

Hearing Transcript

Project:	North Falls Offshore Wind Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part G
Date:	H A April 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.

File Name: NF_3APR_ISH1_PT2.mp3

File Length: 01:13:38

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:03:11 - 00:00:39:03

It's now 1154. Um, if we can resume, um, issue one, uh, at the point. Uh, where we finished, we were on agenda item 3.5, and I now propose to move to the final bullet point of that agenda item on the width of the cable corridor and depth of the cables. We've already looked and discussed the depth of the cables. Um, and comments have been noted on that, um, in connection with the width of the cable corridor.

00:00:39:26 - 00:00:53:29

Uh, Mr. Fell, on behalf of Stretton Park Farms Limited and Liana Enterprises Limited at As 050. It's made representations in respect of the width of the easement required for the cable installation.

00:00:55:17 - 00:01:02:28

Um, and I would ask the applicant to comment on the representation made by Mr. Fell

00:01:04:15 - 00:01:07:12

on the width of the easement, please.

00:01:11:12 - 00:01:56:17

Uh project for the applicant. I'll just repeat for the benefit of, uh, Mr. Reed. Um, obviously, um, in terms of the width of the cable corridor, um, we have set out details, um, in the s chapter five, um, and specifically table 5.26, and that's reference app Dash 019, which provides details of the cable route width for construction, depending on whether, um, the construction technique is open cut or whether it is a more complex, um, crossing um, or being undertaken by way of um, trench techniques such as horizontal directional drill.

00:01:57:02 - 00:02:11:15

Um, I will hand over to Mr. Reed, who can provide some more detail about the reasoning for, uh, for the width, um, both for the North Walls project and also in terms of its co-location with five estuaries. Thank you.

00:02:13:22 - 00:02:49:06

Uh, David Reed, for the applicant. So generally, the cable corridor, red line boundary that we've got is 90m wide for the majority of it. There are a few instances where it gets wider. So particularly where we're crossing the railway line where we've got to go deeper underneath the railway. So we need to spread the cables out wider and to be able to, to facilitate that. Where we cross under the Tendring Brook, where again, we need to go deeper than normal to be able to, to meet the conditions underneath the, the, the river.

00:02:49:21 - 00:03:41:18

Um, and that this needs the cables to be spread out generally for the rest of the cable corridor. The width is 90m. That is to allow shallow HDDs under certain constraints. Be that roads be that environmentally sensitive hedgerows, and also to allow open cut trenching from an open cut trenching perspective. The combined corridor for North Falls and five estuaries will be less than the 90m. However, because of the unknowns that we've got within the cable corridor, items such as archaeology, those type of things, we may need to microsite within the cable corridor, the actual location of the cable trenches, um, to be able to avoid, where possible, those type of constraints within that 90 metre, um, red line boundaries.

00:03:42:24 - 00:04:15:16

There are also locations where we have to route the haul road off of the, um, off of the cable corridor to avoid having to wear. We go underneath environmentally sensitive features. We are targeting existing gaps in the hedgerow or existing gaps in the the areas, uh, to be able to route the whole road through so that we are not having to remove any of those hedgerows. So considering the environmental aspects of those type of things.

00:04:16:00 - 00:05:02:09

So there are areas where the off route haul road makes that wider than 90m as well. Um, and that is what we're, we're looking at from a red line boundary perspective. And that is what has been included within the red line boundary limits. Proposed. The corridor proposed considers both the north walls and five estuaries construction. To ensure that North Falls can build out the ducks for five estuaries if required, and that is covered under Works Plan six a um, which is a subset of Works Plan six for the ducks from the landfall to substation for five estuaries, so that the Red line boundary covers effectively the infrastructure required for both projects for cable ducting.

00:05:08:04 - 00:05:40:09

I wonder if Mr. could also just there was a supplemental question, um, in respect of um, Mr. furl, in his most recent representation, has referred to a number of examples of HVDC cables and the widths required for those and why and perhaps, um, it would assist to provide an explanation of why the um, configuration of these um, HVAC cabling is, is different to other projects that are using HVDC cabling solution.

00:05:42:02 - 00:06:19:09

So HVDC is a specific type of technology, um, that requires the the Electricity generated by the wind turbines, which is generated as HVAC to be converted to HVDC, to then be converted back again onshore from HVDC to HVAC. In order to do that conversion, that requires a very large substation to be created onshore at the, uh, at the onshore substation. It comprises a very large building, um, that is needed to be able to convert the power from HVDC back to HVAC

00:06:20:24 - 00:06:51:01

from a landscape and visual impact perspective. The HVDC converter station has a significant permanent infrastructure on. It has a significant permanent footprint and a height in excess of, sometimes in excess of 20m, which would cause a significant impact on the landscape at the substation location. From an HVAC perspective, the height of the buildings is significantly lower And significantly less noisy.

00:06:51:03 - 00:07:07:03

We've got similar equipment in terms of transformers, whereas the HVDC, as was mentioned yesterday, has other items such as cooling fans that are needed. So it feeds into a much larger impact at the substation area that we are trying to to mitigate.

00:07:08:22 - 00:07:47:15

Whilst the number of cables is reduced. Um, it depends on how we're we're kind of installing the cables and how those, those cables work. So there is a depending on the size of the windfarm, there may be we might be from a North Falls perspective, if we were to go HVDC, um, there is a potential reduction of a single cable. So the overall redline boundary would not be as significant, but the reduction in the redline boundary would not be as significant as potentially thought.

00:07:48:09 - 00:08:28:24

The reasoning is that I guess the benefit and the saving from HVDC would be in a combined North Falls and Five Estuaries project. However, that due to the geographical separation, offshore would cause significant issues in terms of how we were to get the the power into a common substation, and then additionally additional issues with the the security and quality of supply standard, the SCS from Nisso in terms of how failure of or loss of power is treated and is backed up in terms of grid stability.

00:08:29:02 - 00:09:11:02

So there are a number of issues that need to be considered in terms of of HVDC, in terms of the infrastructure that it requires and the amount of space saving it saves from a project like North Falls, where HVDC is beneficial is for much larger projects located further offshore, where they would potentially need what is called a relay station. Because of the issue of reactive power generated in an HVAC system. An HVDC substation effectively removes these intermediary substations along the cable route, and therefore effectively reduces the overall impact in North Falls case.

00:09:11:05 - 00:09:21:14

We don't need any of these intermediary relay stations, so the benefits of HVDC are not as significant as they could be for other projects.

00:09:26:04 - 00:09:39:09

Thank you. Um, are there any parties within the room who want to make any comment on what the applicant has just indicated? This is fairly comes.

