

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm
<b>Hearing:</b>	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) - Part 5
<b>Date:</b>	22 January 2025

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

## **Five Estuaries\_Colchester\_ISH6\_22 Jan\_PT5**

Created on: 2025-01-22 13:42:51

Project Length: 01:19:46

File Name: Five Estuaries\_Colchester\_ISH6\_22 Jan\_PT5

File Length: 01:19:46

### **FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)**

00:00:02:21 - 00:00:12:06

So it is. Uh, well, it's now almost 10 to 2. This hearing is resumed with item 3.7. Effects on offshore ecology. Please may the applicant introduce its team again.

00:00:14:11 - 00:00:18:28

Uh, Mr. Ryan Irvine, on behalf of the applicant. Speaking on offshore ornithology.

00:00:21:17 - 00:00:24:28

John Bleach, benthic ecologist, on behalf of the applicant.

00:00:27:03 - 00:00:39:10

Uh, behalf of applicant. Sir. Online, we have Jason Gale speaking on bass. Awfully Humphrey speaking on marine mammals. Doctor James Miles, also on or offshore ornithology. And Anna love for fish.

00:00:40:28 - 00:00:41:18

Thank you.

00:00:43:05 - 00:00:50:28

Previously, we'd just agreed that a quick summary on any progress made on offshore ecological matters since the previous issue specific hearings was to be provided in writing.

00:00:54:16 - 00:01:18:18

So prior to the small technical glitch, we were stating that its To effects on bats is a bit of a concern for the examining authority. And I wonder, can the applicant explain to the examining authority how the habitats regulations apply with regard to harm to an individual protected species? That is not a qualifying feature of any European site. What are the applicable stages and tests to be considered in the event of any such harm?

00:01:29:02 - 00:01:50:21

Paul McCartney for the applicant. Fundamentally, sir, this is not a nature issue because the bats are not a species and a designated site within the vicinity of the project, and the HRA regulations refer to the integrity of an adverse effect on the sites and the conservation objective of the sites, not individual species outside of those. This is purely an eye issue.

00:01:50:26 - 00:02:00:03

I appreciate the not qualifying feature. Could you take me through the legislative procedure then, with regard to harm to an individual protected species outside of a European site matter.

00:02:23:09 - 00:02:41:06

I'm Paul McCartney. Applicant. Fundamentally, sir, if you're if you're going to disturb or harm a protected species, you need a protected species licence to do that. As far as we're aware of Natural England or not submitting that we need to protect these species licence in this case, and we don't believe we need one at all. So we don't think there is any other consent to get here.

00:02:46:27 - 00:03:04:12

I guess I'm trying to understand what the legislative position is. If I'm having to make a recommendation, a recommendation to the competent decision making authority, if it cannot be put beyond any reasonable scientific doubt that there will be harm to bats. Would that just simply be a licensing issue? And are you saying.

00:03:11:03 - 00:03:38:23

I'm all negative, that we don't agree that the relevant test here as we submitted this is an eye issue? There is no evidence before you. There would be a likely significant effect. There's also no evidence before you that we need a protected species licence, and therefore we haven't included that in the other consents and licences. If Natural England changed their position and told us we did, we'd have to look into that and have that argument with them. But that would be outside of this process because EPs are not covered by the DCO.

00:03:39:28 - 00:03:43:09

Are you still having ongoing discussions with Natural England with regard to this species?

00:03:45:21 - 00:04:13:07

Then you're basically the applicant. Yes we are. We met with Natural England last week to discuss, um, discuss offshore bats and, uh, commence discussions on potential arrangements for monitoring or research to contribute towards the data gaps. Um, our intention is to provide a proposal to Natural England prior to deadline six and hopefully receive some response from them on it. Um, but that is as far as those discussions have gone.

00:04:18:03 - 00:04:47:09

Thank you. Notwithstanding the legislative legislative position, then I note the marine policy assessment provided the deadline. Five. That's rep 5068 and N three together seek to protect biodiversity as a whole and ensure that appropriate and extensive evidence is considered with regard to any protected species setting aside than any legislative context. Can the applicant explain the policy ramifications of harm to bats, and what weight should be given to any conflict with this policy?

00:05:23:18 - 00:05:38:18

All the difficulty we're having, sir, is there is no evidence that there will be harm to birds. There is no likely significant effect on bats, and therefore there is no policy test to apply. So we're having a bit of a difficulty.

00:05:39:17 - 00:05:45:28

In the hypothetical context. Then if we did agree, or if we did find it was hard to, that's what policy would be engaged and what weight should be given to that policy.

00:06:28:02 - 00:06:57:02

Well, I might get you for that, but a little bit nervous engaging with these hypotheticals. But fundamentally, if it was determined on the basis of evidence that there was going to be an effect on a species that was not an HIV issue, it was an EIA issue. And putting aside the EPA point, then that would go into the planning balance as said, and the potential adverse effect of the pot. But I can't tell you. I'm afraid I can't tell you off the top of my head which particular parts of the policy we need to refer to those deals in writing.

00:06:58:17 - 00:07:07:18

If that issue then arises with further discussions with Natural England, maybe that can be a follow up that if there is any issues outlined, there's a policy context attached that.

00:07:14:14 - 00:07:26:24

Up for that concern. As far as we are aware. Natural England have accepted there is not sufficient data to reach a conclusion of harm, so we don't expect them to engage with us. On this point, we can try, but we don't expect them to engage given that conclusion.

00:07:47:15 - 00:07:48:00

Okay.

00:07:49:23 - 00:08:01:02

I note that the applicant has agreed to contribute to monitoring and research projects for Bats on a precautionary basis. Does the applicant intend to monitor bats migration during the next migratory period this year to assist with this?

00:08:04:20 - 00:08:29:05

And your rights with the applicant? Um, to be honest, that's part that's that's not included. Um, it's not currently our intention to undertake monitoring this year. Um, we have only recently commenced the discussions with Natural England. Um, the intention would be if monitoring were to be undertaken, that would be undertaken pre-construction.

00:08:31:17 - 00:08:33:27

But not necessarily in the in the next year.

00:08:38:29 - 00:08:46:22

And the applicant outline which migratory research projects could uh that the proposed development could contribute to and how these would be secured.

00:09:13:00 - 00:09:31:17

Uh, for the applicant, sir, that's a slightly premature. And that if we were doing the monitoring, we would do it through the in principle monitoring plan. However, if we were contributing to a research

project, that wouldn't be an activity that was secured through our, you know, DCO, because we're not doing it, we'd be contributing to somebody else's work.

00:09:33:12 - 00:09:34:17

What type of work?

00:09:44:05 - 00:09:48:18

You do So this is still the subject of ongoing discussion with Natural England. We don't have an answer for you.

