



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Dogger Bank South
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4) – Part 3
Date:	9 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.

00:00:04:29 - 00:00:17:08

Welcome back everyone to this issue specific hearing for for the offshore Dogger Bank wind farms. I'm now going to pass over back to my colleague Mr. Bronski to conclude on matters with regards to landscaping.

00:00:19:16 - 00:00:37:24

Thank you, Miss Dowling. Um, so just wrapping up then on ash dieback, I asked the applicants, um, earlier on if they could confirm the current rates of ash dieback, but they were not able to provide that. Could I have that as an action point to to give that information at, um, deadline for please.

00:00:55:02 - 00:01:11:26

All the credits for the applicant. Could you clarify what information specifically you are looking for in that regard, because we're not clear on on what information that would be and how we would find that out.

00:01:13:06 - 00:01:22:24

I'm looking for the current rates of ash dieback within the surrounding. Um, I understand that that information should be able to be provided.

00:01:24:24 - 00:01:27:14

Um, Rosemary Tingle for the applicant. Um, a couple.

00:01:27:16 - 00:01:33:08

Of the areas that you've mentioned should be managed by East Riding. Is this a question for East Riding as well?

00:01:34:13 - 00:01:47:03

You're. Yes. I mean, and you're obviously welcome to liaise with them in order to obtain that information and provide it into the examination. But if East Riding are better placed to provide it, then certainly I would welcome that information either from yourselves or them.

00:01:48:10 - 00:01:51:21

Yeah. Um, this would be particularly in relation to risk because I think.

00:01:54:00 - 00:01:56:16

Yes, it's in relation to risk. But to be honest, I,

00:01:58:14 - 00:02:02:02

I'm struggling to understand the point that.

00:02:04:17 - 00:02:31:15

Ash dieback, if it were prevalent in the areas of where The woodlands been identified as screening, and that you have stated that to limit the extent of effects, that that wouldn't then have an impact on the significance of effects. So I would like to see that, if possible, for any of the areas of woodland which have been identified as providing screening for the converter stations.

00:02:37:21 - 00:02:45:18

For the applicant, I think there's two separate points. So there is the presence of ash, which would make

00:02:47:14 - 00:02:54:25

the woodland susceptible to ash dieback. And then there is the rate of tree loss

00:02:56:14 - 00:03:06:13

which would. Which is presumably something that's a general right applicable to the area.

00:03:09:11 - 00:03:24:18

So I think between those two things, I think our position is still the same that there is there is no real risk of a material difference to the outcome of the LBA.

00:03:26:25 - 00:03:34:11

When considering you know how many ash trees may be present and how many may be lost in the coming years.

00:03:36:11 - 00:03:47:24

But we yes, we can liaise with the Council to to see if we can provide any, um, factual data to, to help you out.

00:03:48:22 - 00:03:53:22

Thank you, I appreciate that. Could I just ask for the council's view on the matter of ash dieback?

00:03:56:04 - 00:04:31:14

Jennifer Wallin for the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Um, I with respect this matter, I would appreciate, uh, details on the composition of those woodlands identified, please. Uh, that would give us a better understanding of how ash dieback would impact them over time. Um, we don't hold any details within the council for rates on ash dieback. And as we said in our written response, that can the decline can be within 12 months from healthy canopy to quite a sparse canopy.

00:04:31:28 - 00:04:40:15

So I believe if we could get that information on composition, that would give us a better idea of what the long term impact would be from ash dieback. Please.

00:04:44:28 - 00:04:51:11

And the applicants? Oh, sorry. Um, I can see a hand up. I'm not sure who that is.

00:04:51:15 - 00:05:23:03

Yep. Uh, it's Bill Blackledge for the East Riding of Yorkshire Council landscape architect um on on the subject of composition and just offer this in the hope it may be helpful. We're actually coming into, uh, a period when it's, uh, really relatively easy to identify ash composition because ash tends to come into leaf much later than most other species. So by observation, it's relatively easy to identify ash.