00:09:39:11 - 00:09:57:09

In fairly pretty and fairly farms. So if there was another project that was bringing a HVDC cable through the middle of tendering as well to a new station, that's going to be a converter station not too far from this one. Could you connect onto that one? And then we would only need one corridor, or is that not possible?

00:09:59:21 - 00:10:22:15

For the applicant. I'm conscious that this is one of the other agenda items in terms of the connection solution, the project and other options considered. So we're more we're happy to talk about it in this agenda item, but I'm just conscious that that is for the later on in the agenda as well, in terms of

consideration of offshore connection points and those sorts of matters. So it was just a flag. We can answer it now or we can wait until that agenda item.

00:10:22:26 - 00:10:29:17

No. If you have a brief response that you can make now that would be helpful. But it is. We are considering that later on.

00:10:31:17 - 00:11:10:12

David Reid for the applicant. So that was considered as part of the OCS scope in terms of what that meant for. Um, so sorry, OCS is offshore coordination scheme. Um, so we were looking at connecting to an offshore HVDC connection point. Um, the issues that you've got from a technical perspective, in terms of connecting in is that HVDC is a very difficult current flow to to sort through because of the the way that it's converted from AC to DC. So actually managing those power flows, managing and doing all that connection requires a significant amount of technology to be able to do that.

00:11:10:26 - 00:11:27:19

And that technology delays the connection time frame because it's significantly more complicated than doing a standard point to point interconnector, as most, um, HVDC connections are at this moment in time. And there is also the issue of.

00:11:30:25 - 00:11:35:07

Pardon me. Um, there is also the issue of being able to.

00:11:38:06 - 00:12:02:18

That the size of those converter stations that then become what is called a multi-purpose interconnector gets significantly larger, significantly higher, significantly bigger to be able to construct. And so there is then an added time frame cost and visual impact that that needs to be considered because of the the the multi-purpose tri directional flows of power that are needed to be able to facilitate the interconnector.

00:12:05:17 - 00:12:42:06

Project for the applicant. Um, we'll obviously elaborate it on on the point at the later agenda item. But we did say in our response to question 3.1.7, um, an update on, um, the, um, the process that was undertaken at the Mr. Reid referred to in terms of the OC s s um, to explore the potential for an offshore connection point. Um, and we mentioned at the open floor hearing that in, um, September of 2024, um, the Secretary of State for the Department of Energy Security, net zero decided not to grant any further funding for that, for that solution.

00:12:42:08 - 00:13:13:26

And that is why. Um, point to point connection for North Falls is being proceeded with. However, as we explained at the open floor hearing, we have retained, um, the ability for an offshore connection as part of the um scheme and is included as part of of schedule one. However, at the moment, um, there is no project coming forward that proposes to connect to North Falls offshore and provide an offshore connection for the project, but we can provide more detail later on.

00:13:13:28 - 00:13:22:01

But at the moment, following that government decision in September of last year, an offshore connection point for the project is not being proceeded with. Okay.

00:13:23:18 - 00:13:26:06

Thank you. And, uh, turning to Mr. Fell.

00:13:28:23 - 00:14:01:01

Thank you. I think, uh, we heard the word significant mention a lot in the in the decision between HVDC and HVAC. Um, I mean, it's all about quantum, isn't it? And, you know, you say significant. What does that mean? You know, I don't know. He talks about substation of up to 20m high. Um, perhaps if I under, uh, next deadline, just look at to see what National Grid are doing on this other scheme that I know. See what the size of the substation is there. Because I think you've heard this definition a significant.

00:14:01:03 - 00:14:36:21

But we don't know what significant means. So, um, the clearly there is a significantly less impact to the landowners if the cable route is significantly reduced, which is what we're concerned about. And I'm concerned is that we're we haven't really looked at the assessment between the two and to see which is potentially the biggest impact, because although the substation might be bigger in one instance, the impact to the rest of the land holdings may be significantly less. So how you play the weight on that is important. The other thing is, is this where we're talking about the whole roads as well? Because I think that was part of my representations.

00:14:36:23 - 00:15:13:18

We're talking about whole road widths and the location of those and going off route. And I'm not particularly happy with some of the off road haul routes as I've put in my representations. And we've just got some wishy washy answer there from Mr. Reid. In actual fact, if you look at the reasoning why when you delve into it, it's relating to dormice. Now, we had this long conversation on the five estuaries. It's annoying. We're having to redo this whole process when we've been told these are supposed to be separate applications, but clearly they're clearly connected entirely throughout this whole thing.

00:15:13:21 - 00:15:48:06

But so it's annoying when we do this, but I what we agreed with five estuaries, um, during the hearing was that the whole road would only be moved off the cable, uh, corridor if, um, if, um, the, um, uh, the dormouse were present at the time in those hedgerows because the surveys show that they weren't there, there was a potential for them, but it was agreed on the five estuaries, one, that a survey would happen.

00:15:48:11 - 00:16:18:21

And if they weren't present, then they would go through the hedgerow that is on the cable corridor as opposed to going off route, as it were. And so I just would like to ensure that that is the same situation here, because it seems crazy that five estuaries have agreed to that. But we we haven't had mention of this in North Falls. And I think you went out to have a look at this on the 1st of April. Did you on your site visit to look at these specific off off site haul roads as well on, on our land? Um, but I just like to have a, uh, exploring that a bit more, please.

00:16:25:14 - 00:16:56:01

Uh, Claire of the applicant, um, we will take away an action to just check whether on that particular point relating to this specific haul road, and that the almost whether any additional wording was included in the outline code of construction practice to to address the point, and if so, then to the extent that it's um, uh, required for north walls as well, then we, we can duplicate the wording, but I don't have the, um, I haven't got the where they secured that commitment if it was agreed to in the Five Estuaries hearings.

00:16:56:03 - 00:16:57:01

But we'll check the point.

00:16:59:06 - 00:17:04:13

Thank you. Are there any other parties in the room that wish to make a comment at this point?

00:17:10:16 - 00:17:13:03

Um, Mr. Blythe.

00:17:13:22 - 00:17:26:21

Just. I'd like to comment. I was there on the first, and, um, at no time did I hear any mention of dormice whatsoever when we were looking round sites. Thought.

00:17:33:26 - 00:17:35:06

Back on that point.

00:17:35:27 - 00:17:43:05

Well, just just to say, obviously we wouldn't be discussing evidence as such on the site, which was explained before the site is.

00:17:48:00 - 00:18:03:11

The applicant I was I was just going to make the same point that it wouldn't it wouldn't have been. That's not the venue for discussing it. We have got an ecology. Um, is on the agenda for next issue specific hearing to where matters relating to um species such as dormice can can be raised there.

00:18:03:17 - 00:18:08:21

Yeah. And we're going to get to your position on that in writing. Thank you.

