt to maintain the valve body itself, then we would look to do implement some sort of temporary system and a temporary sewer system of isolation. That would be engineered at the time. But I said there are no plans for any routine maintenance.

So we don't see that there are any sort of safety implications of not having these vents at the block valve.

Okay, you mentioned that a temporary solution. I'm aware that in earlier correspondence in ES Chapter Three for example,

is saying that in the event of emergency or even the iminium and or the Fed of thought and a 50 meter high venting stack would be erected in the in an emergency. That position has revised and I'll come back to that in a later question. But what sort of temporary measures in the event of emergency are we

talking about at the block valve stations? Do you imagine a temporary venting stack of x meters in height would be required

for the applicant, no, we don't envisage any venting blockhouse in an emergency situation.

Thank you very much. And just on that 50 meter high venting stack it was said earlier in this examination that that was going to be for emergency purposes. But then with the venting technical note, that was provided it said that would only be required at decommissioning, which seems to go against what was said earlier could it be clarified? First of all, exactly when and why a 50 meter venting stack would be required and to what is there within the DCO itself, particularly having regard to requirement for that actually allows such a stack to be erected, please?

You'll just allow Mr. Davis and Mr. Leger just one moment before coming back to you on that, of course.

Sabe cineleisure If the applicant the only time we need to vent down the pipeline is final decommissioning. When we have to do vectorize obviously has to do militarized the pipeline.

There's no need for an emergency event for the pipeline.

Okay, if I may also add,

it is likely that we would opt to Vin down the pipeline from offshore because it's the most remote location for the event.

Okay,

the second part in relation to the DCO because I believe requirement for sets a height of stack at 25 meters, it doesn't mention emergency vents of any sort.

back tomorrow for the applicant. Yeah, requirement for an table one within that sets the heights of permanent infrastructure. And that that is the mechanism to control

the maximum parameters for any permanent infrastructure to be built under the DCO.

Okay, the only

concern there then, is that we've got the permanent infrastructure covered, but that it does the DCO therefore allow any temporary infrastructure that the applicant chooses?

No, regardless of duration, no temporary could mean a month it could mean three months for example, I mean, it is there not then an implication at that there is free rein to put up any Tim temporary infrastructure that's needed or deemed to be needed within the order limits



back from the applicant, no any infrastructure that was needed in relation to maintenance work would be covered by the broad definition of further associated development, which is within shedule one of the development consent order after all of this specific works numbers are listed, there is a control on that, that it only relates to works

for part of the authorized development which do not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement. So any maintenance works are controlled by what has been assessed in the environmental statement which will be a certified document as part of the DCO

Okay, okay. Just returning if I may, to the safety implications, if you like of not having venting stacks at the block valve stations. Let's say that there's between

washing dowels and Louth, for example, that

There is a pipeline rupture as such, and the valve is then turned off at Washington dollars to stop any more gas going down. What would happen to that gas? Is that just kept within the pipeline? In which case the pressure would build up? Or would it be, in effect reversed and then vented back up at the immingham facility? what would actually happen there?

Paul Davis for the applicant,

the vents are two are designed to depressurize equipment, what were the events cited? So the events at the immingham and federal thought site with depressurize, the

the pit launches, the pit catches, and the equipment that is at those sites to make it safe for workers to work on that equipment. The same would apply to vents that were at the block valves, they are to depressurize the equipment, they wouldn't be used to depressurize the pipeline.

Okay.

Okay, that's that's fine. That's under understood. And just one final point on this element of this topic.

Now that we understand that they're not required, we have some indicative layout plans for each of the block valve stations appreciate they are illustrative and that a final detailed design will take place later on, should development consent be granted? But will we be receiving amended plans during the course of this examination?

Patch Notes The applicant? Yes. So instructed that we can provide an updated set of indicative plans that would be the certified documents.

Okay, thank you very much.

Couple more questions on this topic of major hazards and accidents.

We covered this a little bit yesterday in terms of pipeline depth, and the limits of deviation.