00:05:23:27 - 00:05:54:24

Uh, given that we're also local, and given that, um, we have a drone, it would be possible to fly over the woodlands that are of concern, assuming they're generally accessible from public highways and so on. Um, to, to get a fair indication of ash composition of the woodlands that we're, we're concerned with. Um, I guess the only, the only sort of Qualification to that would.

00:05:54:26 - 00:06:17:07

Would be how how worthwhile is it to do that? Given how much difference it may or may not make. But I'd I'd let that decision be for other people and simply offer that there's a possibility there to do it, um, probably at greater convenience for us than it would be for the for the applicant. Given that we're local.

00:06:19:21 - 00:06:23:22

Thank you, Mr. Blackledge. Okay. Can I have the applicant's thoughts on that, please?

00:06:33:21 - 00:07:03:09

Impossible for the applicant. I guess we're struggling a bit with this whole topic, madam. Um, in that no one can control the, you know, the passage of this disease or or another disease. Um. And I'm not clear what was what's at stake here. I mean, if it were the case that the rate of dieback was relatively high in this location, what would what would flow from that?

00:07:06:04 - 00:07:37:11

I think that the the outstanding point in my mind is making sure that the environmental statement in Libya reports the worst case scenario in terms of the significance of effects. So as I've stated within the submitted information, it it alludes to the fact that the the effects on the converter stations are mitigated, at least in part, by some of these areas of woodland. And at present, not all of the areas of woodlands have been identified or surveyed, and the presence of ash isn't known in some of those.

00:07:37:13 - 00:07:56:22

So if ash was prevalent and it had an effect, the ash dieback had an effect within 12 months for argument's sake. Has the future baseline accounted for where ash dieback could affect those areas of woodland and have the significance of effect being reported in such a way that takes account of any potential ash dieback.

00:08:02:19 - 00:08:30:10

Well, we will try to come back to you if we can. On the ash dieback rate, I guess I am struggling with whether it's a reasonable to expect us to speculate about the, the potential, um, uh, sort of progress of, of, of a of a disease like this that may or may not play out over a period of time. Um, and so we'll reflect on that as well.

00:08:33:27 - 00:08:59:29

Okay. Thank you. We'll leave that as an action point for you to review potential rates of ash dieback. Obviously, the council's, um, offer of, um, potential, um, visual survey of some of the areas of woodland is there. So if that would assist in determining, um, potential areas where ash dieback could affect the significance of effect. I would encourage you to have that dialogue with the council.

00:09:05:25 - 00:09:12:21

I'm now going to move on to the last, um, bullet point of this agenda item, which is, um, good design.

00:09:15:02 - 00:09:48:01

In previous hearings, we've discussed, um, screening the low level elements of the converter stations, and the applicants have provided more information on what these low level elements might include. However, I still remain unclear about the how the outline landscape management plan or design and access statement would definitively ensure that these low level elements are screened by the planting. For example, there's no definition or maximum height given of the low level elements in the design and access statement, which would then inform the type of planting which would need to be which would need to screen these elements.

00:09:48:11 - 00:09:50:22

Could the applicants provide a view on this, please?

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

Pray for the applicants. So there isn't a definition for low level features within the.

00:10:15:21 - 00:10:49:05

Um, within the onshore converter stations. Um, but we would refer you to the cross-sections that have been provided and were submitted at the last deadline, as these will illustrate the general relationship between the mitigation planting the converter holes, which are the largest part of the the development and the lower uh, elements Within the compounds.

00:11:00:22 - 00:11:02:22

Okay. Thank you. So

00:11:04:14 - 00:11:10:10

how how does any how do any of the supporting documents ensure that the low level elements would be screened by the planting?

00:11:20:16 - 00:11:25:03

The screening. Um, is.

00:11:27:11 - 00:12:00:07

Designed to to grow over time. So in the short term, there will be relatively limited screening. Um, we have, uh, suggested, uh, potential growth rates at year ten or around eight meters, uh, planting height. Uh, so that will clearly, uh, offer a degree of screening for elements such as fencing.

00:12:00:09 - 00:12:32:06

And, uh, the precise amount of screening would obviously depend on where the viewer is in relation to the, um, in relation to the screening and in relation to the converter station itself. So it's not possible to be categorical, but we would be in terms of providing screening of low level features.