00:18:12:06 - 00:18:27:02

So unless there are any other points at this stage that anybody wants to raise in respect of agricultural soils and land use, um, I propose now to hand over, um, to my colleague, Mr. Medlin for item.

00:18:29:12 - 00:18:59:25

Just before we move on, it would be helpful. Mr. fell mentions in his um, written representations and proposed development. Um, on his client's land. Um, we're aware that a plan relating to, um, what's called phase one, um, development proposals was submitted into the Five Estuaries Examination.

That document hasn't been submitted into the North Falls examination. So it would be of assistance if the examining authority could request Mr..

00:18:59:27 - 00:19:19:20

Fail to submit that plan. Similarly, there is reference in his representation to a phase two or further phases of development. Again. Um, the applicant hasn't seen any plans showing those areas, and so it would be of assistance to us in responding to the points he's raised to actually see some plans of the developments being proposed.

00:19:19:22 - 00:19:41:10

Thank you. Yeah, I was going to ask Mr. Fell for that. So, Mr. Foley, if we could have full details of those development proposals and any planning permission granted, together with the plan of the alternative cable route that you have been discussing or what you're putting forward? And if I could have that at deadline for.

00:19:51:02 - 00:19:53:15

Okay. Can. Can I respond?

00:19:54:21 - 00:19:55:18

Yes, please.

00:19:56:01 - 00:20:33:03

Yeah, that's absolutely fine. Yeah. We can submit those plans. Um, just to point out that the applicant's agents do have those plans as well. So it's not it's not right in saying that they haven't seen them. Um, but, uh, we have been sharing that have been discussing this matter for a long period of time. And to be frank, we've been fairly stonewalled on, on certain parts of it, we've come to some arrangements and some of it, but not all of it. So it is important because I think, um, that, uh, there are alternatives.

00:20:33:05 - 00:20:37:27

I'm not sure whether this is the right section. We're talking about alternatives, as it should be later on, shouldn't it? That's why I'm not mentioning.

00:20:37:29 - 00:20:56:23

It is later on, Mr. Fell. But as it's been raised, we'll deal with this now. And I think given that, um, we need that information from you and we may have provided it to others, but if you can provide that to the examining authority, that that would be very helpful.

00:20:57:23 - 00:20:59:05

Yeah. No problems.

00:21:05:11 - 00:21:10:10

So thank you. I will now pass to Mr. Medlin and item 3.6.

00:21:12:14 - 00:21:13:03

Thank you.

00:21:16:04 - 00:21:17:24

Miss Broderick, do you need a moment to.

00:21:18:21 - 00:21:20:17

Change our team around. Thank you very much.

00:21:45:07 - 00:22:21:22

I was expecting, just whilst we're bringing in, um, the relevant experts to deal with, um, agenda item 3.6, we do also have, um, somebody um, online as well. So I just wanted to double check that, um, Helena Wicks was there. I think she is. Um, and also Simon Ford. So I wonder if they could just perhaps introduce themselves whilst, um, uh, Caroline Martin is just getting herself set up just so that you're aware of, who is available to speak on behalf of the applicant and what topics they're covering.

00:22:21:24 - 00:22:25:28

So, Helena, if you're just able to introduce yourself, that would be helpful. Thank you.

00:22:28:03 - 00:22:39:24

Hi, Helena. On behalf of the applicant, um, I'm a principal flood risk consultant, and I will be leading on the sort of flood risk questions of this element, having authored the flood risk assessment.

00:22:43:00 - 00:22:48:18

Thank you. Helena. And if Simon Folds could just introduce himself as well and explain what topic he'll be covering.

00:22:48:20 - 00:23:05:13

Q hi, Simon falls for the applicant. Um, I offered the, um, chapter 21 Water Resources and Flood Risk and the Water Environment Regulations, uh, appendix as well. Um, and I'll be covering the question on the licenses we applied or not.

00:23:08:12 - 00:23:16:15

The applicant. Thank you. And then we're also joined by, um, Caroline Martin, who I will also introduce herself, and she can explain which topic area she's coming. Thank you.

00:23:17:00 - 00:23:21:25

Caroline Martin, on behalf of the applicant and the topic I'm covering today is groundwater.

00:23:24:19 - 00:23:39:06

Thank you. Okay, on to item 3.6. First bullet point is whether the proposed development has adequately taken account of these residents. Of those residents whose water supply is only guaranteed through well water,

00:23:41:01 - 00:23:59:29

through relevant representations. A number of residents, particularly within the Little Bromley area, have drawn attention to concerns about the water table and well water and the impact of the proposed development. The concern relates to the disturbance of well supplies and the water table,

00:24:01:17 - 00:24:35:08

as a direct consequence of the works to be proposed, works to be undertaken. So, under this topic, I'm first going to ask the applicant to outline how the impact on well water on groundwater. And the water table has been assessed very briefly and provide any specific comments on the water condition in Little Bromley, but not exclusively Little Bromley and how that's been assessed. What measures would be introduced to guarantee continued water supply? I'm then going to invite interested parties to provide comments.

00:24:36:08 - 00:24:38:26

I'd like to hear from them on this issue about

00:24:40:13 - 00:24:58:23

why they feel it may affect the water supply in any instances of the effect of proposed or any other proposed developments on the water supplies or evidence that they have to counter what the applicant will explain to us. So first of all, I'd like to invite the applicant to respond to that.

00:25:06:23 - 00:25:40:10

Caroline Martin, on behalf of the applicant and the first step to identify potential residential properties rely on the drinking water through wells. Supply was undertaken as part of the consultation process with tendering District Council, the Environment Agency and the land agents employed by the applicants. These properties were summarised in the Geo Environmental Death Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment Report submitted at 112, with tables 26 and 27. This was the first step taken in identifying potential users that may be affected by the proposed development.

00:25:40:21 - 00:26:12:12

This document adequately identifies those who have the potential to be affected by the proposed development. In this respect, these locations were then plotted and submitted in s chapter figures. Application up 64. Figure nine 19.6. Since the submission of the DCO application, the north walls and five estuaries have been jointly undertaking groundwater monitoring in Little Bromley. Samples were taken in August 24th January 25th to understand the design of the wells, inflows and water quality.

00:26:15:15 - 00:26:36:27

A groundwater risk assessment and construction monitoring plan is is presently being completed in a tiered approach by the applicant, but will align to that produced by five estuaries as submitted as part of their DCO application. This document will adequately account for those residents whose drinking water is only guaranteed through wells supply, and this will be submitted at an appropriate future deadline

00:26:38:19 - 00:27:14:03

and will include the following a bespoke application assessment for each location within 250m of the onshore project area. This will consider geology local hydrogeology that works are being undertaken within the vicinity of the well and site will walk over data obtained by five estuaries as a joint venture. The assessment will then determine if the location has the potential to be affected by the proposed development or not. If there is a potential for the supply to be impacted either by a reduction in water quality, guarantee a supply or both, then baseline data will be obtained in other times and analyzed.

