



Planning Inspectorate  
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Sea Link
<b>Hearing:</b>	Transcript of Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 2
<b>Date:</b>	11 November 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.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:08:10 - 00:00:31:28

Welcome back. Can I confirm with the case team that the livestream of this hearing has recommenced? Thank you. So, in the interest of time, I'll have a brief submission from Mr. Marsh's who had their hand up before the break. Um, can I just remind you, you don't need to raise anything that you've already covered in your relevant representation, because we have made all that and seen that. So said Mr. Marsh would like to speak now.

00:00:34:05 - 00:00:38:03

Thank you, madam. Karen McKenzie, representing Southminster Marshes.

00:00:38:10 - 00:01:08:20

Um, I would just like to ask you, um, to re re ask them, Stevens, about the reason for the connection not being closer to grain, bearing in mind that the holistic network design document from 2022 showed a connection to the north of Kent. And when we have asked for our information about the choice of location, um, we have not had a very, very full or reasoned response.

00:01:08:22 - 00:01:09:17

Thank you.

00:01:11:14 - 00:01:20:09

Okay. I think I think Mr. Stevens has answered that. But, um, just for clarity, if the applicant should just respond to that point again, that would be helpful. Thank you.

00:01:22:12 - 00:01:53:26

Um, thank you, ma'am, said Stevens. For the applicant. Um, the needs case for Sealink isn't to take power, um, to the Isle of Grain or indeed close to London in the way um suggested. The needs case for Sealink is specifically to reinforce against a scenario where there is a fault on the existing circuits west of Canterbury North substation. So Sealink, in order to meet its needs, case has to connect either at Canterbury North or eastwards, and this is set out in the strategic options in the Needs Case document.

00:01:56:00 - 00:02:28:26

Thank you very much. so. Due to time constraints, we do now need to move on to the next item on the agenda. We do want to hear your comments though, so please do submit them in writing. As I stated earlier, it would be really useful for us for the applicant to supply a post submission covering all the points they've just made and if that can be submitted at deadline one please. And then for any interested parties to respond to that at deadline one a and as we've stated previously, the examination is a predominantly written process and any submissions given orally are not given any extra weight to those submitted in writing.

00:02:29:27 - 00:02:33:11

I'll now pass over to Mrs. Thomas for the next item on the agenda.

00:02:34:09 - 00:02:35:03

Thank you.

00:02:35:05 - 00:03:00:27

I would like to ask firstly about Friston scenario two, which is where the National Grid substation at Friston in Suffolk is built by National Grid rather than by Scottish Power Renewables. So firstly, can East Suffolk Council tell me if they have received submissions to discharge the requirements for the SPR consented substation for National Grid. Please.

00:03:04:16 - 00:03:38:02

Thank you. Mark Westerman and Smith Casey for East Suffolk Council and both E one North and E two commenced in July of this year with the start of the substation haul Road works having previously discharged the necessary requirements or part requirements related to those works. Prior to that, there were onshore preparation works, but those didn't commence the development given the definition of commencement in those development consent orders.

00:03:38:09 - 00:04:15:28

We are anticipating we know SPR are on the call, so Mr. Ehlers will be able to comment if he takes a different view. But our understanding is that SPR are due to start submitting Writing requirement discharge documents for both projects in relation to the substation, earthworks and permanent substation access. During this month and in the run up to Christmas, we're anticipating about 30 documents need to be submitted, um, under the various requirements.

00:04:16:12 - 00:04:46:11

Um, and there is a 56 day discharge period. That means we anticipate that all of the relevant documents should be discharged by the end of February next year. And our understanding is that SVR have awarded contracts with the substation works and intend for those works to start in March of next year. So that's a position, as we understand it, at East Suffolk Council.

00:04:50:02 - 00:04:52:06

Thank you. That's very helpful.

00:04:54:28 - 00:05:03:12

Um, but, um, the East Anglia, um, representatives want to say anything at this point.