00:12:32:24 - 00:12:41:16

We have an expectation that the screening would by year ten reduce.

00:12:43:18 - 00:13:25:07

The visibility of the ancillary parts of the development, and that would include things like fencing, vehicle movements, um, any other low level infrastructure which, which, um, would appear in the view. And that's what, what has been illustrated uh, on the visualizations. We don't have any, um, guarantees about what level of infrastructure would be screened in in every available view.

00:13:25:14 - 00:13:29:11

And it's not possible to, to provide that level of certainty.

00:13:31:03 - 00:14:12:03

Okay. Thank you. I wondered if possibly a zoning plan identifying maximum heights for different areas of equipment or different groups of equipment within the converter station zone could help to define what planting there needs, or help inform what types of planting in the landscape mitigation plan. Um, just to ensure that to the best of the ability through the DCO documents, that it could ensure that the low level elements are adequately screened in, that um, ensures that the effects identified within the environmental statement are not exceeded.

00:14:24:09 - 00:14:54:13

For the applicant. Uh, so we consider that as a matter for detailed design, uh, when the, uh, precise detail of the engineering structures would be known and the detail of the Finalized landscape management plan would be developed in response to that, and consulted on with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

00:14:57:13 - 00:14:59:25

Could I have the Council's thoughts on this matter, please?

00:15:05:00 - 00:15:08:26

Bill Blackledge for the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Um,

00:15:10:22 - 00:15:45:02

it's it seems to me it's one of the problems of a of a project of this scale that design many aspects of design remain unresolved. Um, certainly at this stage, um, and we are obliged to accept that, uh, the design will become resolved over time, and that will continue a dialogue with the applicant. Um, your suggestion as to a zoning plan, uh, might be helpful if the applicants felt they could commit to, uh, such.

00:15:45:04 - 00:15:52:15

Such a plan to provide a little more detail on height implications of that equipment.

00:15:56:15 - 00:15:58:02

Thank you, Mr. Blackledge. Um,

00:15:59:18 - 00:16:06:23

could I ask that the applicants review this? Um, and review the potential for some sort of zoning plan? I think

00:16:08:09 - 00:16:46:25

the problem that I'm having at the moment is that the significance of effects. Focus on, in part, screening the lower level items and that reducing the significance of effects, or that is at least how I've understood it. However, there's no nothing within the draft DCO or the supporting documents which ensures that that will actually happen. I understood what you said in terms of the aspiration, um, of the planting to screen the lower level elements, but there's nothing that I can see that captures that at this point, um, and ensures that that will happen.

00:16:47:05 - 00:16:58:07

So either through a zoning plan or if there's another solution that the applicants could think about, or ways to capture and ensure that. I would welcome that. And you're having reviewing that if that's okay.

00:17:01:09 - 00:17:35:07

Um, by design, that access statement that does include an outline of the various different types of equipment and the maximum height. We've also added the cross section to provide some which need to provide some additional detail. Um, I'd argue that the lower level elements may have been taken out of context. Obviously there are certain elements, but when we use that kind of language in our responses, what we mean is we can't screen the entire 24 meter height, the building. So we're only taking you know, we acknowledge that there is a certain portion that would still be visible in the long term.

00:17:35:15 - 00:18:05:23

So there is not specific Equipment that, you know, we're talking about things like vehicle movements. Things that would fall below that 8 to 10m reading height. So I think I don't think we have made the commitment through the landscape management plan, through the visualizations, that is showing that that height and, you know, it's showing what is above that screen. So it's a bit of a catch all term that we've used, but it's not a specific piece of equipment. When we say lower levels, it's things that are happening that won't be screened by that planting in the long term.

00:18:06:00 - 00:18:15:09

We've tended to use that terminology in our responses, but I can appreciate it. It's not one particular piece of equipment. It's just anything that won't be screened below that, just on occasion.

00:18:16:26 - 00:18:37:12

I think that's why I thought that a zoning plan could assist with that. So recognizing that the convertibles wouldn't be able to be screened, they could they could be contained to one part of the site, and then the rest of it effectively would be screened by the planting, is what you're suggesting. But at the moment, I'm not clear on where that starts and ends, but.