00:27:15:09 - 00:27:23:07

It's worth noting that no residents within the onshore project area who solely rely upon their water supply will within 250m.

00:27:24:24 - 00:28:03:13

The appendix to Applicant Response to Written Questions rep two. Hyphen 021. Figure prepared in support of the response to question 1.111.1.7. Groundwater monitoring points identifies the location where monitoring will be undertaken to obtain baseline data for the properties, as an early indication that the potential exists for them to be impacted by the property. These locations have been selected after consideration steps outlined above, and our potable water supply and assessment will be aligned to that undertaken by five estuaries and it's secured through DCR requirement number 50.

00:28:07:13 - 00:28:08:04

Thank you.

00:28:08:21 - 00:28:11:26

Thank you for that summary. That's helpful.

00:28:13:28 - 00:28:22:25

I'm going to next. Invite any local authorities present if they have comments or concerns on what they've heard.

00:28:30:12 - 00:28:43:04

Wallace, Essex County Council. Uh, we have our, um, local rates officer online joining us remotely. Um, Allison, would you like to introduce yourselves, please?

00:28:43:10 - 00:28:43:27

Thank you.

00:28:48:09 - 00:29:11:05

Hello, everyone. Um, Allison Vaughn. Yes. Lead local authority specifically with the search team. Um, with regard to wells and, uh, drinking water. This is not an area that I would comment on. It doesn't come under my expertise. Um, I don't know. It would be more for the Environment Agency to comment on.

00:29:11:24 - 00:29:12:16

Thank you.

00:29:13:09 - 00:29:26:00

I will turn then to any IPPs, any other IPPs in the room. This has been raised, as I say, at relevant reps and more recently in additional submissions.

00:29:28:27 - 00:29:38:13

Okay, we have a a hand up. There's a roving mic coming towards you. If you could just bear with that and introduce yourself and outline the concerns.

00:29:38:22 - 00:30:02:04

My name is Julian Christmas. I'm a resident of Bentley Road, Little Bromley. Um, our concerns are that we're going to lose our water. We have no mains water up the whole of Bentley Road. Um, so we want to know what precautions are going to be taken against losing our water.

00:30:08:19 - 00:30:09:09

Okay.

00:30:10:18 - 00:30:17:07

Any other IP's on? Well. Water and water table impacts at fairly.

00:30:19:12 - 00:30:44:01

Many farms. Um, I think the the wording of no house that solely relies in the project is a little bit convenient because Norman's farm in particular is the site of the substation, and they don't. They have one tap that is on mains. The rest of the house relies on well water. So I wouldn't I wouldn't really call one tap being not solely reliant on on well water.

00:30:46:25 - 00:30:47:18

Thank you.

00:30:49:25 - 00:30:55:13

Before, uh, before going back to the applicant, I'm just going to check online. I know

00:30:57:00 - 00:31:02:01

Barbara moss Taylor from the Environment Agency Nancy is joining us today.

00:31:03:27 - 00:31:12:13

I think it's mainly to discuss flood risk, Miss Moss Taylor. Is there anything you'd like to add on this point?

00:31:15:20 - 00:31:32:09

Uh, thank you sir. Uh, no, we don't really have anything to add. It wasn't, um, raised as a significant concern by our internal consultees. Uh, so I haven't had any, um, further preparation on that.

00:31:32:22 - 00:31:33:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:31:36:00 - 00:32:09:19

In that case, I will invite the applicant to respond to the comments specifically around Bentley Road and those residents and where they fall within the area of search and monitoring. And the specific point about guaranteeing continued water supply and then the point around certain, uh, certain residential properties may not rely solely on, well, water, but rely substantially on well water.

00:32:14:01 - 00:32:53:09

So to answer the first question, um, first, I think where we're, we're trying to get to is we're trying to understand how the water feeds into the wells. That is why we did the initial surveys in, um, the back

end of middle of last year, um, and started and carried on an infill survey in January of, of this year to try to understand what the wells were, were constructed. We were carrying out some inspections of the wells to understand how deep the water level was, how deep the well was, um, to try and understand how the water from the surrounding area drains into those wells.

00:32:53:22 - 00:33:28:26

We also carried out, uh, some chemical analysis of water samples from the wells to try and understand. Again, to get more information as to where the water was feeding in. At what rough level. Because of the chemical composition varies depending on how deep the water is being drawn into the well. So we were trying to use that as a baseline understanding to try and gauge where the the water was coming in and how the water was, was effectively flowing in the vicinity. The intention then is to use that information to feed into the detailed design of the cable route.

00:33:29:11 - 00:34:06:22

Apologies for going back to it. To understand the burial depths that are needed to minimize our impacts on on world waters, to try and understand it. What we've said in chapter 21, in relation to the area of influence of water, is in relation to how the cable ducts themselves block those inflows of of water. And from Experience. Um, effectively the the blocking of water happens. And then after about 250m beyond in the flows, the water returns to being at the same level and being continuous.

00:34:07:00 - 00:34:49:15

So our real interest is in properties that are within that 250m, based on our experience of how the water realigns itself. After that, uh, after after the cables due to capillary action of water in the vicinity. So I think it really depends on how far the properties are located away from the cable route in particular, not necessarily the red line boundary, because it's the action of the cables and the buried cables within the, the, the ground that will impact on how the, the quantity of water and thus the quality of water that's being drawn into the wells is, is actually occurring.

00:34:50:18 - 00:35:25:00

So hopefully that answers First question to kind of get to the second question. It's a very similar answer in that we're trying to mitigate the impact on the wells in the first instance to try and prevent there being an issue. Um, and so hopefully maintaining the same water supply as is currently doing to be able to to mitigate that that impact, we will need to carry out further works and further detailed design works to fully understand the impact on every single property within that 250 meter radius of which Norman's farm is, is one.

00:35:25:19 - 00:35:37:15

Um, and that's what we are ongoing with. And we will need to understand detailed design of the cable route, burial depths of the cables to understand the exact impacts on the particular wells that that are being asked about.

00:35:38:13 - 00:36:16:06

Thank you, Mister Reed. That may give some reassurance or further explanation to IPS. I would appreciate that deadline for if possible, just you say from experience it's 250m. If you could submit something to the examining authority that substantiates that rather than just experience, although I

appreciate the experience, it will be borne out elsewhere. If there is anything, any guidance or examples that you could submit into that that corroborates the the distance of 250m.

00:36:16:11 - 00:36:23:13

Some are relevant reps, maybe outwith that 250 metre radius, but still have concerns.