00:10:20:15 - 00:10:29:00

Thank you. Um, that's all I have on this first item of the agenda. Are there any other points on protected species that any party wishes to raise?

00:10:34:00 - 00:10:34:28

Seeing anything.

00:10:37:12 - 00:10:55:21

So turning to assessment methodologies. And there are still a number of outstanding areas of methodological dispute between the applicant and interested parties. Can the applicant clarify whether we are now nearing, or are we at final positions in relation to these disputes, or are there any further discussions planned with IPPs to address them?

00:11:03:14 - 00:11:25:00

Daniel Bates For the applicant, the applicant has continued to engage naturally on these on these matters. Um, we had a topic specific meeting and offshore ornithology on the 13th of January. Um, part of that was to discuss the, uh, differing approaches to, uh, calculating the quantum of impact and the quantum of compensation required.

00:11:26:20 - 00:11:56:23

Um, but deadline for Natural England proposed that the applicant should include NATO filepath rates in its calculations for the quantum of compensation. These rates at which uh or the the sort of description of native trees is that these are the rates at which fledglings at a particular colony will leave that colony to breed at another site. And if we were to use those rates, that would inflate compensation numbers to sort of wholly unrealistic levels.

00:11:57:00 - 00:12:26:01

So, for example, for five estuaries for razorbills, where we calculate an impact of 0.2 birds a year, using the Natural England approach would result in the need to compensate to the level of 1300 birds. Um, for another project that we're aware of currently going through examination. A similar calculation for Razorbills, uh, has, has led to a compensation quantum greater than the assumed global population of Razorbills.

00:12:28:17 - 00:12:43:15

Whilst this isn't the only methodological difference. Um, and the applicant understands that Natural England are reviewing this advice on NATO rates. It is demonstrative of the fact that the additive effect of layering

00:12:45:02 - 00:13:02:28

is what we consider to be excessively precautionary figures throughout both the calculation of impact and the calculation of compensation does lead you to a place where the outcomes can be wholly unrepresentative and totally divorced from the impact that's actually happening.

00:13:04:14 - 00:13:25:01

Um, and the applications. So the applicant's position is that this approach to the calculation, uh, to its calculation of impacts and compensation are suitably precautionary whilst providing a much more realistic and proportionate quantum. And really, that can be taken throughout the various discussions that are being had with the different species.

00:13:28:26 - 00:13:36:20

So, I mean, in conclusion, we're unlikely to reach agreement on the methodology for these things. And we've presented our case and we'll continue

00:13:38:14 - 00:13:38:29

Thank you.

00:13:39:01 - 00:13:43:05

So it can be taken that we are nearing or at the point of settle positions.

00:13:43:28 - 00:13:45:02

Uh, yes, I would say so.

00:13:46:16 - 00:13:55:16

Thank you. Just just on that point, in terms of the discussions that are ongoing with Natural England.

00:13:58:10 - 00:14:24:11

When you take them through your calculations and your logic to the outcome, are they giving any indication as to whether they recognize what you're saying? Um, you indicated earlier that they are perhaps reviewing their methodology. Have they indicated that they might change their approach to their their favoured methodology sooner rather than later?

00:14:26:22 - 00:14:50:00

So the reference to them reviewing their methodology only apply to the application of these natal rates. Um, in terms of the other factors that go into the calculation of the quantum. The quantum. Uh. Now, I believe they're looking to review those. And, uh, neither, I think are they looking to, um, align with the applicant's position?

00:15:05:02 - 00:15:12:05

I don't have any more questions on this particular matter. Um, does anyone else wish to raise anything on methodological issues?

00:16:07:28 - 00:16:41:13

Ryan Ervin for the applicant and to the main disagreements we have is how we're calculating the mortality for less black black girl and Knox. So for less black black gold, we're using a more stable approach to age specific demographic rates. So we're using a more national approach to, um, adult proportions, whereas the national approach is to use site specific data for the site specific data for the digital ERA surveys takes into account birds that look like adults, not actually adults that inflates numbers.

00:16:41:15 - 00:16:54:16

So that's why we're sticking with our petition, because there isn't a true representation. And then for guillemots Bill, they are still advocating 70% for displacement. And there's many papers coming out now

00:16:56:01 - 00:17:09:25

a pen and paper in 2022. Trinder produced a paper in 2024 which is advocating that 50% is still precautionary. Um, and that 70%, 70% is over precautionary.

00:17:35:06 - 00:17:59:00

Mr. Bates, a little while ago, you indicated that this is arising with or has arisen with other cases. Are there any cases where decisions have actually been made? This sort of issue has arisen, and in effect, the Secretary of State has reached a conclusion which is either favoured the applicant's approach or favoured Natural England's approach.

00:18:04:14 - 00:18:09:25

Or or are or the cases that you were referring to still live examination.

00:18:11:22 - 00:18:19:24

Daniel Bates for the applicant. The case I was very interested in a live application. We would have to go and do a bit of research looking into the various decisions.

00:18:19:26 - 00:18:23:07

Is that the project that's ahead of us or behind us?

00:18:23:19 - 00:18:26:12

They are a few weeks behind us. Right?

00:18:27:03 - 00:18:42:17

We're not going to get much assistance in terms of what's coming out of that case, because it's not ultimately going to end up Secretary of State's desk, and he makes a decision decision before or certainly we have to start making a recommendation, okay. That that that helps.

00:18:48:13 - 00:19:08:06

I'm just wondering, do we from your perspective, have clearly explaining how you're doing your calculations and how the how natural England are doing their calculations? And the key differences are, was that something that you spelt out recently?

00:19:25:22 - 00:19:43:04

Uh, Daniel Bates with the applicant. We have set this out. It is across various documents in the submissions, particularly the compensation documents where it does talk through the different approaches. Um, we do have more we can submit. Um, again.

00:19:43:09 - 00:20:16:28

I'm just wondering whether it's possible, perhaps to consolidate the information, because if nothing, when we have to come to report on it, that makes life somewhat easier, particularly than when the um, department is then also looking at our report. Um, they seem to like a lot of signposting, particularly when we've got issues of this particular issue where there's clearly a difference. And in this instance, because we've got a statutory, uh, nature conservation body.

00:20:17:21 - 00:20:52:22

Um, and it would, I think, make it easier for us to plot the path through whatever we end up recommending. And then for the Secretary of State through his advisers in the department, to actually get to the bottom of where the differences are, because ultimately, it's sounding like there will be a balance that has to be struck one side of the line or the other. Um, and it's certainly a lot easier when you've got one document in front of you that has got this sort of information clearly set out in it, rather than having to go across a whole range of different things.

00:21:03:18 - 00:21:08:02

Uh, yes. We should be able to provide that sort of note. Um, and to look to provide that.