Obviously, it's said that the pipeline would be buried, so the top outer casing of the pipe would be at least 1.2 meters below ground. But it could rise to naught point seven meters below ground level where certain ground conditions dictate.

It was not immediately clear, I've reread the chapter. So apologies if I've reread it wrong. But it's not entirely clear which depth may have informed the worst case scenario within chapter 19. Nor whether the likelihood or magnitude of a major accident increases as a result of this reduced pipeline depth. Could you reverse signpost me to the right places? Or let me know what the situation is there, please?

Certainly, if you're listening, I was one moment on that, of course.

Paul Davis for the applicant, I spoke about the last principal yesterday, and in the calculations for the work that was done to show that the pipeline

was a lot 1.2 meters was the depth that was used.

Okay. And in terms of

preparing, if you like for for a worst case, if you were having to do a section of pipeline at naught point seven meters.

What does that do to the potential risk of a major event occurring?

The applicant, where we identify areas above the 1.2 meters, we would

look to further mitigate those areas, things like concrete slabbing, has not been included in the calculations as yet. So we have additional measures we could apply were one to 1.3 meters isn't achievable.

But in that, in that context, I think it's as well to not lose sight of the fact that the entirety of and appreciate these are matters that then examination and indeed to yourself and the rest of the examining authority are very familiar with but it's as well not to lose sight of the fact that at whatever that the pipeline is being laid, it is being laid as a thick pipe that is to say, a 30

mill pipe that is thick throughout its length. And it as well in the context when considering issues or rupture, and so on and so forth. I think I'll be corrected if I'm wrong, but

the thickest pipeline to have ruptured to date in the United Kingdom as I think 11 mil, so we are so much more robust as a piece of infrastructure than anything else that has as yet

experienced a significant failure. That is something which necessarily, I respectfully submit has to be borne in mind.

No, I do appreciate that there is a thick wall pipe being used.

I know that, however, would know when things are struck,

if not singly, then repeatedly denied that it will wear

over time, there will be an impact on the structural integrity of the pipe, if it were to receive some sort of blows here and there. And what I just want to ensure is that that possibility, that where the pipe is lower, no closer to the surface, you know, that there is potential for it to be struck more, or we heard previously about mold drilling activities now appreciate there is still a margin between the bottom of farmers doing their mold drilling activities, and the top of the pipeline, there is still a margin. But with soil erosion, with droughts with various climatic events, there is all possibility that margin of error goes down. And therefore the risk logically goes up. And I want to make sure or seeking reassurance from the applicant, that those scenarios have been considered, and that measures are available. Now I've heard it mentioned there about concrete slabbing.

I've not seen that as a said mitigation within the camp or any audit the operational phase mitigation.

What why not and what other measures are available to you?

I suppose. So what I'll do in a moment is Pastor Mr. Davis and Mr. St. Leger to address those points.

That is to say, for example, the type of other measures and the extent to which they have or not have or have not been had regard to, I think, I mean, the first point to make is that, of course, as you've already heard, indeed, I think you've heard from Mr. Davis yesterday, we say that the compliant the pipeline, and its proposed installation is compliant with the relevant standard PD 8010, with relevant HSE guidance and with the relevant safety regulations.

We do say that this the landform for this pipeline, which is essentially flat, stable landform is

ideal. And indeed is the optimum landform for laying in the pipeline, because to the extent that there is ever a significant risk of rupture, that would be far more likely to be caused by issues relating to landform, for example, landslip, and that is not a consideration, which is, which effectively rears its head in this context. So I know what you say, as to your concern, essentially being as regards the depth of the pipeline, and the fact of the pipeline being struck, if not say once, but repeatedly. I mean, the first point to make is as regards monitoring of the pipeline, and, Mr. Davis, I know, we'll be able to speak to that. The second point to make as regards an object, whether it be a mold power, or anything else striking the pipeline with a pipeline of this thickness, there would be far more concern relating to the object which had struck the pipeline rather than the pipeline itself, because it is so robust, but in terms of those, the measures that are available,

and the extent to which they have or have been, or can be considered. I'm going to pass to Mr. Davis and also Mr. Smith.