00:36:26:00 - 00:36:46:21

David Reid for the applicant, and we're in the process of carrying out some downdraft calculations in terms of our impact of the cable route on the well. Those are currently planned for submission deadline five. So that will be how we will define the sphere of influence on the wells and what that will mean. So if possible, could we push that to deadline five.

00:36:50:08 - 00:37:18:04

Yes, that that is noted. So that that will obviously the work take, take some time to complete. In the meantime, I will invite as it Missus Christmas to to respond to what you've heard and see if that has, um, helped any understanding or any concerns. It may not have overcome the concerns completely, but if you if you want to just outline further thoughts.

00:37:22:07 - 00:37:45:26

Supply. Um, I would like to know what's going to happen next because we have no mains water down the whole of Bentley Road. Um, and my house is 400m away from the trench. Um, so I'm, I mean, I've, I've spoken to David Reeve

00:37:47:11 - 00:37:56:07

Today and yesterday. Um, so he's reassured me that he's going to keep on top of it. So.

00:37:59:09 - 00:38:03:17

I'll be I'll be waiting to see what happens next.

00:38:03:25 - 00:38:22:16

Thank you. Okay. Mr. Reed. Obviously, you've heard Mrs. Christmas's comments. Um, what what happens to or if properties outside of that boundary do suffer water supply issues? And so and it's demonstrably as a result of cabling.

00:38:23:12 - 00:38:56:29

David Reed for the applicant. So we will be working on a mitigation hierarchy. That hierarchy may be different for different properties depending on whether people would prefer mains water or would not prefer mains water. So there is a definite exercise. And the next step of this, once we understand the sphere of influence from the down draw calcs on the on the wells to understand what the mitigation measures need to be to mitigate the risks. And we will be. Need to be constantly in discussion because this is obviously drinking water, which is very.

00:38:57:01 - 00:39:07:26

Human right. To be able to to understand what the most appropriate mitigation is for. For the properties that are in at risk from the the interaction of the cable cables.

00:39:08:19 - 00:39:26:19

Thank you. So it gives progress at least. And deadline five for submission into the examination of those calculations. Um, it's fairly if you want to come and find a brief final comment before we move on.

00:39:26:21 - 00:39:55:29

Thames Valley for TNR Valley Farms does that apply to Norman's farm as well, in the sense that you'll be happy to engage, because the voluntary agreement you've given us for the substation, if we sign that we've been told that's full and final settlement, we can't come back for anything else. So if you then leave them without, well, water that they previously had before. They're being asked that. They've got to decide that now, but we don't know that. And we wouldn't then be able to come back to you for for something else afterwards, which you're precluding us from discussing that. But you're quite happy to do that with everyone else.

00:39:58:11 - 00:39:59:03

Mr. Reid.

00:40:00:16 - 00:40:12:12

Comment is noted. I need to check what's in the heads of terms to to understand how that works. Because this is a cable routing issue, not a substation issue, and how the heads of terms are jointly coordinated. And.

00:40:14:20 - 00:40:21:14

The cable route goes into the substation immediately outside the house. So it's a both issue and all of them are going to affect the water.

00:40:24:12 - 00:40:51:22

Yes. Um, however, the substation, the the inflows into the from the substation because of the shallow nature of it, um, in terms of where the water ingresses into the well, inflows into the well, um, the cable route is the predominant factor. And so we'll need to understand where that cable route sits to understand the impacts on the wells. And that will be discussed as part of the ongoing exercise. Thank you.

00:40:52:05 - 00:41:13:16

I think that is an important issue. If you could continue the the dialogue and reassess those heads of terms to see whether or not the same preclusion would apply to Norman's farm in regards to substation, and whether or not there is a similarity or crossover to water supply.

00:41:15:19 - 00:41:47:20

For the applicant, yes, that point is needed and we'll pick up to make sure the points covered. Also, just to add that we obviously will the code of construction practice and the DCO and the drafting of the requirements in the DCO will, um, may need to be updated depending on the outcome of the assessment that Mr. Reed was mentioning. That's ongoing and that will be submitted for deadline. Five to the extent that there's a need to then, um, include commitments to deliver any particular type of, uh, monitoring or mitigation measures as a result of the findings of that work.

00:41:47:22 - 00:42:11:02

Then that will feed into, uh, further updated versions of those management plans or, or adjustments to the drafting, um, of requirement 15. So it's just to say that, uh, for interested parties, that anything that's identified as being a necessary mitigation would be secured via via the DCO. We just don't know the method yet. Um, to do that until we wait for the outcome of the assessment work.

00:42:11:09 - 00:42:14:07

Thank you. Yes, I appreciate that. I think.

00:42:16:09 - 00:42:20:17

I have a comment on this, Mr. Blythe, very briefly.

00:42:20:19 - 00:42:48:27

Um, my experience, uh, digging gravel inwardly, um, we have had to, uh, been asked by the Environment Agency to mitigate our activities by putting in water mains for householders Who have suffered loss of water. And it's quite simple. The Environment Agency will tell you to. That's. So maybe that's something you can hold on to. Thanks.

00:42:48:29 - 00:42:49:16

Thank you.

00:42:51:23 - 00:42:53:29

Any further comments before I move this on.

00:42:54:18 - 00:43:07:05

Back to the applicant? As as Mr. Reed said, um, connections to water main water supplies are being discussed, but it's noted that that's not something that every everybody actually wants to be facilitated by the project.

00:43:08:09 - 00:43:39:10

Okay. Thank you. Moving on to bullet point two of the item relating to this application for environment permits for obstruction and dewatering activity. Whether or not an abstraction licence or exemption is in fact required. Um, the Environment Agency has responded and made relevant reps stating that it will not consent to the application of environmental regulations in respect of abstraction and dewatering activities.

00:43:43:17 - 00:44:16:17

So this may relate to the previous topic. It relates to dewatering and the impact on water table and drainage and drainage has also been discussed under agriculture and soil. Questions here. I would like to hear from the Environment Agency, uh, Mrs. Moss Taylor, about this issue, whether you can provide further clarification or whether this is fairly standard approach to licences that would be sought at a later date.

00:44:16:23 - 00:44:21:03

I will ask the applicant to respond to the likelihood of requiring such a licence.

00:44:23:03 - 00:44:42:14

There will be further questions on drainage through written questions, so it will really be confirmation here, um, about the applicant's approach to licenses. First of all, Mrs. Moss Taylor, I know you introduce yourself if you

00:44:44:03 - 00:44:50:23

would appear on screen and, um, explain the Environment Agency's point in this regard, please.

00:44:51:17 - 00:45:26:20

Thank you. Sir. Um, the Environment Agency's, uh, position is that as a matter of course, certainly. Uh, with in the East Anglia area that we do not agree to displaying um, licences for abstraction, uh, due to the complexity in a seriously water stressed area of supplying those. Uh, so we, we defer to the, the standard licensing requirements.