00:18:39:25 - 00:18:59:10

I've already provided a bit more explanation as to how they work and what they're supposed to show. Um, I mean, I think we have got plenty of information there just to show you where the different heights are and where the information is. Um, most things are above ten meters. Um, but the main key elements that we've, we've included in the assessment.

00:19:00:25 - 00:19:01:16

Mr.. Darling.

00:19:02:21 - 00:19:03:28

Um, I'm on action.

00:19:04:00 - 00:19:36:09

Point, so I'm just going to suggest I think this is captured potentially by the action points. So I just want to say the action point I have for this agenda item is to the applicant is going to consider providing a zoning plan or other solution to identify the maximum heights for different equipment areas of the converter station zone, to help in defining what should be screened by the proposed landscape mitigation, with particular reference to low level planting or signpost where this information has already been provided within the application document. So it doesn't would that, from your point of view, from the applicant's point of view, capture those options for you.

00:19:47:11 - 00:20:06:01

To just provide a full response to the to the issues that you kind of discussed there and talked about. So that we can pull together and perhaps provide further clarification as to how the heights are assessed in the landscape and visual impact assessment and the various different diagrams we've already provided in the design and access statement. So I think that does that does cover that point. And we can provide some clarification.

00:20:10:18 - 00:20:11:09

Thank you.

00:20:13:20 - 00:20:43:03

Um, and then I've just got one final question. And this is for East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Um, paragraph 270 of the Design and Access statement states that comments on any output of any design panel review must be provided within 28 days to the applicants by by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council and the relevant ward councillors. Kenney's Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed with 28 days be be a long enough time frame in which to obtain views and report back to the applicants.

00:20:55:13 - 00:21:02:24

Mr. Varley. Unfortunately, we can't hear you don't I don't think you're on mute, but I can't see that. But unfortunately, we can't hear you.

00:21:09:29 - 00:21:41:05

Can you hear me now? Oh, God. I don't know what happened there. Okay. Um, as East Riding of Yorkshire Council, we still, um, are of the opinion that 28 days would not give us that sufficient time to be able to carry out the consultations required and to assess those and respond within that 28 days. we still feel that 56 days is necessary to be able to do that. Um, if I can just add a little bit if I may, or if you don't mind.

00:21:41:07 - 00:22:16:09

Uh, just in terms of what is included in the, uh, in the, in this section of the, uh, Design and Access review. Um, we've commented previously about, um, potentially having Historic England as one of the consultees on this as well. Um, we would certainly feel that, given the comments historic England England have made in relation to, uh, but firm that the they should be one of the consultees. So I think at the minute the um design and access statements suggest that East Riding of Yorkshire Council and ward councillors will be consulted.

00:22:16:15 - 00:23:08:21

Um, but we feel that that could go further and it should include historic England given their comments. Um, given the timescales with historical England to respond if it went through ourselves. Um, we certainly feel that 28 days we couldn't, uh, facilitate that. Um, the other matter is more about the makeup of the panel itself. Um, because it's references about not having any, um, referral to a Design Council review, which I think we can accept as long as there is, uh, something in there that gives a clear, um, commitment to making sure that that design panel review is independent from the applicants, uh, and that it covers sufficient, uh, design, uh, expertise to be able to, um, cover those elements as well.

00:23:08:23 - 00:23:41:10

So again, at the minute, I think it refers to having a design champion who's been involved in similar projects and refers to a panel made up of engineers with similar expertise or who have that design expertise and a landscape architect. Again, that seems very narrow. Uh, from our point of view. And we feel that could potentially be expanded to include architects, for example. Um, we wondered about whether it would be would be helpful to have somebody from East Riding of Yorkshire Council, uh, on that.

00:23:41:15 - 00:24:10:12

Uh, we feel that's not necessary. Not not necessarily necessary. Apologies. Um, um, but the terms of reference, again, the terms of reference is, uh, quoted as being prepared by that panel. And again, we feel that given a lot of the elements involved, particularly around the, uh, the landscape, uh, matters that have been raised that a representative from the council should be involved in that preparation of the terms of reference as a minimum.