Thank you, Paul Davis for the applicant. Yes, I think it's

worth noting that we are talking about a highly improbable scenario. And I'd like to just speak a little bit about

the layers of protection that there are in terms of prevention. Now, these have been these have been referenced, but I think it's worth going through them in sequence. The first is obviously the

route selection, the route that's chosen.

The second that has been mentioned is the fact wall pipe.

And the third has, again been mentioned that it's pressure control, monitoring the monitoring the pressure of the pipe.

The fourth is the fluid specification, the fluid that's allowed through through the pipeline. And then we have a layer on top of that of the routine inspection,

the pipeline burial,

the possibility of slapping above the pipeline, if required, which is part of PD 8010 regulations that we have spoken of. And of course, the pipeline will be marked

by by, by pipeline markers, which is a standard techniques to show any future construction workers where the pipeline where the pipeline is, I'll hand on to my colleague, Toby cineleisure, to see if he wishes to add any comments.

For the applicant, I would only add to that, that the final layer there is there will be routine

inspections of the routes.

In particular, looking for any sort of unusual activity over the pipeline using

a cane Okay, in terms of that, looking for unusual activity. as such. I know we touched on this yesterday in the compulsory acquisition hearing earlier in the month that

where the pipeline depth is less than 1.2 meters, you'll be liaising with the landowner, you'll be sorted out the leases there, and if necessary, imposing sort of any restrictions upon their use of the land to note to protect the pipe, as such,

can the examining authority and indeed the Secretary of State be reassured and rely on those discussions taking place and those sorts of restrictions being imposed through those negotiated heads of terms as the mitigation for any major hazards that may or may be potential?

So absolutely, they can. That is the stated intention of the applicant. We've stated repeatedly and publicly in the context of this examination. The applicant has every reason to wish the project to be not only be constructed or consented, but to be constructed safely and to operate safely. That is absolutely the intention of the applicant. And you both yourselves and the Secretary of State can be assured that those discussions with landowners will indeed take place.

Okay, thank you very much.

There's one final question that I have on this topic, after which I think we'll we'll adjourn for lunch. But just one further question

that we've received representations from the residents of corner farm,

obviously known setting out a number of concerns about safety and everything in relation to their specific property.

One of the

contradictions to the applicants case, if you like that they have put forward in relation to the HSE guidance, is this idea of an engineered solution. The residents of corner farm have said, well, we know that the first instance should be routed the pipe away from us. It shouldn't be an engineered solution being relied upon to provide safety. That's not what the HSE guidance says.

I'm not an expert in the HSE guidance. So I'm looking to the applicant to just elaborate on on that point. And if you can provide a response to the to the residence of corner farm, here and now please. In the first instance that I'm going to ask Mr. Davis to address that point.

Paul Davis for the applicant, yes, under the

lap principles. The aim is for the

foot to be the rest of you as low as reasonably practicable. And

it runs in the broadly acceptable

range where the pipeline is currently situated.

This as I mentioned, is the lowest ranking of risk under the ALARP principle. There is

is no lower risk and therefore,

the HSE do not normally require additional measures to be taken

other than emergency response plans to be drafted. And therefore, the risk is, as I say, broadly acceptable, the lowest ranking of risk. So other criterias have been looked at in the area of corner farm, including the excursions into the floodplain.

Okay.

But not the further criticisms that the residents of corn farm had in response to those emergency response plans, is that

even if they're agreed it should something happened within the proximity to corner farm. They say it'd be too late for an emergency response plan to not putting words in their mouth, but save them, if he like if there was an event near them. What do you say to that?

Yeah, so I mean, I think perhaps I'm going to ask Mr. Cousins to come in at this point.