00:45:27:06 - 00:45:37:04

Uh, I should also add that licences are only required where there is a proposal to abstract more than 20m³ per day.

00:45:39:22 - 00:45:40:14

Thank you.

00:45:44:12 - 00:45:52:03

If I could hear from the applicant as to the applicant's approach and whether or not that threshold is likely to be

00:45:53:28 - 00:46:04:03

reached, and therefore what the applicant's approach would be to pursuing those licenses is that Mr. Foulds I can see on screen.

00:46:04:23 - 00:46:42:18

For the applicant. Uh, we can confirm that the licenses we we won't be looking to apply them. Um, the need for environmental permits, uh, for obstruction and discharge will be determined post consent by the principal contractor. Uh, and the relevant and the relevant regulations will still apply. Placing a responsibility on the contract to ensure they have all the relevant licenses in place. It's not known for certain at this stage whether um licenses will be required or will, um, fall under the relevant, uh, exemptions.

00:46:42:22 - 00:47:15:24

Uh, we are aware of the relevant conditions for volumes that were mentioned and durations and other factors as well, such as proximity to um designated sites. Um, but at the moment, um, it's not possible to know the sort of conditions that we will encounter, whether there will be water, how much water, uh, what the weather conditions might be that could add water to, um, any excavations. Um, so it's something that will be, uh, determined post consent by the principal contractor.

00:47:17:18 - 00:47:20:13

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that explanation.

00:47:25:28 - 00:47:34:11

I don't think I have any further questions. if that. If that remains the case and will be addressed post consent.

00:47:36:14 - 00:47:37:01

Okay.

00:47:39:23 - 00:47:43:13

In that case, I will move on to bullet point three.

00:47:45:03 - 00:48:08:01

Whether the applicant's position regarding post consent Fra is considered best practice. So in the environment, agencies response and responses to Ex one question 11 .1.3. Environment Agency has stated that it does not consider the applicant's approach to flood risk assessment to be best practice.

00:48:09:27 - 00:48:30:02

The examining authority has also noted the recent publication of new Environment Agency flood maps. I think 25th of March. So last week, the Environment Agency has updated its flood map for planning service, which displays flood zones and other data sets relevant to development planning.

00:48:32:17 - 00:48:36:04

These are all available via the Environment Agency's website.

00:48:37:23 - 00:48:47:05

So the question on the flood risk assessment, I will pose, first of all, to the Environment Agency regarding the flood risk assessment,

00:48:48:22 - 00:48:55:08

to provide further information on the issue around best practice and why it considers the approach not to be best practice.

00:48:56:23 - 00:49:31:23

What are the existing deficiencies and how may these be overcome? I would also like to hear in whilst we have the Environment Agency here, what its view on the new flood maps for planning, which we have looked at. Um, and as we are now during the examination, what the applicant should be doing to take account of the new flood risk maps, and I will then invite the applicant to comment on both points.

00:49:34:05 - 00:49:37:28

So is Moss Taylor. Thank you.

00:49:40:07 - 00:49:44:09

Thank you, sir. Barbara moss Taylor for the Environment Agency. Um.

00:49:46:27 - 00:50:05:07

It's important that if any flood risk is present, uh, that we understand how it can be mitigated. Um, and if that mitigation is feasible,

00:50:07:03 - 00:50:19:03

therefore, and then understand what the residual risks are to any third party receptors. Um, it's therefore sorry.

00:50:21:10 - 00:50:45:07

As it stands at the moment. It's quite possible that the mitigation that the applicant has put forward may be sufficient, but it's not tested. If there is a residual third party risk remaining, then it's important that that is weighed up in the planning balance by the decision making body.

00:50:46:25 - 00:51:39:20

Our concern is that potentially, uh, when we come to discharging the protective provisions, um, we find that for some reason, the coveted haul road crossing still presents risks to a third party. If the flood risk assessment has been done post consent, this places the Environment Agency in a position of then having to make a decision regarding that that was not necessarily known to the examination examining body and therefore putting us in a position of making that decision, which is not a decision that the Environment Agency should have to make.

00:51:40:27 - 00:51:50:28

Um, in respect to the flood maps, the new flood maps are primary. Yes. They should be used to consider what the the risk is now.

00:51:54:26 - 00:52:14:28

And should be, should be applied as part of a review of that. Um, I can't comment on detail how that would affect, um, the particular crossing where, um, the, where we would have protective provisions, um, under consideration. Um.

00:52:17:02 - 00:52:36:24

And in order to see how that how that would impact we would in the first instance, any flood extent. Um, but also how that would impact we would need to understand more about the proposed size of culvert, etc.. Okay. But those details are missing.

00:52:37:09 - 00:52:55:09

Okay. Thank you. I can see is Allison Vaughn has a hand raised and has introduced herself. Would you be able to respond to those two points? So the the point about

00:52:57:03 - 00:53:03:07

the Fra and the point about what the applicant may now do with the new flooding maps?

00:53:04:04 - 00:53:52:07

Yes. Um. Thank you. Yes. I agree with, um, what the Environment Agency have stated, um, with regard to best practice, best practices is always that they engage with the Alpha and other agencies as early as possible in the process. Um, while stating that I do understand that this project is not at the

detailed design yet, what I would like to stress is that it's absolutely essential that the applicant engages with the alpha, um, as soon as possible with not only with regard to the flood risk assessment, but also with the drainage strategy and also the construction management plan.

00:53:53:01 - 00:54:04:19

Okay. Thank you. So we've heard from the Environment Agency and lead local flood authority. I'll invite the applicant and representatives to respond now.

00:54:05:00 - 00:54:31:26

Uh, Claire, project the applicant. I will bring in, um, Helena Wicks, who, um, will be speaking on this particular topic for, um, the applicant in terms of the, um, flood risk assessment work that has been undertaken. To date. And then in terms of further work that's ongoing, um, to cover, um, the point that you raised in respect of the new flood mapping that has been recently published by the Environment Agency. Thank you.

00:54:33:06 - 00:55:09:14

Thank you very much. Um, Helena Wicks, on behalf of the applicant, um, in response to sort of Miss Moss Taylor's sort of, um, from the Environment Agency's comment, we have noted in their response to written questions. XK one rep two hyphen 034. The Environment Agency had noted that following a meeting we held with them in January 2025, they'd got ongoing concerns related to the flood risk, primarily at the potential haul road crossings at 22 A and 20 at 23. Sorry, I think the the applicant would like to clarify that we're not considering that the flood risk assessment should be undertaken post consent.