00:21:08:11 - 00:21:33:13

Yeah. The other thing to consolidate, um, when do you think the discussions with Natural England, as far as this case, are likely to conclude, given where we are within the examination, because there's not much point, perhaps doing a consolidated Dietary note until you have, in effect, finally drawn a line with Natural England as to where this matter can be progressed or not.

00:21:37:02 - 00:22:07:06

Naturally. As I've said, I've suggested to us that they're going to reconsider or look again at this advice on the NATO battery rates when we get that back. I'm not sure. Um, we could potentially wait for Natural England's deadline of six submissions to see if there's an update on that. In terms of discussions between the applicant and Natural England on this matter, I would say it's concluded subject to anything else, natural England submit. Um, so.

00:22:07:08 - 00:22:30:14

Sounding like Insensibly Natural England might submit something at deadline six. This is something for deadline seven from your perspective, because by that point, it's likely, uh, that we may have had some further discussion, but any movement, on one or other side should have resolved itself by by deadline seven given that's a little way off.

00:22:31:16 - 00:22:33:15

Yes, that sounds like a sensible suggestion.



00:22:44:24 - 00:22:50:17

Does anybody else here in the room or online have anything they wish to say in relation to methodological issues?

00:22:54:26 - 00:22:58:15

Okay. Well then moving on to compensatory measures then

00:23:00:04 - 00:23:18:08

in terms of the compensatory strategy for the letter black black girl, we still appear to have the two available options, these being at Orford Ness and Outer Trial Bank. Is the applicant able to now commit to a particular compensatory option for the girls, or are we likely to have a dual strategy at the end of the examination?

00:23:26:03 - 00:23:45:20

We still progressing both options on a mutually exclusive basis? I think as the applicant has made clear previously, we believe either measure would sufficiently compensate for the project's impacts unless a black back goal. Um, so the expectation would be at the end of examination, both measures would be there. Uh, as as options.

00:23:52:07 - 00:24:04:11

Thank you. I'm guessing there are. Excuse me. Still ongoing discussions with relevant parties that, uh, pursuant to those options then. And if so, one of these taking place or have they concluded?

00:24:09:09 - 00:24:41:09

Uh, the discussions are still very much ongoing. Um, so, uh, with respect to the site of awkwardness, discussions are ongoing with the Cobra Over Mr. Landowner. And with respect to our bank, uh, the applicant had a very productive meeting with the Crown Estate prior to Christmas. Um, alongside North walls. Um, and we were expecting, uh, to be able to submit, uh, some update from the Crown Estate at deadline six.

00:24:41:11 - 00:24:49:21

And we're working with them to, to be able to provide that. Uh, but currently, uh, the land outside bank is, is not secured.

00:24:59:07 - 00:25:02:27

Are there any key outstanding issues with regard to securing these sites?

00:25:07:13 - 00:25:32:13

Any rights for the applicant? Um, with regard to going back to our to our bank, in principle, I don't believe so. As I say, I've had very positive discussions with the Crown Estate, and we have requested from them and believe that we will receive a letter of comfort along the lines of being able to obtain the necessary rights out of our bank to carry out the measures. Um.

00:26:22:01 - 00:26:33:19

And to provide more context around where the discussions are without Bank and what systems have been going well, we do need to make clear that we don't have the terms. We don't have,

00:26:35:08 - 00:26:41:19

uh, costs. We don't have any sort of level of agreement with the Crown Estate. So really, to put that in context,

00:26:43:10 - 00:26:51:27

you know, the land and the rights are not secured at this point. Um, so we absolutely need to maintain both options.

00:26:54:03 - 00:26:59:15

There's nothing sort of fundamental without our bank that would prohibit that prior to the conclusion of the examination.

00:27:00:18 - 00:27:04:08

That would depend on the approach of the Crown Estate. So we can't speak on their behalf.

00:27:14:27 - 00:27:25:17

Similarly, can the applicant update us on the razor bill and guillemot compensation strategy? How will this be secured? What discussions are taking place? Any critical issues with regard to securing this compensation?

00:27:30:23 - 00:28:08:12

And your rights with the applicant, and noting that these measures are entirely without prejudice at this stage? Um, we are continuing to, uh, just one of my notes. Uh, we are continuing to progress those measures. Uh, speaking with a number of third parties in the South West and with other developers for potential collaborative measures. Um, fundamentally, uh, those proposals do not or would not require any land and could be delivered either by the applicant alone, in collaboration with other developers or as a more strategic measure.

00:28:09:10 - 00:28:28:20

Um, essentially was that uh, whilst those agreements are still under discussion, given the very, very minimal potential impact from the project on those species, um, we believe that there can be confidence that if it's required, the measure can be carried out to the extent needed to compensate for the impact of five estuaries.

00:28:30:13 - 00:28:33:13

And this was set out in our update at deadline.

00:28:58:29 - 00:29:07:25

Thank you. Is there anything else any interested party wishes to raise in relation to compensatory measures or other matters that may arise under tomorrow's hearings?

00:29:13:06 - 00:29:32:27

So lastly, then in terms of benthic and aquatic ecology, we touched upon cable burial depths yesterday. Can the applicant just confirm that it understands that Harwich Haven Authority and the Port of

London Authority are satisfied that a cable burial depth of 22m is not required in the MLS SAC. So this would be 19m here.

00:29:47:21 - 00:29:57:20

For the applicant. Sorry, the 19m is for the slope into the deep water. We would not be burying in 19m outside that slope. And that has never been anybody's contention so far as we are aware.

00:29:59:09 - 00:30:01:16

What will the cable burial depth be in the sac?

00:30:06:21 - 00:30:36:26

And this may not be the applicant, the cable burial depth in the SAC has not been finally determined. There is a process in detailed design that will establish the target cable burial depths. It's, uh, anticipated to be between, uh, you know, one and a half and two meters, but it may be a meter. Um, it's highly variable on seabed mobility.

00:30:48:07 - 00:31:05:21

As measured for the applicant. I'd also like to make the point, um, for clarity, that the the 19m and the 22m that have been mentioned in relation to the deep water channels are levels, not depths. Um, yeah. Thank you.

00:31:06:29 - 00:31:16:01

Okay. let me check that. Thank you very much. That is all the questions I wish to ask. Are there any parties that wish to raise anything else with regard to this agenda item?

00:31:49:28 - 00:31:50:13

Yes.

00:31:55:21 - 00:32:10:03

Sir. Just mindful that Julian Boswell for the applicant, just mindful that you're sort of thinking ahead to what what kind of needs to happen in the remainder of the examination that there's in relation to SAC.

00:32:12:09 - 00:32:34:13

We are hopeful that we won't need any compensation, as I hope you've gathered, i.e. that there won't need to be cable protection. But if there is, and we lose the argument on that and there is compensation imposed, then um, no project is in a position to provide.