00:05:06:09 - 00:05:47:01

Yes. Uh, and it's on behalf of ScottishPower renewables. And by that I mean also their two subsidiary companies that are the holders of the respective dsos for the offshore wind farm associated development and onshore works, including the overhead line realignment. Uh, first of all, dealing with the discharge. Uh, madam, the position is that, uh, the design of the uh, substations at Kiln Lane is essentially an integrated process, and therefore, it is not surprising that the whole suite of documents will be coming forward in the relatively short order, uh, over the next few weeks.

00:05:47:14 - 00:06:21:01

Um, and that therefore aligns with what the council are anticipating. And as I say, these documents will substantially deal with the design and associated matters in and around the Kiln Lane substations. Um, insofar as the, uh, timings are concerned, um, just to confirm that, yes, the civil works in relation to, uh, the uh, substations have been awarded, as has the main plant and cable works associated.

00:06:21:03 - 00:06:54:12

So all the main contracts, uh, relating to the construction of the East Anglia two substations have been let. And as you'll appreciate, there is a distinction here between the East Anglian two and one. North East Anglia two is a project that has a contract for difference and therefore is proceeding first. Um, there are some works being carried out in relation to East Anglia one North, but they're not the main substantive, um, works with the full works.

00:06:54:14 - 00:07:24:15

So it's just to note that distinction. Um, but in terms of proceeding, the timescales are broadly as set out on behalf of the council. That being the case, there is going to be a lot of information that comes forward. Um, that insofar as, um, Scottish Renewables are concerned, are essentially matters for them and they're discharging authorities, but they obviously bear on and have a relevance to this examination.

00:07:25:00 - 00:07:57:27

But it's really for, as we see it, for the applicant, uh, for this, uh, this DCO to consider these matters and to demonstrate and consider them and identify the relevance to you in relation to the proposals that they're putting forward. And in that respect, we're not so Anticipating that this examination will be a form in which the discharge documents are debated. It's the consequences of the discharge documents for the current proposals being considered for the examination.

00:07:58:03 - 00:08:09:27

Um, and unless you mean we will provide further information and writing to appreciate the relatively tight timescale this morning, but we'll confirm the timings and the updates to you at deadline. One A.

00:08:11:26 - 00:08:31:20

Thank you. That's that's very helpful. Um, so if I've understood correctly, um, the, um, requirements are likely to be discharged shortly and work commencing, um, early next year. Would the applicant like to say anything in response at this point?

00:08:33:22 - 00:08:46:12

Thank thank you, ma'am Sarah Shaikh, for the applicant. I'm going to ask the DCO consents advisor, Ali Leader, um, to make some comments, having heard what's just been said.

00:08:48:00 - 00:09:20:06

Good morning Ali, leader for the applicant. Um, yeah. I mean, we agree with what's been said by our SPR colleagues. National grid is working very closely with SPR on the delivery of Friston substation, and we're confident that delivery of the substation under the SPR consents remains by far the most likely scenario. And we have also been reviewing draft documents for discharge, um, and inputting into those. And we've also been attending SPR consultation events.

00:09:20:08 - 00:09:56:12

Um, on the discharge of those documents. So the two teams are working very close together. Um, on the delivery of of kill nine Preston substation. I think it is worth emphasising, though, that as we are today, at the moment, National Grid does not have the consents and land rights necessary to deliver a Friston Substation and Friston substation is necessary to take the power from Sealink and onshore into Suffolk. So as we are today, that substation is required to be considered.

00:09:56:14 - 00:10:05:03

Um, scenario two is required to be considered and we are expecting both scenarios to be fully examined in this examination.

00:10:06:07 - 00:10:40:25

So, um, I think in your letter, um, of in July 20th 4th of July, following our early questions about this, you said that you would provide a further update in the autumn. Can you please provide that update? Um, at deadline one. Thank you. And can you also in that consider, um, what the justification is for including part of the project that already has consent and, um, whether the examination time that is needed to examine both scenarios is justified.

00:10:41:22 - 00:10:50:07

Um, moving on to. Oh, I think, um, there's a hand up for Suffolk County Council if you'd like to.

00:10:51:24 - 00:10:52:09

Thank you.

00:10:52:11 - 00:10:52:26

Madam.

00:10:52:28 - 00:10:53:13

Thank you.

00:10:53:15 - 00:11:04:26

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Madam, you might not have appreciated because I don't know that anybody will have given you all of the details of the development consent orders for East.