00:55:09:16 - 00:55:49:01

It is very much upfront and that it's the detailed design of the mitigation measures that should be dealt with. Um post consent. Um, the applicant would like to clarify that the flood risk assessment, um, is appendix 21 three freight app 121 has been undertaken on a worst case assumption that the whole road crossings are required. It's also noted that both locations W x 22 A and W x 23, i.e. where those, uh, need for the temporary haul road crossings might be needed, were subject to the site walkover as part of the Geomorphology Baseline survey, which is in app 119.

00:55:49:18 - 00:56:28:09

Um, this has been reviewed as part of the flood risk assessment, including photographs and observations taken at those proposed crossing locations. The watercourse channel at 22 A is shown on plate 30 of the Geomorphology Baseline Survey. Um and W x 23 is shown on plate one of that of that document. It's confirmed, therefore, that the baseline conditions of flood risk at these locations has been included in the Fra. So in line with best practice, we have been considering it moving forward to provide further clarification to the Environment Agency on their ongoing concerns, um, that they raised in the meeting in January 2025 and noted in their response to the written questions.

00:56:28:18 - 00:56:53:14

We are currently producing a supplementary technical note entitled Flood Risk Assessment. It's a bit wordy, actually. Clarification regarding flood risk associated with watercourse crossings. Technical note. The aim of this technical notice to provide clarification that the flood risk in this location is

acceptable, that we have considered it in, won't affect offsite receptors. Um, this technical note is going to be submitted into examination at deadline for.

00:56:54:02 - 00:56:54:19

Okay.

00:56:55:09 - 00:57:31:00

Um, just to provide a bit of an overview of the technical technical note provides clarification on the topographical elevation changes between the watercourses in these locations and offsite receptors such as, uh, residential properties, you know, nearby, whether they're within the likely to be within the flood extent. It also notes the presence of existing constrictions within the watercourse in proximity to these locations. At um uh w x 22 A, there is an existing access road with an existing concrete bridge and culvert already in place, which already provided constriction in that location.

00:57:31:08 - 00:58:02:00

Um, so there is, you know, an existing infrastructure in place in that location that's already, um, that's already affecting the potential flood risk in this location on the basis that the applicant's position remains, that they don't know whether the whole roads are going to be required. We have assessed them and the potential impact, and that'll be included in the technical note. Um, but it is considered that the detail designed for them should be, um, undertaken post post consent.

00:58:02:02 - 00:58:44:07

I think that moves on to one of the other agenda items. Um, but I'll also respond on with regard to the new NAFTA two mapping that was published. It came out in two two releases. The initial release was in January, but the latest release was the 25th of March. It is confirmed that the technical note being produced in deadline for does include a comparison with the new flood map for planning in those locations. So it has been taken into account and we're also producing clarification note with regard to the wider flood risk mapping updates that have been produced that will also be submitted at deadline for with regard to the sort of suite of mapping that has been produced, provided, sorry, by the Environment Agency in their new new mapping.

00:58:44:09 - 00:58:52:05

So I hope that provides the confidence that we are addressing and reviewing those those data sources.

00:58:53:05 - 00:58:54:21

Thank you. That's very helpful for me.

00:58:56:25 - 00:59:20:13

And it does start to address the the later points on the agenda. Can you can I just confirm um. the involvement of the Environment Agency in that technical note that will be submitted into deadline for. And or will that be the first instance that the Environment Agency. See that note?

00:59:21:08 - 00:59:43:12

Helena, on behalf of the applicant, I know miss Miss West has just come on the screen. Um, whilst it would be our preference to get it to the Environment Agency advance, it is unlikely with the

timescales coming up that it would be, um, available before deadline for to go to the Environment Agency. However, it would be if it were available, preference would be for them to sit in advance.

00:59:44:16 - 00:59:45:08

Thank you.

00:59:49:15 - 00:59:56:09

Ms.. Taylor, would you having heard the applicants response, is there anything you wish to now add?

00:59:59:10 - 01:00:14:24

No, we, um sorry, but Ms.. Taylor from the Environment Agency, uh, We would be pleased to see that as soon as it's available. Um, we do think that it's probably something that can be resolved before the end of the examination period.

01:00:15:14 - 01:00:16:05

Thank you.

01:00:19:18 - 01:00:28:21

Just going to invite or see if any other IP's wish to speak on the topic of the flood risk assessment.

01:00:31:15 - 01:00:32:00

Yes.

01:00:34:11 - 01:01:18:23

I don't know if this is the the right moment exactly to bring this up, but we'd like to know whether the, um, the flood risk assessment that North Falls will carry out in relation to their substations, whether that's given any consideration to the fact that, um, the ECN substation intends to put most of their water through north walls and five estuaries, ditches and things that they intend to use, which then goes on to the farmland to the south. So if we're only looking at north pools in isolation and not assessing the impact of, then that will obviously be very different and we just would like to understand what impact that's going to have and potentially on other landowners to the south who might not be directly affected by the project, who won't have a direct link, but who may subsequently be affected by the way in which that water moves.

01:01:20:07 - 01:01:31:00

Thank you. Yes. I mean, this is as good an opportunity as any. I'll turn to the applicant to to respond directly if you have a response.

01:01:32:01 - 01:02:09:08

David Reed for the applicant. So we are in discussions with National Grid about their proposed design. Um, given that, as you said, that was the design proposed at their peer stage. And so we are in discussions with them to understand their their drainage design as part of the drainage surveys that we're going through. We're looking at the outfall drainage from from the the North Pole substation and understanding how that water flows through that system and where the nearest constraint is within that substation drainage. Um, and we will we'll look at that from, a North Falls perspective to understand how our outfall and our surface water runoff interacts with the system as things stand.

01:02:11:10 - 01:02:12:00

Thank you.

01:02:16:00 - 01:02:20:06

Just a final point on the this bullet point,

01:02:21:21 - 01:02:53:15

and noting that the following bullet point about the post, the adequate assessed risk to third parties, which I feel we have covered. Can I ask for an update on statement of Common Ground? So the most recent one dates from the 5th of March, which is now four weeks ago. And there were several outstanding issues which the invite between the environmental agency and the applicant.

01:02:54:14 - 01:03:03:23

Um, Miss Moss Taylor, you've said that you feel reasonably confident that most issues can be resolved before the examination.

01:03:05:10 - 01:03:19:23

I'd just like to invite the applicant to comment on that and progress towards the revised statement of common ground, which we will hope to see a deadline for if practical.

01:03:22:15 - 01:03:24:04

And Gordon Campbell for the applicant.

01:03:24:06 - 01:03:40:12

Um, that's correct. We'll we'll see to submit, um, the latest version of the Statement of Common Ground at deadline for, uh, noting, uh, the conversation we just had in terms of the timing of the updated note that it may be the case that, um, there's a, uh, further update to that statement of common ground at a future deadline.