00:32:37:09 - 00:33:09:10

Sack company. Well, sorry, I'll put that slightly differently. The way, the way the industry is heading is that Defra has committed publicly to providing either an extension to an sack or a new sack, or potentially an extension or a new MCC Zed as an industry level. Um, sort of, uh, An amount of compensation that can be drawn down through the Marine Recovery Fund.

00:33:09:19 - 00:33:49:07

So there are other projects that are having to sort of where this is kind of front and centre of what's playing out. This project is unusual because it's it's very it's conditional. There are, as I've already just indicated, there are different situations where this may not be relevant. But for completeness, we just wanted to say that this that we keep being told this announcement is imminent, so that there's going to be a ministerial statement and some new guidance that's going to relate to the three measures of which benthic compensation is one in relation to that will be available when the Marine Recovery Fund is set up.

00:33:49:22 - 00:34:27:29

So assuming that the announcement does come out in sufficient time before the end of this examination, we would expect to be submitting that and the suitable commentary on how that, uh, how that is or is or isn't relevant. We have done our best to anticipate this in the DCO drafting that is already included. So there's a good chance that DCO drafting will not change. But unless and until we actually see this announcement or these announcements, this statement and this guidance, um, it's possible that there will be, um, at the very least for information that we would want to be submitting to you.

00:34:28:01 - 00:34:32:01

And I just thought it was worth mentioning that since we're on this general topic.

00:34:33:28 - 00:35:09:26

Uh, thank you, Mr. Boswell. Uh, our colleagues who deal particularly with this sort of thing in the environmental services team equally are aware, like you are, that something has been, uh, muted as to, uh, being, uh, the subject of a ministerial statement. But there is, uh, like you've indicated, certainly from our understanding, nothing as yet in terms of a firm deadline. There has been some discussion about possibly January, but we are now in nearly toward the end of the third week of January.

00:35:10:18 - 00:35:43:12

Um, and there is no no more information. Certainly, that's come our direction. That, uh, indicates that the January date that was or January as a month that has been talked about will actually, uh, come to fruition. But it's helpful that you've you've given some contents as how you've, you've been seeking to address the issue in what is, um, an area that is still evolving. Um, I just want to pick up on.

00:35:45:13 - 00:35:49:21

Um, something that Miss Brainard was referring to. Don't don't

00:35:51:17 - 00:36:24:28

it. It's more just so that we are, as an example, entirely clear. I think we were getting there yesterday in the shipping navigation section that there is no concern coming from the the port site and the shipping side in terms of the depth of a cable burial. Um, generally what we were being told yesterday is that in terms of the depth of burial, um, dredging will be possible within the deep water channels.

00:36:25:11 - 00:36:27:11

Um, of 22m.

00:36:28:24 - 00:36:49:00

Alice Maynard for the applicant. Yes. That is the commitment that we are making that dredging to 22m chart datum. That level, uh, will be possible. Um, and we will bury our cable sufficiently deep below that at a depth to be determined to allow that to happen in the future.

00:36:49:02 - 00:37:19:24

Then when we come to the SAC, which sits just outside, as I understand it, the deep water routes, the port authorities have not raised any from Europe as you understand it. No concerns in respect of potentially not being able to bury as deep within the SAC. Is that a fair? Yeah. That they put another way. They are not insisting on 22m within sac.

00:37:20:12 - 00:37:21:21

That's that's correct.

00:37:21:23 - 00:37:22:15

Yeah.

00:37:22:17 - 00:37:48:07

Because as I think we developed yesterday in some of the discussion there is sufficient manoeuvrability. But for vessels out there, either in the course of their movement to and fro or entry to and exit from the deep water route and or as the um pilot boarding takes place at the pilot boarding stage, there's sufficient space for all of that to happen without needing 22m.

00:37:49:26 - 00:37:51:03

Yes. That's correct.

00:37:51:13 - 00:38:10:16

We just need to be 100% clear because, um, I've certainly seen in some of your documents. You're taking a conservative approach to the sack because you are concerned that if you had to do too much work within the sack, you might not get through the habitat's race.

00:38:12:06 - 00:38:22:21

Yes. That's correct. And I think that's a position that's recognized by the ports as well. That dredging, uh, two 22m is highly unlikely to be acceptable within the sack.

00:38:24:12 - 00:38:56:27

I think that point has moved within the examination at the start of the examination, I think our understanding was there might have been an issue with the sack, but the discussion that we had yesterday, I think, usefully clarified that they don't have an issue with the sack. Otherwise, it appeared to us that there wouldn't be much point in, uh, in effect, enabling an installation that would allow dredging to 22m on either side of the sack. But you then have the the sack area, which would have been an impediment.

00:38:57:07 - 00:39:14:00

Because you wouldn't have the ability to get into that area. But it looks like we've actually got past that hurdle, uh, with with the ports and the shipping side of things, accepting that they can do everything they need to do without.

00:39:26:05 - 00:39:31:19

Well, just to clarify, the SEC is on one side of the deep water. It's it's not either side.

00:39:32:21 - 00:40:13:06

But yeah, in effect, whatever. It wouldn't be if there had been an impediment because the, the burial depth within the SAC then actually dredging to 22m within um, the deep water route would have neither been here nor there because the controlling factor would have been the SAC. But actually, I think yesterday we were clearly able to establish that the SAT is not an impediment because it wasn't raised yesterday. Um, and what we've now discussed about what does or doesn't happen within the stack isn't going to upset the applet in terms of where we were yesterday in the navigation and shipping discussion.

00:40:14:01 - 00:40:17:14

But I just wanted to be 100% clear about that.

00:40:18:13 - 00:40:34:24

That's certainly our understanding. And in, uh, in discussions with the ports. Uh, discussion has been around the fact that there is sufficient sea room north of the shack, as you say, to bring in those potential 20 metre draught vessels that would be enabled by the commitments elsewhere.

00:40:37:27 - 00:41:16:18

I mean, this potentially showed a little bit of ignorance on my part. The actual pilot boarding station, is that a physical structure or is that just in effect, a zone that I'm getting a nod from Spain. Yet it's never very clear because it's always referred to as a boarding station or a diamond. And it's it's always a little bit like all the Mariners know what they're on about. Um, but yeah, it's just a ineffective charted zone. And everybody knows that that's where you go either to receive a pilot or to, uh, transfer the pilot to a boat.

00:41:16:25 - 00:41:19:09

Uh.

00:41:29:13 - 00:41:41:07

Yes. That's correct. So it's a chartered diamond. It's a reference point where vessels can be either targeted at that diamond or to a certain distance, you know, east or west, um, to receive a pilot.