00:24:13:25 - 00:24:16:22

Thank you, Mr. Barley. And can I have the applicant's response, please?

00:24:22:28 - 00:24:57:18

Um, thank you for those comments. Um, we we did recently become aware of them, but only yesterday afternoon, so we have not provided a detailed response of all of them. I think the first point was about whether, um, Historic England could be a consultee. We discussed that internally and are happy to have them along with the ward councillors, because I like their statement. Um, there were a couple of comments about the design champion. Um, I think in relation to the design champion, we added further detail in the last update to the design and access statement to provide further clarity on the process.

00:24:57:29 - 00:25:37:21

Um, it's still quite it's still a quite high level point at the moment, and I think we do want to leave some opportunity to develop the process that goes on and learning through other projects that within our portfolio that we're all going through this process. Um, which is why it's still fairly high level. And we haven't, um, named exactly how many panel members there be or exactly who they would be. So there is still an opportunity to, to, um, kind of refine that. Um, we take on the point, um, that about the independence element. Um, we want to make sure that the panel is has got people that are suitably qualified and knowledgeable about this type of scheme just so that we, um, kind of get a pragmatic viewpoint from the panel.

00:25:38:02 - 00:26:08:18

Um, we have committed to an independent landscape architect being part of that panel. Um, we haven't been specific about, um, who else would sit on that panel? But what we do envisage is that there would be members of RWA on that. You don't necessarily sit on the DBS project as slightly separate, but would have that kind of nationally significant infrastructure, offshore wind farm experience. Um, we think it's quite important to have somebody who has that kind of background and experience on the panel, um, but is slightly removed from the DBS project. So we've added some further detail about that.

00:26:08:20 - 00:26:37:25

But having received these comments and then we're happy to, um, discuss those further with East Riding of Yorkshire. Um, about the panel composition, if we need to provide further detail on the design statement, but ideally we would agree the actual number of panel members and who they are at the detailed design stage. Um, so there's a few points there I think we need to to respond to in writing to East Writings. They're fairly new to us, but um, um, we do take on board their points and have tried to add a further detail in that last update, just to provide a bit more clarity about it.

00:26:41:00 - 00:26:56:03

Thank you. Um, I note your points, um, certainly regarding wanting to leave the actual number of the panel members to a later stage. And I think if you're committing now to a landscape architect, would you not be able to commit to an architect

00:26:57:20 - 00:27:01:25

for the design of the actual converter stations in its, its layout?

00:27:03:03 - 00:27:31:21

I think that, um, we could do to appoint the reason we've chosen a landscape architect is because I think we've added to the design access statement at some points, just to clarify that the design planner would have quite limited things that they could comment on. So the main things being the external appearance involved in the landscape outline, landscape management plan, all the things you've just been discussing actually in relation to heights and how the landscaping could work. We all envisage that as part of the design and access statement and and the overall kind of design plan for you. Um, but, um.

00:27:35:16 - 00:27:50:22

Sorry. Okay. So the landscape, the landscape architects, I think would be, um, the most appropriate panel member. So I think we're not against it, but we just need to take it away and discuss, because it's

a new comment as to whether we, um, whether we fully commit that, um, we do take on board that that could be appropriate.

00:27:52:13 - 00:28:18:12

Okay. Thank you. Um, I think it's an action point. Then I would ask that you look at, um, if I gave you what the points that East Yorkshire Council have just set out. Um, I know that you said that you will add, um, historic England as a as a consultee. So again, that can be included with the actual point to update, um, the design and access statement to do that. Um.

00:28:20:18 - 00:28:23:19

So yes, we'll we'll wait to hear from you on on those points.

00:28:24:03 - 00:28:28:23

And probably add them to the statement of common ground as well, which has been submitted.

00:28:30:11 - 00:28:46:22

Yes. Thank you. That's that's great. I appreciate that. Um, so before we move on to the next agenda item, can I ask if there's any other comments on, um, any of the agenda items? Um, under landscape and visual effects and good design, which anybody wishes to raise. Now, if they'd like to raise their hands.