01:03:42:14 - 01:03:43:17

Okay. Thank you.

01:03:54:20 - 01:03:56:17

I will now take us on to.

01:03:59:24 - 01:04:31:10

The penultimate bullet point under this item. This relates to the coordination of landfall, flood, defense, impact and progress between North Falls and five estuaries. So the export cable makes landfall at a point where drawings for the defense flood defense predate the formation of the Environment Agency, and therefore there may be some variation to what is shown on the drawings and those drawings that the Environment Agency holds.

01:04:32:24 - 01:04:41:03

The Environment Agency has drawn attention to the complexities crossing the defenses without causing harm and recognizing potential future works.

01:04:44:05 - 01:05:11:18

I'd like to invite the Environment Agency and the applicant to explain very briefly how this point is being taken forward. Bear in mind, obviously we have heard there will be a revised statement of common ground, and this is an issue directly in that statement of common ground. First of all, can I ask the applicant to explain how they are working, hopefully collaboratively with five estuaries?

01:05:12:25 - 01:05:54:23

David Reid for the applicant. So, um, some boreholes were drilled by five estuaries in late 22, in terms of obtaining ground conditions onshore side of the landfall in this location. Um, those that information from those boreholes has been shared with North Falls. And between the two projects we have designed a set of um, an initial design of the horizontal directional drills for the landfall, which can be seen in the outline horizontal directional drill method statement and contingency plan, which is app.

01:05:59:16 - 01:06:45:26

Uh, 250. So that shows the the proposed configuration both horizontally and vertically of the proposed drills. Those have been considered based on the existing information that the E have fully appreciating, as per EA's relevant rep. Um 091 that those documents might be out of date and there may need to be further, uh, works carried out to to understand their their accuracy. What we have tried to do with that design is ensure that we are within the the stiff clay element of the um, of the ground conditions to ensure that we maximize the potential or minimize the potential for having an impact on the on the landfall defenses.

01:06:46:10 - 01:06:54:25

Um, as we as things stand, there is still work to do to understand the validity of the drawings, but based on the information we have, we have tried to

01:06:56:17 - 01:07:08:19

use the make the best design possible from the information we've got. Fully appreciating there may need to be further work done in the future to try and verify the accuracy of of some some information.

01:07:09:27 - 01:07:15:15

Thank you, Mr. Reid. I'll just ask the Environment Agency

01:07:17:08 - 01:07:21:00

to comment on on that point, Miss Moss. Taylor.

01:07:22:14 - 01:08:11:18

Thank you. Chair. Barbara moss Taylor from the Environment Agency. Um, yes. Uh, we are now content. We understood that there was there had been, uh, some ongoing work undertaken by five estuaries, um, but were not fully informed as to how, uh, coordinated at that point it was with the North Falls project. Um, we are content following our meeting in January that the applicant will and and the Five Estuaries representatives will keep both um, project managers for the Environment Agency informed of the progress of their works.

01:08:13:22 - 01:08:14:13

Thank you.

01:08:25:06 - 01:08:33:16

Did any other IP have a comment to make? I think it's a reasonably specific point between the Environment Agency and the applicant, but I will.

01:08:36:07 - 01:08:36:26

Check.

01:08:40:08 - 01:08:44:28

Just ask the applicant if that's the shared understanding between parties.

01:08:47:22 - 01:08:50:06

They've agreed to the applicant. That is our understanding.

01:08:50:24 - 01:08:52:26

Thank you. In that case,

01:08:54:12 - 01:09:22:23

we did say that we would aim to break at 1:00. I have one further point on this agenda item. I'm going to propose to continue before moving to that sort of 45, 50 minute break for lunch. The final point on the agenda is construction related impacts and flood risk. Whether or not the position of the Environment Agency regarding code of construction practice and trenched crossings and roads crossings using HDD.

01:09:24:22 - 01:09:53:18

So this may have been touched on, but I will seek some confirmation from the applicant and the Environment Agency. The concerns relate to potential impacts of construction related activity at Hall Road crossings, due to the potential to interfere with the flow of flood water, which can increase the risk of flooding to third parties. First of all, I'll just ask the applicant if there is anything they wish to update on what we have already heard, and then I'll turn to the Environment Agency.

01:09:54:23 - 01:10:19:07

Project for the applicant. Yes. Just to add to what we said, obviously we're preparing this technical note, which will be submitted at deadline for that. The work for that technical note is still ongoing at the moment, but to the extent that any additional wording is required to be added to the Outline Code of Construction Practice to address any any points, then that will be included at the deadline for up to date version of the management plan.

01:10:20:17 - 01:10:29:13

Thank you. I can see Miss Vaughn from the local flood authority. Has a hand raised Mistborn?

01:10:29:23 - 01:11:11:21

Yes, Alison Vaughn from the local flood authority. I just wanted to reiterate on this point what I had previously said in that it is essential that, um, the applicant engages with us with regard to the

construction management plan, which will, um. Should evidence that there will be no increased risk of flood to um, adjacent parties and downstream residents and also, um, ensure how, uh, surface water will be disposed off without increasing any, uh, risk of pollution in adjacent waterways.

01:11:12:08 - 01:11:34:01

Thank you. Yes, that point is certainly noted from the point of view of the examining authority. I'll ask the applicant to confirm their approach in a moment. I just ask final point from the Environment Agency. If there is anything further that you wish to add to that which has already been discussed.

01:11:36:07 - 01:11:43:16

Um, but mostly for the Environment Agency. Thank you sir. said. I would just like to add that

01:11:45:04 - 01:12:11:11

yes, we probably can address the the flood risk issues, um, at this through the technical note. Um, but we would like ongoing discussions with the applicant regarding the Code of construction practice, um, during the development stage and post consent. Uh, so there will be other matters arising from how this is dealt with.

01:12:12:21 - 01:12:13:11

Thank you.

01:12:14:28 - 01:12:30:16

So I'll just ask the applicant to respond to the lead local flood water authority's comments and their continued involvement and any final comment on this point.

01:12:35:02 - 01:12:55:15

For the applicant, um, reference to consultation with the, um. The local flood authority is referred to in the Code of Construction Practice. If there is any additional drafting, um, that um, the council council would like to see included in there, then obviously we'd be happy to consider it.

01:12:57:12 - 01:12:57:29

Thank you.

01:13:00:29 - 01:13:01:20

Okay.

01:13:03:09 - 01:13:03:24

Um.

01:13:04:18 - 01:13:13:26

Before moving to a break. Are there any other comments from IPPs on those issues, on the agenda that we have discussed?

01:13:16:21 - 01:13:31:15

And online. No hands. So it is 1:08 and we will take a break now of 50 52 minutes and resume at 10 to 2.

01:13:32:25 - 01:13:33:13

Thank you.