00:41:42:25 - 00:41:53:17

Well, thank you for that. So would it be of assistance if we put in with our summary, a brief explanation of how this whole area works in terms of Maneuvering ships in and out of deep water routes? Or are you comfortable with that?

00:41:54:18 - 00:42:14:23

Um, we're comfortable with it. But, um, if that note had a little plan attached to it. That is something that we can embed within the recommendation, and potentially means we don't actually have to use a lot of words to explain what can easily be shown on an image.

00:42:16:11 - 00:42:39:21

Um, because certainly, you know, from those that are reading the report, particularly on the decision making side, some of this stuff is quite complex. Uh, and a really reckoner type approach does make life a lot easier. Um, I've certainly had a, uh, worked on another report recently where a few images did save us an awful lot of words.

00:42:42:19 - 00:42:44:25

Yes, we certainly provide a plan along those lines.

00:42:50:20 - 00:43:08:28

Thank you. I think that's all of the questions that we wish to ask. Are there any parties that wish to raise anything else for this item? No. Okay. Well, that concludes this agenda item, and I'll hand you over to Mrs. Weber to discuss onshore ecology.

00:43:11:05 - 00:43:14:05

Uh, I assume you've been doing a bit of swap around.

00:43:32:03 - 00:43:33:29

Okay. Would you like to introduce your team?

00:43:37:03 - 00:43:40:20

Uh, Jess Colebrook, on behalf of the applicant here as the ecology lead.

00:43:43:10 - 00:43:47:19

We also have Mr. James Eaton, the onshore consenting manager who's just getting settled.

00:43:53:09 - 00:43:59:19

But I think the Essex County Council got some representation or.

00:44:01:08 - 00:44:01:23

Yes.

00:44:07:07 - 00:44:12:03

Okay. Um, now, before we actually start into questions.

00:44:14:11 - 00:44:26:27

Uh, can I ask that the applicant reviews and amends the figures in the MP rep. 200022 insofar as there are two figure twos,

00:44:28:24 - 00:44:35:00

and check that where they are referenced in the text, they are correctly identified. Thank you.

00:44:35:14 - 00:44:37:23

Yes of course, madam. Apologies for that. We'll fix it.

00:44:38:03 - 00:44:38:26

That's okay.

00:44:49:00 - 00:45:37:16

Move on straight into the questioning then. And and to be fair, it's a combination of to the applicant and Essex County Council. Uh, so first we're talking about the green infrastructure strategy, including the assessment for achieving 10% biodiversity, net gain for the proposed development and the proposed North Falls offshore wind farm in the response. Um rep. 5073 um ECC .06 just deadline for submissions which are which was GC 204 in rep 4046 made by Essex County Council, stating.

00:45:38:02 - 00:46:04:05

However, if the lamp provides the necessary details required for a GI landscape strategy, then that would be satisfactory. It is noted that the lamp is a requirement of the DCO. So to Essex County Council, I would ask, do you wish to see the wording within the DCO requirement relating to the LMP to include reference to the GI strategy?

00:46:37:18 - 00:46:44:08

Kerry Wallace, Essex County Council. We will take it back because we need to check with our legal representative. Thank you.

00:46:46:21 - 00:46:51:26

Well, will we expect a response in a deadline six submission?

00:46:52:27 - 00:46:53:27

Yes. Thank you.

00:47:01:14 - 00:47:02:07

Um, again?

00:47:03:27 - 00:47:06:15

Oh, okay. Just go across to the applicant.

00:47:06:25 - 00:47:24:03

Sorry, madam. We just wanted to raise that. There is already a wording relating to this in the Olympus section 2.4.1, and therefore it would already be secured through the outline. Um, we would ask that again to review that wording as well. We don't necessarily think in addition to the requirement is necessarily where it's already in the outline

00:47:25:24 - 00:47:26:09

with.

00:47:27:04 - 00:47:30:10

Essex County Council. Happy to include that in their review.

00:47:32:22 - 00:47:35:19

Thank you.



00:47:45:16 - 00:48:25:10

Also to Essex County Council. Um, again, based on your responses to your comments and your comments in respect of requirement five of the DCO or suitable wording be provided around plans as suggested by the applicant in their response to IC 0.06. Um, I'm assuming, to be honest, I think it's probably the applicant needs to respond as well. Um, are you committing to providing details of planning plans to be submitted under the requirement?

00:48:27:12 - 00:48:47:06

For the applicant in the requirement wording? No, because it's a little bit early to specify which plans would be and what scale and that level of detail, we are willing to put those principles into the outline to be agreed with the council pre-submission as to what would be plans and what would be written for them. Um, we don't think it would be helpful to try and specify that in the requirement. Now, given that we're only at outline design.

00:48:48:12 - 00:48:56:25

Right? So probably Essex County Council if for it to be included in a commitment in the outline lamp.

00:48:59:08 - 00:49:01:14

Are you happy? Are you content with that?

00:49:07:13 - 00:49:16:10

Um, Carol Wallace Essex County Council's sorry. Um, no, we haven't got a landscape, um, consultant today, so I need to take it.

00:49:16:12 - 00:49:27:26

You need to take it back. Okay, fine. Fair enough. The second consideration and response for deadline six. Thank you.

00:49:32:27 - 00:50:03:02

And I'll pass over the next question because you've actually already engaged on it. Um, moving forward to the creation of the onshore subset of an orchard within the onshore substation zone. In your response? Um, in the case of traditional maybe, uh, sorry, in your response to the comments made by Essex County Council, it is stated in the case of the traditional orchard.

00:50:03:12 - 00:50:34:23

The specific definition definition for this habitat is taken from UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats descriptions. Brig, 2008. It includes nut trees and therefore hazel is appropriate in to consider in the mix. However, Essex County Council are suggesting that an orchard, regardless of fruit or nut, requires specialist pruning in order to maintain fruit production, suggesting planting.

00:50:34:25 - 00:51:07:00

hazel in a regular layout that could be easily be maintained by coppicing on a regular rotation. So for my first question to the applicant, is, um, that in your response to 3.3 in the early earlier. Well yesterday, yesterday, um, that the orchard would not be farmed. It's as a, as a commercial crop for the duration of the aftercare period.

00:51:07:11 - 00:51:15:02

Therefore, what is the purpose of planting an orchard and what are the management implications of planting an orchard?

00:51:17:12 - 00:51:52:08

Jess Colebrook, on behalf of the applicant. Um, first of all, I think it probably help if I read out a slightly wider description, a summary description for all this habitat type. So traditional orchard is is the the name of the the habitat type which Is one of the section 41 habitats of principal importance. That's our our ambition to to meet that and the specific definition of that. The main points are it's defined by habitat structure rather than vegetation type. And it can include trees, scrub, grassland, ponds, walls, hedgerows and hedgerow trees.