00:11:04:28 - 00:11:38:12

Anglia one North and East Anglia two but on those two development consent orders, the discharging authority is not, uh, in all cases. Uh East Suffolk County Council sorry East Suffolk Council as relevant planning authority. In some cases it is Suffolk County Council as the lead local flood authority, as a drainage authority or as a local highway authority, and also in relation to archaeology matters. Responsibility for that sits with Suffolk rather than with East Suffolk.

00:11:38:14 - 00:11:55:26

So all I was going to say is it would probably help you if our post hearing submissions at deadline one provide you with, as it were, a similar factual update of what the state of play is with the discharge of requirements that are our responsibility in relation to those two projects.

00:11:56:07 - 00:12:06:19

Yes, that would be very helpful. Thank you. And if East Suffolk could also provide the the recent update of what they've just told us, that would be very helpful. Um, so

00:12:08:07 - 00:12:14:13

are there if there are no further questions on that point about or I can see a hand up.

00:12:16:08 - 00:12:18:16

I can't see the the name.

00:12:20:09 - 00:12:27:09

Oh, is it Michael? Michael. Mani. Sorry your name didn't come up. Would you like to say something on this? Briefly?

00:12:27:11 - 00:12:27:26

Yes.

00:12:27:28 - 00:13:00:06

As you. Yes. Very briefly, as you know, um, from our relevant representations and correspondence, this is a matter of very great concern to Freston. I don't understand, and I think it'd be helpful if the applicant and their submissions could explain why the reference to land rights is important in this context. But a particular issue on all of this is that is, there's a discharge of requirements process going on, which relates to the mitigation which has been set out as part of the EA to DCO.

00:13:01:11 - 00:13:38:06

And it is unclear to me what would happen if at some point in the future, um, National Grid takes it upon itself to develop the National Grid substation. And in a circumstance where EA two and EA one might go ahead. And in those circumstances, how will Scottish Power be able to discharge its obligations under its DCO? I think there's huge risk that what has already happened. There is great confusion already over all of this national grid have justified this on different bases.

00:13:38:09 - 00:13:54:03

And I'm really concerned that in a situation where the NSA has a huge amount of work to do, both in Suffolk and in Kent and offshore, the examination of this scenario will be a huge distraction from that when it is fundamentally unnecessary. Thank you.

00:13:54:23 - 00:14:00:00

I see one more hand up, but I will need to move on quite quickly to another matter.

00:14:03:15 - 00:14:36:17

Colin Innes yes, yes, Colin is the path of Scottish pardon. I've just got two matters in response to what the applicant has said. First of all, it's absolutely right that we're working very closely with them in relation to the discharge of our requirements. And generally there's a really good working relationship at the moment, and we're effectively seeking to understand the information, because we've gained

quite a lot of information during the finalised design of powers, substations and the information and that has been transferred to National Grid.

00:14:36:19 - 00:15:17:29

To make sure its consistency. The second point is that at the current time, the applicant does not have the powers to build the National Grid substation that still sits under the East Anglia two DCO and would need to be transferred. Um, that would be um, that is under discussion. Um, and it is anticipated that the processes associated with those will be taken forward in the spring of 2026. And at that point, uh, the um, applicant would be given the benefit of, uh, the, uh, the powers under the, uh, E2 order to construct the substation.

00:15:18:07 - 00:15:43:07

And we've already gained, um, land ownership around that substation, and there will be land transfers associated. It's an all an integrated package. But just to give you the approximate timings that that will be occurring sometime in the spring of 2026, and it may not. May or may not be completed by the time you complete the examination. But that's just to let you know that that is something being contemplated. Thank you.

00:15:43:11 - 00:16:24:26

Thank you. Um, if that could just be confirmed in, um, at deadline one in writing, that would be much appreciated. Thank you. Um, just turning now to Lion Link. The applicant stated in their letter of 1st of September that there was no model yet available for Lion Link for the cumulative visualization images. We are aware that consultation is currently taking place for Lion Link. Can the applicant please update me as to whether that's still the case? That it is not possible to provide a cumulative visualization for the Lion Link Converter station alongside the Sea Link Converter station proposed at Saxmundham.