00:28:52:03 - 00:28:58:16

Okay. Thank you. I can't see any hands. Um, in that case, I will pass on to Mrs. Shawnee, who will deal with item agenda five.

00:29:02:10 - 00:29:19:28

Thank you. Yes. Um, noting the time, but considering we had a break at, um, 40 minutes ago. So if we continue with noise and vibration before we, um, have our lunch break, if that's okay with everyone. Um, I know you're just shuffling seeds, so I'll just wait for.

00:30:00:03 - 00:30:00:20

Get ready when.

00:30:00:22 - 00:30:01:07

You are ready.

00:30:02:03 - 00:30:06:04

Perfect. Would you like to introduce yourself? Um. Where we start?

00:30:06:22 - 00:30:10:19

Yeah. Hi, I'm Matthew Hayden from SP acoustics, and I've been dealing with them because of vibration.

00:30:12:24 - 00:30:13:28

Hello, I'm Lauren Thompson.

00:30:14:09 - 00:30:15:28

Concert manager for the applicant.

00:30:17:13 - 00:30:59:09

Thank you. Okay, moving now to, um, noise and specifically to the item of construction working hours. The Xa Xa is aware that this matter was raised at the last hearings, and also as part of the first round of written questions. I mean, it is noted that we have also representatives here from East Riding of Yorkshire Council today and obviously the applicant. So this should be quite useful to understand and discuss any outstanding concerns with regard to that. And moving to the first question, in terms of, um, section five two of the Outline Code of Construction practice, which is rep 1025 considers the general site operation working hours.

00:30:59:11 - 00:31:32:26

And paragraph 34 states that no activity where significant noise is audible beyond the onshore development area will take place outside of these hours, including Sundays, public holidays or bank holidays. Apart from under the following circumstances. Um, in response to the written question NV11 One. The East Riding of Yorkshire Council raised concerns with this suggested wording in the Outline Code of Construction Practice, and with particular regard to the use of the wording audible and significant noise.

00:31:33:28 - 00:31:46:04

Um, so if we could come to East Riding of Yorkshire County first. My question is, could you explain in more detail your concerns raised as part of your response to this question and how you would like to see this address, please?

00:31:47:23 - 00:32:24:05

Yes. Thank you. Madam Jonathan Smith from the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. I did receive some contact from the applicant very recently to clarify my, um, opinions on this particular point. And yes, I do think the words audible and significant are not particularly useful in this kind of, um, scenario. They're not really, um, enforceable as such. So what I did, I came up with a form of words which suggested that, um, I think no plant or equipment shall be operated between the hours of 7 a.m.

00:32:24:07 - 00:32:56:06

to 7 p.m., Monday to Saturday. And no plant and equipment operating on Sundays or bank holidays unless approved in writing with the local authority. And I think the applicants took this on board and I think they're in agreement with that. I personally feel it's a lot better, um, a form of wording and a lot better way of potentially controlling and minimizing any, uh, loss of residential amenity as to the construction works in this project.

00:32:56:27 - 00:33:15:25

Um, and also, it gives the flexibility that, um, other work activities may still take place outside those hours if required, emergency wise or whatever, that won't have an impact on on residential amenity at all.

00:33:19:09 - 00:33:19:29

Thank you.

00:33:20:14 - 00:33:32:11

Okay. Thank you. And do you. Do you consider the audibles? Should be further explained as part of the Outline Code of construction practice, or considering the amended wording that you're suggesting, would that be sufficient?

00:33:33:00 - 00:34:05:19

I think the amended wording would be sufficient because the problem with audible is that. Who who are you saying is it audible to? Is it ourselves as officers of local authority? Are you saying it's audible to the people that live there? Are you saying it's audible to a representative of the construction company? And similarly with the term significant. How how do you determine significance? There are various British standards available which quantify impacts on residential amenity.

00:34:05:21 - 00:34:27:10

And I feel that the applicants have, um, adequately use these, uh, standards and explanations in their noise assessment, um, as part of the environmental statement. So I think removing the words altogether is probably more helpful than trying to clarify exactly what it means to who, where and when.

00:34:30:03 - 00:34:34:07

Could I have the applicant's response on that? Well, we're just talking about this place.