00:51:52:10 - 00:52:25:04

So there's actually quite a broad description. Um, traditional orchards comprise groups of fruit and nut trees at low densities in permanent grassland, and they're managed in a low intensity way that also is part of the description. The final part is that spacing of trees in traditional orchards can vary quite widely, and that depends on the species and the rootstocks used. So that can be sort of three meters for plum orchards up to over 20m if it was a cherry orchard. So they're very different from orchards managed intensively for fruit production.

00:52:26:09 - 00:52:48:27

Um, in this instance the trees would be managed to provide screening and thereafter for biodiversity benefit, so low trees and scrub are necessary for the screening element. The fact that we have chosen fruit trees is because we have an ambition to create this section 41 habitat type for biodiversity enhancement reasons.

00:52:52:00 - 00:53:26:12

Uh, to expand on that slightly. Um, I mean, uh, the varieties of fruit, for instance, that you're choosing. Are you going? Are you looking more on, um, heritage type? Because because, you know, if you're planting commercial apple trees, then varieties, then they're, they're they're designed to produce a lot. I mean, you so you're going to have, you know, a lot of animal apples falling basically and could in fact create their own problems.

00:53:27:12 - 00:54:02:02

Uh, just on behalf of the applicant, I, I'd hope that the abundance of fruit would be of great benefit to the local wildlife, but absolutely, the choice of species and the choice of cultivar would be something that would follow on. As part of the detailed design and in consultation with Essex County Council in the development of the final. So those species mixtures and the types as well, because obviously as you, as you know, um, different apple varieties have different cropping, um, um, yield.

00:54:02:07 - 00:54:13:09

And they also would flower and fruit at different times. So that's another thing that would be included in the decision making process when it came to finalising exactly what might be appropriate.

00:54:14:09 - 00:54:14:26

Thank you.

00:54:16:18 - 00:54:44:29

Um, as a follow on, um, and almost also probably expand slightly more on what you've just said. Essex County Council have suggested that Hazel would be preferable. Um, given that you have already stated that nuts would be a consideration for the orchard, please provide an explanation as to why it is considered that an orchard would be more practicable and sustainable than a hazel coppice.

00:54:46:22 - 00:55:13:03

Jess. Colebrook, on behalf of the applicant I. Firstly with the planting needs to provide landscape screening. Um Hazel coppice also is a different habitat type than traditional orchard. It's not as um doesn't support such a degree of biodiversity unless it's, uh, in or adjacent to an area of existing old woodlands. Um, so.

00:55:15:23 - 00:55:39:06

Um, managing Hazel by managing small areas of hazel rather than a hazel woodland, uh, by coppicing, taking to ground level and allowing them to regrow may be appropriate in some areas at the, uh, substation location. But again, that would be part of the final design. And we would obviously need to first and foremost ensure that the screening benefit of the planting was met.

00:55:44:14 - 00:56:04:08

I'd also reiterate as well that the, um, management of the fruit trees is is not for fruit production. So, um, perhaps some of the council's comments are thinking that there would be a much greater intervention management intervention needed on the the fruit trees and not trees. And then we're anticipating.

00:56:04:28 - 00:56:12:12

Um, so effectively you're saying that that you would consult more directly with Essex County Council on species.

00:56:13:18 - 00:56:17:06

Yes, absolutely. That's written into the, um, outline just now as well.

00:56:18:10 - 00:56:31:17

Thank you. Um, I'm aware that, uh, Essex may not have anybody can respond directly on this, But do you get some comfort from what's been said regarding the orchard?

00:57:12:04 - 00:57:13:24

Oh, it's back now.

00:57:13:26 - 00:57:15:02

There we go. Back again.

00:57:16:27 - 00:57:28:24

Thank you for that. Um, so again, we'll take on board that. Uh, there will be consultation between Essex County Council and the applicant. Thank you.

00:57:34:26 - 00:57:45:03

But moving on now to trees, TPO and hedgerows. And I'm not sure. Is there anybody from, um Tendring District Council available.

00:57:48:21 - 00:57:51:00

Um

00:57:52:23 - 00:58:01:15

Tendring District Council. Um, I'm not a tree or hedgerow expert. Um, but I will I will assist as best as I can. Thank you.

00:58:02:11 - 00:58:30:03

That's that's okay. I'll. I'll probably modify my question. Um, so moving forward, the depiction of hedgerows on the baseline drawing to, uh, particularly sheet 19, the biodiversity net gain assessment. Paragraph 4.13, in app 149 explains that figure three, which is actually the second of the figure two, is

00:58:31:18 - 00:59:01:22

in rep 2022. Showing the indicative landscaping and ecological enhancement at the onshore substation site has been relied on in section four, app 149, it is explained that the Beng assessment has been undertaken on the basis of build scenario one five estuaries with ducting and onshore substation platform for north poles. What is the.

00:59:01:24 - 00:59:08:03

What is the Beng hectare requirement for? Should five estuaries be alone?

00:59:13:28 - 00:59:56:24

Uh, just on behalf of the applicant, um, the there is. It's a fair question, but there is not a there's not a rich answer to that question because of the way biodiversity units are measured and the amount that one hectare of national land can provide varies depending on the habitat that is provided and the condition of the habitat that you consider you are able to to provide as well. So that's why the, uh, apologies that the, um, conclusion of the um, BNG, uh report provides biodiversity units but not areas.

00:59:57:08 - 01:00:05:23

And that's again, that's because the actual area that's required to deliver a certain number of biodiversity units will vary depending on, on, um, where that land is.

01:00:05:29 - 01:00:28:14

So do you think that there would be a significant and significant difference in, um, the percentage of biodiversity net gain Should the screening and etc. or the whatever you're counting in that's associated with North Falls would actually, um, change the percentage outcome.

01:00:31:21 - 01:01:04:03

Um, Jess Colebrook, on behalf of the applicant, I think I understand your question correctly. Um, but do obviously let me know if I'm wrong. The the approach that we've taken is to assess the biodiversity losses and gains as a result of the Five Estuaries Project, but the five Estuaries project footprint is, in

effect, the footprint of both five estuaries and North Falls, because that's the powers that are being sought under the DCO. So the biodiversity net gain assessment for five estuaries is the reasonable worst case scenario.

01:01:06:00 - 01:01:10:14

Um, so I hope that answers your question.

01:01:11:02 - 01:01:18:25

Right. Well, I think I'm just going to hand over to my colleague a moment who I'll carry on. Okay. Uh, right.

01:01:19:19 - 01:01:22:07

Um.

01:01:22:21 - 01:01:38:03

Yes, I know. It's my answer to you, and I'd probably have to think about what you've said. Um, if I feel I need to come back to you again. I will. Um. I had a question for Tendring. I'm not going to be able to answer. Right. Okay.