00:16:27:14 - 00:16:41:25

Thank you ma'am for the applicant. Um, again, I'm going to pass over to, um, Alley leader. Um, who is again the DCO Consensus advisor, and she's supported here by James Buckley, who is the senior project manager.

00:16:43:23 - 00:17:17:07

Thank you, alley leader, for the applicant. Um, so as we explored at the preliminary meeting, NGV and then get our, our separate organizations. But I have liaised with NGV in advance of this hearing. Um, and they're happy for me to share that they're planning to start their statutory consultation in January 2026 until until March 2026. And so at that point, we will expect the publication of their their peer, which will give them a lot give us a lot more information on their project.

00:17:17:26 - 00:17:50:11

And it is currently my understanding, however, that that wouldn't necessarily involve the creation of a 3D model, which is what's required to develop cumulative photo montages. So we're able to create visualizations, of course, of our own project and with the kind permission of SPR, with our project alongside SPR. But we can't build as you will appreciate, a 3D model for Lion Link. So for us to do that would require them to to build that model and to share it with us.

00:17:50:23 - 00:18:03:11

Um, it may be possible for them to, to develop that alongside, um, their processes. We'll, we will go back and ask them. But my current understanding is that's not the plan. Okay.

00:18:03:19 - 00:18:24:23

Thank you for that update. Um, so in the interest of time, it'd be helpful if the applicant could submit their post hearing submissions at deadline one, and interested parties can submit their comments on that at deadline one a thank you. Um, I will now pass on to Mr. Regan for the next item on the agenda.

00:18:30:27 - 00:18:34:02

Sorry, I've just seen. There's a hand up, Mr. Burton.

00:18:39:20 - 00:19:14:14

Thank you. Madam James Burton, on behalf of Suffolk Energy Action Solutions. Very helpful to hear from this leader. Um, something a little firmer about when we might expect the line link consultation to be published. Could I, um, though, ask a question through you, if I if I may, madam? We already heard, of course, from Mr. Stevens. Um, in relation to the extent to which and get for this application is relying on line link for the so-called Suffolk generation group was worse for scenario generation need.

00:19:14:16 - 00:19:50:01

It says Sealink is needed for um um now we'll come back of course, on what he said and I'm not going to prolong that. But do I understand correctly? Just trying to get the timetable clear and when the public will get information that it won't be until January that we hear from National Grid Ventures as to anything it has to say about any need for Sealink by reference to Lion Link in circumstances where.

00:19:50:03 - 00:20:20:29

And now I am going to ask a question also of you, if I may, and your colleagues, as I understand it, we're being encouraged to put in, um, written evidence submissions at deadline one a dealing with what Mr. Stevens has said about lion making its contribution or not to that generation capacity need. And our concern, of course, is that things will become somewhat out of sync as a result.

00:20:22:23 - 00:20:23:17

Thank you.

00:20:23:23 - 00:20:24:19

Thank you.

00:20:24:29 - 00:20:29:23

Um, I believe. Suffolk County Council would also like to say something.

00:20:33:12 - 00:21:03:14

Thank you. Madam. Yes. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, madam. It was simply that we dealt with the first bullet point under agenda item four. And obviously that's where I made my comments about discharge of requirements. You then move to the third bullet point in agenda item



four, which is line link. But you didn't deal with the second bullet point of agenda item four, but you then indicated you were about to move to the next, um, item.

00:21:03:16 - 00:21:23:18

And so I was just anxious. Are you now moving on from agenda item four altogether to agenda item five, or are we still in agenda item four? Because I would certainly urge you to stay in agenda item four, because we did have something we wanted to say on the second bullet point in agenda item four.

00:21:23:29 - 00:21:27:19

Okay. Thank you. Just a moment. I will just check.

00:21:42:13 - 00:21:57:00

Sorry I didn't have that point in front of me. So that the second point was about the need for Friston substation to be included in the DCO, which I did ask about. So, um, well, the applicant replied, on that point.

00:21:57:02 - 00:22:05:22

You did not invite any comments from anybody else on that point, and I would certainly would welcome the opportunity to be so invited.