00:34:36:11 - 00:34:42:10

That I have the applicant. Yes. We're happy to include the wording provided by the ACP.

00:34:53:27 - 00:35:03:01

Thank you. And if I could just go back to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, please. Um, do you consider the mechanisms for consultation with yourselves, provide commencement of works

00:35:04:23 - 00:35:16:16

to be appropriately sufficient in terms of the, um, details provided in the Outline Code of Construction Practice and the requirements for um. Details of requirement 20 of the draft DCO.

00:35:17:21 - 00:35:20:10

Yes, I do, madam. Thank you.

00:35:23:00 - 00:35:23:23

Thank you.

00:35:29:18 - 00:36:08:03

Um, my next question is to the applicants. Um, in paragraph 33 of the Outline Code of Construction Practice, it is stated that construction and construction related traffic movements would generally be within these hours, but there would be some vehicle movement outside these hours on the public highway for vehicles travelling, travelling to and from site relating to mobilisation. Could you just clarify for me what the time frame is that is referred to here and where this is explained? Any if this is

explained anywhere further? And also how is this restricted to ensure it would not generate significant noise levels as stated in paragraph 38?

00:36:14:06 - 00:36:28:01

I can respond on from the noise perspective. So the noise impact assessment is based on traffic data from six in the morning to midnight. So it should include outside of those hours on the on the roads. And that impact assessment found that those effects.

00:36:31:00 - 00:36:36:13

In terms of the applicant the outline code outlined.

00:36:36:15 - 00:36:41:03

Construction traffic management plan also makes reference to sort of mobilization time.

00:36:41:05 - 00:36:42:21

Typically sort of the hour before.

00:36:43:08 - 00:36:44:10

Um where deliveries.

00:36:44:12 - 00:36:45:09

Might occur.

00:36:45:28 - 00:36:49:22

Um, so some further details in the management plan.

00:36:52:28 - 00:37:03:24

Thank you. And in terms of where the vehicles or lorries would wait once they arrive, could I just clarify, would they be waiting within the compound or would that be on the public highway?

00:37:13:09 - 00:37:13:24

Yeah.

00:37:13:26 - 00:37:14:19

And, um.

00:37:15:07 - 00:37:16:17

I feel that's more of a traffic.

00:37:16:23 - 00:37:17:21

Related question.

00:37:17:23 - 00:37:18:23

So it's one we'd.

00:37:18:25 - 00:37:19:10

Have to take away.

00:37:19:12 - 00:37:21:21

We don't have our traffic specialist today.

00:37:22:07 - 00:37:22:22

And

00:37:24:19 - 00:37:28:23

that's fine. Yeah, we could just have that as an action point if you could confirm that.

00:37:37:03 - 00:38:14:07

Continuing with my next question. So it would appear that there's been an agreement now between the applicants and the East Riding of Yorkshire Council in terms of the requirement for a section 61 consent, the Outline Code of Construction Practice has included the wording. The applicants and or principal contractor will consult with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council and agree a process for determining areas where, in advance of construction, core working hours may not be appropriate, and a section 61 consent must be obtained by the principal construction contractor for certain activities.

00:38:14:27 - 00:38:47:21

The East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and the applicants, both considered in their response to the first round of written questions that specific locations for section 61 consent could not be agreed in advance, as a detailed plant and equipment used for the works is not known at this stage. But could that just clarify? Um, how does agree a process for determining areas would be implemented in practice, and how would it be ensured that the local planning authority is able to confirm and agree sensitive locations prior to construction works commencing?

00:38:52:16 - 00:39:18:09

Yeah. Um, I think the CHP, um, says this will be done before the final CHP, but it's definitely in the applicant's interest to do this as early as possible. But as you mentioned, um, to do this effectively, I think we need more detailed construction information. So how much we'd be looking to do it as soon as possible. Once we have that information, we would probably be running a contractor on board, but we'd be happy to work closely with you on this. Um.

00:39:22:15 - 00:39:28:26

So could I just double check? The applicant is proposing to contact the local authority

00:39:30:21 - 00:39:41:24

prior to commencing work on specific locations. Or would that be the other way around? Would the local authority contact the applicant if they have concerns about any specific locations?