01:01:40:00 - 01:01:41:24

Sorry. Yeah. I'll pass.

01:01:42:13 - 01:01:56:22

I've got a query related to PNG and the calculation of it, and I think it's appropriate at this point before I ask my question, I think. Miss McGee, did you want to come in? No, I thought I saw you perhaps heading towards the mic.

01:01:58:13 - 01:02:13:13

Um, in terms of the way the bag calculation has been undertaken, um, that we find in, um, AWP 149, which is a report, um, titled.

01:02:15:09 - 01:02:29:12

Yeah. An onshore biodiversity net gain. Indicative design stage report. I think if I could, could I ask for that to be brought up on screen. And can we go to page 69 or at least electronic page 69.

01:02:34:15 - 01:02:37:22

Did those handling the documents get the reference?

01:02:43:01 - 01:02:46:03

Should be a WP 149. Yep.

01:02:50:19 - 01:02:52:20

And if we can head on on

01:02:54:06 - 01:03:01:09

say I use a fair way into it, I think it's 69. So I'm, I'm just trying to get to on my version.

01:03:04:22 - 01:03:10:04

Sorry, sorry. Is it page 69 of 90 per the PDF or the one that's actually labeled as page 69.

01:03:10:16 - 01:03:16:25

That's what I'm just checking. Uh, I'm potentially going to give you an E page, because I think that might be easier.

01:03:18:16 - 01:03:20:07

I've actually found it.

01:03:25:17 - 01:03:34:28

Yeah, we're on the right page now. If you can just scroll so that the whole of that. Sorry. The other way. Yeah. Yeah. Keep on. Sorry. Go down one page

01:03:36:21 - 01:03:39:21

and another page, please. That's it.

01:03:41:24 - 01:03:57:05

Um. Now this image drawing number two. It. Sorry. Um, 19. It's maybe I can't quite read it from there. So I'm going to get the electronic version on my screen as well.

01:04:06:18 - 01:04:09:15

It's it's titled Baseline Habitats.

01:04:11:11 - 01:04:27:09

Um, but we see on it a hedgerow, which in effect runs from Grange Road across the Five Estuaries substation site and then dives southward. Um, that hedgerow doesn't exist.

01:04:29:02 - 01:05:08:05

Um, that that that is proposed hedgerows. My my query is, has the inclusion of that hedgerow in whatever calculations have been going on in the background? In effect, affected the ultimate bottom line for how, however many units you think are necessary to meet the requirements of the project. Because, um, just starting to see that hedgerow appearing on what should be a baseline um, drawing suggests that there might be an issue with the way things have been calculated.

01:05:10:15 - 01:05:21:12

Jess Colebrook on behalf of the applicant. Um, thank you, sir. And, um, that is an error only on this PDF. The calculations as presented remain valid.

01:05:23:02 - 01:05:35:10

Um, and if it's any extra comfort, if we had included this in the baseline, then the outcome would have been worse because we would have been removing even more hedgerow, as it were.

01:05:37:14 - 01:05:53:18

So, um, yeah, just to reiterate, this is an error on this PDF. It's but the background data which we used for the BMG approach is sound. Um, still retained in very detailed spreadsheets.

01:05:55:21 - 01:06:05:11

We can update the bag assessment report to amend this error. Um, the next deadline if that. If that persists.

01:06:11:01 - 01:06:12:25

I think it might be useful.

01:06:15:07 - 01:06:15:24

Thank you sir.

01:06:15:27 - 01:06:21:18

Thank you for that. Offhand, whether this is one of the documents that is to be certified or not.

01:06:24:01 - 01:06:29:24

I don't think it is on the basis that we need to update it. Post to DCO. Once we have final design.

01:06:31:20 - 01:06:37:24

I think it would still be useful to have, um, a corrected version.

01:06:39:20 - 01:06:40:07

Thank you.

01:06:40:21 - 01:06:42:18

Thank you sir. We'll fix that too.

01:06:49:08 - 01:07:11:22

Well, thank you very much. Um, that concludes all the questions that I have. Um, I don't know if there are anybody present who may wish to ask any questions. Uh, six. No. No. And there's nobody from tendering. Nobody in the room? No, no thank you. Well, thank you very much for your responses.

01:07:13:19 - 01:07:18:28

Uh, I think moving on. Pass back to Mr. Gould to conclude.

01:07:37:01 - 01:07:57:24

So that then takes us to agenda item four, which is any other business looking at the applicant. Is there anything that you want to raise in respect to the environmental matters arising out of what we've been discussing for the last day and a bit? Thank you sir. Anything from the local authorities?

01:07:59:21 - 01:08:03:21

I think I think. Anything from Tending? Sorry.

01:08:04:12 - 01:08:06:01

No, nothing for my side.

01:08:09:16 - 01:08:13:22

And not seeing any other indications from any other party.

01:08:20:06 - 01:08:44:17

Which then takes us on to agenda item five, which is the review of matters of um and actions arising. Um, I've been scribbling on my notes, been getting even worse as we've been progressing. I did miss Mcgeeney or somebody from your side. Do you want to start? And we'll. And we'll have a look and see whether or not the two lists correspond with one another.

01:08:45:28 - 01:09:17:00

Thank you sir. Good to hear that again. Um, the applicant to include in the oral summary of submissions I note on decommissioning and the Energy Act, which will come in at deadline six with the oral summary. Next one is the applicant to provide an update on progress with National Highways with regard to the bypass and solutions produced by AOL. I, I apologize. Um, which we said we could submit a deadline. We will also update the CG as and when anything changes in that.

01:09:18:28 - 01:09:25:04

The next one is the applicant to submit a swept path analysis for the BO135.

01:09:28:15 - 01:09:33:25

And then I can't read the next number. It's A12 something. I will double check that. And we said we would submit that at d6.

01:09:37:00 - 01:09:57:19

Uh, the applicant and Essex County Council to um, try and put together an agreed position on the operation and maintenance port traffic management plan position, because we think there was maybe a bit of misunderstanding going on there. Um, we will get in contact with Essex and try to do that for deadline six.

01:10:01:04 - 01:10:04:06

The applicant to submit a map showing

01:10:05:29 - 01:10:14:11

the various marine area boundaries. The marine plan area boundaries offshore, which we think we can do for deadline six as well.

01:10:15:27 - 01:10:44:17

Um, the applicant and Suffolk County Council, um, both to submit a deadline. Six a submission on the application of the Countryside Rights of Way Act duty, as amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act, which is being referred to as the duty to enhance. Um, I'm not entirely clear, sir, whether or not the National Landscape Partnership is submitting a separate case or if they're working with Suffolk. Sorry, does not clear on my notes about that one.



01:10:47:17 - 01:10:52:07

I think my understanding of that was that all each party was going to submit something.