00:22:06:00 - 00:22:16:25

Okay. If you'd like to say something, obviously we are, I'm afraid, constrained by time. But if you could, if you'd like to say something and you can obviously respond in writing at deadline one a.

00:22:17:07 - 00:22:52:18

Indeed, madam. Thank you madam. Madam, there are two points that we just briefly want to touch on here. Firstly, it is obviously a moving target so far as the state of play, with the Friston proceeding under its own separate development consent orders and therefore whether or not there remains a need for scenario two, we would accept that simply as matters sit today, there is still a case for scenario two to be part of this examination. But from what we've been hearing, we think that that may very well change during the currency of this examination.

00:22:52:20 - 00:23:23:00

And before we get to May 2026 and the end of the examination, and what we would very much appreciate is some clarity from the applicant, probably in their post hearing submissions after today as to how they see that, as it were, the point of as it were, exclusion as to when you can be satisfied that you no longer need to examine scenario two, because I'm afraid we're not clear where that point sits. So we welcome clarity on that.

00:23:23:03 - 00:24:04:24

The second point, and this is probably the more important point, and it also relates to a point raised by Mr. Mahony on behalf of Friston um Parish Council is um it's a critical issue for Suffolk County Council and indeed others, that if scenario two remains as part of this examination, there is a need to ensure a consistency of control documents and requirements and that the applicant shouldn't be able to use scenario two to resign or from what it already knows, can work and can be delivered under scenario one.

00:24:04:26 - 00:24:13:05

And that is an important point we will obviously return to. I think when we talk about control documents, but I wouldn't want that point to be lost in any way. Thank you madam.

00:24:13:16 - 00:24:21:18

Okay. Thank you very much. I see one more hand up. Is that a legacy hand or Mr. Burton? Is it?

00:24:23:18 - 00:24:29:28

Oh, I do apologize. It's a legacy hand. Obviously. I'm waiting here for my questions.

00:24:30:00 - 00:24:37:29

Yeah, that's all right. Thank you. Right. I will, um, now pass to Mr. Regan for the next item on the agenda. Item five.

00:24:39:24 - 00:25:21:22

Thank you. So moving to item five, which is cumulative effects on the agenda. Um, firstly, under this item I would like to discuss with the applicant, if I may, their approach with respect to the assessment of intra projects, cumulative effects and mitigation of those effects. This is to assist in understanding how the accumulation of and interrelationship between effects might affect the environment, economy, or community as a whole. The scope of this discussion today does not mean that we are not aware of and interested on wider examination of cumulative effects issues, but they will take place in a different, more appropriate part of the examination.

00:25:22:21 - 00:25:53:15

After concluding the first part of this agenda item. I'll be handing over to my colleagues who will be posing some specific questions around parts of the applicants into project cumulative assessment, namely relating to shipping and navigation and traffic matters. So firstly, then I'll be identifying an example to hopefully provide some context to the questions I pose. But the issues are common to a certain extent to intra project cumulative effects in both Suffolk and Kent.

00:25:54:18 - 00:26:27:06

So the applicants is chapter three, which is a summary of likely significant effects. Document ref app 087 on pages 18 to 22 sets out cumulative intra projects effects for Suffolk, and I note that that document has the same issue in play on page 40 with respect to Kent. So at this stage, please can I ask the applicant just to show. Page 18 of app 087 please.

00:26:33:13 - 00:26:34:22

Is that available?

00:26:37:10 - 00:26:39:12

So yes that is being put up.

00:26:39:21 - 00:26:42:11

Thank you. Page 18 please.

00:26:56:12 - 00:27:32:06

So with regards to what we're looking at on the screen there, it's obviously identifies significant adverse intra project's cumulative effects resulting from effects on noise, traffic, transport and visual amenity amongst others. The first thing I note from looking at that page is that the significant significance of effect has been stated as significant adverse. So please can I ask the applicants to explain if it is the case that these could be the moderate or major adverse effects, as is the case indicated elsewhere in that table, please?

00:27:35:03 - 00:27:45:04

Check for the applicant. Yes. We have got Mr. Nigel Pilkington here to help on this. He's the lead EIA coordinator. So if I can pass over to him, please.

00:27:45:06 - 00:27:45:28

Thank you.