00:39:43:20 - 00:40:10:15

The applicant? I think we we don't see contact from historically, but we would we would aim to come back to them as soon as we thought we had sufficient information that would enable us to hopefully agree those positions. And as we said, we it's in our interest to get that agreed as soon as possible

when it gives us more time to respond. We could react to any conditions. They make place as part of section 61, and it gives us more certainty in our construction process, so we're keen to get that done early. We're happy to leave that. But also if you they didn't want to contact us, that's fine.

00:40:13:21 - 00:40:17:13

East Riding of Yorkshire Council, do you have any follow up comments on that?

00:40:17:25 - 00:40:40:15

I think it's appropriate that the applicant and contractors should lead on this. Um, but equally, if we have concerns or are contacted by residents, then yeah, we would like the, the the opportunity to, um, have contacts and discussions as appropriate depending on site location and, um, circumstances. So thank you.

00:40:42:09 - 00:40:55:18

So just as a final question. Can I just confirm you're happy with the wording that is, um, confirm or that is provided in the outline code of construction practice? In terms of the section 61 consent to East of Yorkshire.

00:40:55:25 - 00:40:56:26

Yes. Thank you.

00:40:58:06 - 00:40:58:27

Thank you.

00:41:08:12 - 00:41:30:28

Just as a final question, then to both the applicants and the council, do you consider that there are any outstanding matters in relation to construction working hours, including the suggested section 61 consent, continuous working or out of agreed hours working proposals as detailed in the Outline Code of Construction Practice. Maybe we start with East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

00:41:32:00 - 00:42:04:11

I think it's adequately considered. Um, I dealt with a scheme very similar to this. And, um, every time that working was proposed outside the hours agreed. There were contacts, both the planner that dealt with the application and myself to seek prior approval. And I see that a system very similar to that will work. Um, but again, there may be more sensitive sites where more detailed discussions about construction techniques, use of plant and equipment.

00:42:05:05 - 00:42:13:03

Um, and, you know, along the lines of a section 61 agreement would be more appropriate. But yeah, I'm happy with with what's been proposed. Thank you.

00:42:15:05 - 00:42:21:10

Thank you. And the applicant would like to say any anything further as well. So in.

00:42:21:12 - 00:42:21:27

Terms.

00:42:21:29 - 00:42:22:14

Of.

00:42:22:16 - 00:42:23:01

The applicant.

00:42:23:03 - 00:42:29:27

Yes we agree and we're happy with the wording. And um, I'm confident that we can, um, finish this process in the.

00:42:30:04 - 00:42:30:26

Finalization.

00:42:30:28 - 00:42:33:05

Of the code of construction practice. And we'll make contact.

00:42:33:07 - 00:42:34:06

With East Riding.

00:42:34:08 - 00:42:39:16

To agree in the areas where section 61 concerns will be required, and go through that process well in.

00:42:39:18 - 00:42:40:16

Advance of.

00:42:40:18 - 00:42:41:26

The construction period.

00:42:44:27 - 00:43:15:12

Thank you. And just one last point. Um, obviously, um, with what was said earlier about the, uh, amended wording for the code of construction practice, I wasn't I can't remember if we have this down as an action point already to amend the wording in there in line with what was discussed earlier. Um, yeah. Okay. Perfect. I think that's all for my part then, and I'll hand back to unless anyone has any further comments in relation to noise or can't see any hands.

00:43:15:14 - 00:43:18:02

Okay. I'll hand back to Miss Dowling then.

00:43:20:01 - 00:43:42:21

Thank you very much. I think this would be an appropriate point to take a break for lunch. Uh, the time is now 1313. Um, and I suggest we take a break for around 45 minutes. Um, and just because my maths isn't that brilliant, I suggest, therefore, we come back at 2:00. Um, is that all right with everyone?

00:43:44:25 - 00:43:59:21

Okay, while we're adjourned, can I ask that all the participants turn off their cameras and mute their microphones? Those people watching the live stream will need to refresh their browser when we recommence. This meeting is now adjourned and will be resumed at 2:00. Thank you.