I mean, the high level observation that I would make

is this is that there's obviously a considerable degree of concern set out in the corner farm representation. And

what that focuses on

is effectively a consequential analysis that is to say in the event of rupture,

what are the consequences? And so that is right and appropriate, insofar as it forms part of a picture or risk analysis. But so, that is only ever can only ever properly be part of an analysis picture. Because not only does one have to have regard to consequences, one has to have regard to likelihood. And indeed, consideration of the likelihood of a catastrophic event or rupture, whichever term one wishes to use is a very relevant and pertinent consideration. And that must also necessarily inform any analysis of risk. And insofar as the discussion in the corner found documentation is only in the event of is only as regard to consequences. It is not a representative analysis, in my respectful submission, but on that basis, I just want to pass to Mr. Cousins.

Knowledge because and on behalf of the applicant,

what

has been said is correct.

The process has been taken is absolutely right, starting from the pipeline safety regulations requiring risk as a risk assessment

BSPT SPD at 10 has criteria for routing, and distances to minimum occupied buildings. For class one and class two, it requires that to be supported by a risk assessment, which takes account of the probability of failure and the consequences. The probability of failure is based on a very well put together database, the Copa data, which incidentally,

from that data, you can look at the function of depth of burial, and also wall thickness and the wall thickness has a much, much larger influence over the probability of failure than the depth of burial.

And the targets, risks are set out in the HSCs documents RSVP to reducing risk protecting people. And that's been done absolutely in accordance in accordance with that. And it's below the

the alarm threshold. So the broadly acceptable region. And that's been done in discussion with health and safety executive. So

it's, you know, it's been done exactly as it should be.

Which is the planning of course, I mean,

corner farms, representation about about the consequences

is a view and that is taken account of in the kewra. But also to do it in its fullness, you need to take account of the portability. That's that's the most important point here. Thank you. Okay. I understand the point. Forgive me for a slight

response, in the sense that I was watching the Euros as indeed many other people were. And during the course of one of the games, the lightning struck close to the stadium, and the immediately response was to take

have players off the pitch for safety. Now in terms of likelihood, the likelihood of a stadium, you know, one small hidden brick in a city if you'd like being struck by lightning is extremely low. But they had an emergency response plan in place should that event occur. So I appreciate what you're saying of likelihood versus consequence. I just want to be reassured, in effect that it has been fought off. And I'm sure the residents of corner farm would appreciate just knowing that that is, has been in the minds of the applicant as they've been preparing this submission.

So I can confirm that the emergency response plan has been given due consideration, it is a matter that the applicant has taken seriously, I mean, the app. So the applicant is hasn't come down in a large shower. The applicant is an experienced and responsible operator of high pressure pipelines. Indeed, it is already responsible for some three and a half 1000 Sorry, three and a half hours three and a half 1000

kilometers of high pressure pipeline. And this is not a matter of safety is not a matter where any corners have been cut whatsoever. On the contrary, to the extent that there has been any divergence from

standards that has been over specification, for example, the full length of the pipeline being 30 mil as opposed to part of it being

lesser at say 12 to 13 mil. So no, sir, I can give that assurance on the part of the applicant that safety has been given absolutely all due consideration.

Many thanks, Mr. Buffon many thanks for sealing that off.

It is now coming up to 20 to one I will first of all, we'll open it up to the floor. Does anyone else have anything they wish to raise or comment on in respect of major hazards or accidents?

Okay, nothing heard, in which case, what we'll shortly do then is adjourn for a lunch break.

After which we'll be resuming with the topic of cultural heritage. And then of course, there's any other business following that. If you have joined us for this morning session as a as an expert in the fields that we've discussed, and do not wish to participate this afternoon. That's fair enough. Thank you very much for your attendance and your contributions. That is much appreciated. Though. Of course, I'm not kicking you out, by all means continue to watch if you wish to do so. But we will adjourn now. And if we take an hour lunch break, so that well, now an hour and five minutes, let's be generous. So 1245 is coming up if we resume this hearing at 1:45pm. Thank you very much, everyone. This hearing is now adjourned.