01:10:58:24 - 01:11:07:14

Uh, My next one is just a note that the examining authority is to look straight, and set a deadline for responses to the submissions on the active duty.

01:11:11:29 - 01:11:24:27

The next one is the applicant to respond on our reasoning. Why we cannot commit to a cable burial date of 1.2m everywhere, and give examples of how we would manage a movable obstacles where encountered.

01:11:28:18 - 01:11:32:29

The next one, again for the applicant is to submit a contextual note.

01:11:35:11 - 01:11:42:01

On the offshore wind farm, leasing rounds together with a map showing the zone boundary for the East Anglia zone.

01:11:45:25 - 01:12:02:08

The applicant to amend the Noise Investigation Protocol and working with National Grid and North Falls to address a number of updates. And I believe it was agreed, sir, that we would wait for the council's comments to do that and submit the deadline serving.

01:12:05:06 - 01:12:28:22

The applicant to submit a technical note on the difference between the applicant and Natural England's methodological approaches, um, and effectively bring to group, consolidate and bring together our points of disagreement and what effect they have. Um, we would propose to submit that deadline seven or so that we can have regard to Natural England's deadline six submissions.

01:12:32:11 - 01:12:40:00

Uh, the applicant to submit a brief technical note with plans on the use of the deep water routes and the pilot boarding station and how they operate.

01:12:42:06 - 01:12:46:16

The applicant to review and update the figure numbers and the outline limp,

01:12:48:04 - 01:12:55:28

and the applicant to update the report to correct the drawing on sheet 19. Baseline habitats EC section seven.

01:12:57:23 - 01:13:03:17

And that one will be dead. Line six. Yeah.

01:13:28:01 - 01:13:28:24

Do you want to?

01:13:30:24 - 01:13:37:29

Sorry. Was that was that a plan to be submitted with regard to the deep water route associated well adjacent to the SAC, rather than a note?

01:13:39:24 - 01:13:40:09

Well.

01:13:41:00 - 01:13:41:29

Including that. Sorry.

01:13:42:19 - 01:13:45:09

It's not including a plan. Yes.

01:13:45:11 - 01:13:46:06

Perfect. Thank you.

01:13:55:29 - 01:14:35:20

Now on my list. I jotted down a few other things, but I think some of what I jotted down was in effect. Various parties, um, submitted things at deadline six. Um, which I don't think you've picked up on on your note. Uh, but I think all parties are aware of what they need to be submitting at deadline six. Um, so I don't think we need to necessarily run through those because your numbering is therefore a bit different to my numbering. Um, would we ask your indulgence that perhaps you get that typed up and sent in to Mr.

01:14:35:22 - 01:15:00:05

Johansson so that we can just check that my garbled notes and hopefully the notes of my colleagues tally with your notes, and we actually get, uh, a unified note issued when we actually issue it. Um, part of the issue I've got is my running order is slightly different to yours because I'd added bits and pieces. Um, but.

01:15:03:22 - 01:15:06:00

But I think your fourth item.

01:15:12:18 - 01:15:29:15

Uh, I'd scribbled something to Suffolk County Council to provide detailed comments about ales, um, and the outline construction management plan at deadline six, because you would then you need to see that information to be able to do a full response, potentially at deadline seven.

01:15:31:07 - 01:15:34:29

I think there was something that you indicated on your note you couldn't quite read.

01:15:38:27 - 01:15:59:13

No, no, sorry. The the thing I couldn't read is one of the road numbers that we're doing. Swept path four. Sorry, my handwriting has failed me on that one. I've got the B1 035 and 812. I can't read them

in between. Um, I haven't noted the one for Suffolk. I hadn't understood that to be an action point. It was more confirmation that was something they were doing anyway. But I'm happy to be corrected.

01:16:00:04 - 01:16:12:18

Well, I think they are doing it, but I think because you from your angle, indicated that you wanted to see their information before you could provide a fuller. I think it's important that it does get recorded.

01:16:15:14 - 01:16:18:01

I have I have little doubt they won't do it, but.

01:16:18:03 - 01:16:23:25

It's Suffolk's response to the changes that were made to the CMP and whether or not they are sufficient to address their concerns. Yeah.

01:16:25:00 - 01:16:32:07

So I'm just trying to see if I can find that path numbering amongst my notes and or whether Mr. Harrison might be able to assist.

01:16:34:14 - 01:16:37:22

It's the roundabout south of the A120. I'm told that's what I'm trying to read.

01:16:57:01 - 01:17:00:11

Yeah.

01:17:02:21 - 01:17:08:19

I don't think any of us can own up to being medics in here, because they're renowned for having the worst handwriting, but.

01:17:12:25 - 01:17:30:04

But yeah, I think if you wouldn't mind, if you could send yours typed up, we'll make sure between us, variously our our scribble notes, also telling them we'll leave you something. Um, either on Friday or perhaps more likely on Monday, given that we'll be travelling on Friday.

01:17:33:19 - 01:17:43:06

Is there anything from any other party still present at this hearing that hasn't, in their opinion, been picked up on the discussion or actions? I'm seeing.

01:17:45:11 - 01:17:48:01

A hand, but I'm not quite sure who that is.

01:17:51:07 - 01:17:51:22

Uh.

01:17:51:24 - 01:17:54:06

Hello, sir. It's Isaac Nunn from Suffolk County Council.

01:17:57:18 - 01:17:58:18

Sorry. Can you hear me?

01:17:58:27 - 01:18:00:14

We can. Yeah, I hear and see you.

01:18:01:06 - 01:18:17:27

Yes. I think, um, we had, uh, one other action for us, I believe, which was that we committed to providing details on, um, successes in port construction management plans for projects which are, um, either in operation or have gone through construction already.

01:18:20:20 - 01:18:22:10

Just checking. You still wanted that?

01:18:23:00 - 01:18:23:24

Uh, yes, please.

01:18:24:12 - 01:18:25:12

Excellent. Thank you.

01:18:40:07 - 01:18:49:21

Are there any other interested parties who think there are actions that we have missed? Variously Not seeing anything either online or

01:18:51:09 - 01:18:55:18

in the room. So I think we've concluded agenda item five. Thank you.

01:18:58:14 - 01:19:28:04

Therefore, just takes us to the close of this hearing and thank everybody for their participation in this hearing. Um, and that therefore concludes issue specific hearing six. Uh, I just remind, uh, those who will be attending tomorrow. We've got a compulsory acquisition hearing in the morning starting at ten. And then we have a DCO hearing following that. Can somebody remind me when we're starting?

01:19:30:15 - 01:19:32:06

Is that 3:00 one? Yep.

01:19:34:26 - 01:19:40:11

Um, the issue specific hearing, uh, six is closed. Thank you very much.