00:27:47:25 - 00:27:54:25

And Nigel Pilkington for the applicant. Um, the reason that this differs from other parts of the table is typically.

00:27:54:27 - 00:27:56:05

In in.

00:27:56:10 - 00:28:00:21

Assessing intra project cumulative effects, we're looking at the potential for.

00:28:00:23 - 00:28:35:25

A significant, um, cumulative effect. We're not We don't typically go into gradations of effect. So what we're looking at here is, uh, I think in all situations we're looking at a moderate major, um, visual effect, uh, combining with and I should say that intra project is sometimes called combined effects. What we're looking at here is the, um, the combined effects of those visual effects with, um, in every other instance, what we've considered to be minor, um, effects.

00:28:35:27 - 00:29:07:18

So your traffic and transport, noise, health and well-being, these are minor effects. Um, it isn't the case that we, um, it isn't the case that we can sort of add these topics together in any sort of quantifiable way. Um, so it's, it probably not particularly appropriate to try and provide a gradation between, um, a moderate and a major cumulative combined effect.

00:29:07:23 - 00:29:17:19

So what we what we're identifying is for the purposes of environmental impact assessment, is that we do believe there is a potential for a significant effect.

00:29:20:21 - 00:29:54:24

Understood. I mean, I suppose my point on this is really as follows. In the absence of quantifying the level of that adverse effect, how is it then, that you suggest a Secretary of State can reach a reason? Conclusion of the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment. And I'm just

mindful of the content of the EIA regs in that respect. How is it that you consider the Secretary of State should consider the level of that adverse effects in the absence of any further detail?

00:29:56:19 - 00:30:04:26

I think what Nigel Pilkington, for the applicant, what I would say is that the EIA regs don't don't demand that we identify a

00:30:06:26 - 00:31:23:26

difference between a moderate and a major effect. What it what it demands is that we identify likely significant effects, which is which is what we believe we've done. We're saying this is a likely significant effect. Um, and in terms to your point about quantification, and I can see there's a subtle difference here between what I'm talking about in terms of quantification, which is you can't add you can't actually add noise to, um, traffic disruption to visual amenity impacts. It's not possible to add those together, but quantification in terms of trying to provide, um, a granularity in the significance of an effect, I think is what the point that, uh, that you're getting to, um, I, you know, I can understand that it may be helpful to the Secretary of State to understand, uh, if it were possible, um, whether those effects are major or moderate, but we are limited by, um, you know, by what we can reasonably do and stand behind in terms of saying whether something is a moderate or a major when actually it's, uh, it's derived from a number of topic experts working together, uh, to to come up with an on balance professional judgment between topics.

00:31:23:28 - 00:31:42:11

So I think pinpointing it as moderate or major, um, would be a challenge and would be, um, to to some extent, I'm not convinced it would be much more helpful than saying there is a potential for a significant effect, which is what the EIA regs require us to, to identify.

00:31:43:10 - 00:32:19:06

Okay. Um, I don't think we're going to get much further on this, but I obviously look forward to seeing seeing what you submit in writing on that point. But fundamentally, I think we could do with some help, really, with regards to how you suggest that those effects are considered in any planning balance in terms of the level of significance. Um, I'll move on for now, but thank you. Um, so staying on the same page there, it's also suggests that in terms of the mitigation of those potentially significant impacts, it states that no mitigation has been confirmed at this stage.

00:32:19:29 - 00:32:31:22

Um, please can the applicant explain what we should take from that particular description and explain their intention with regards to mitigating those effects and outline their approach, please. Thank you.

00:32:33:28 - 00:33:06:00

Nigel Pilkington for the applicant. So the issue we have here is that, as I've explained before, we're dealing with an already significant visual effect. That's, that's that's, um, consistent between the effects that we've reported here. So if we're reporting a significant visual effect, um, we will have already mitigated that individual effect as far as reasonably practicable. We obviously don't want to be reporting significant effects we've reported.

00:33:06:12 - 00:33:38:05

We've mitigated it as far as possible. So that's to some extent that individual effect is now static. Um, so what we're left with is the contributing minor effects, which are typically noise and, and you know, traffic disruption and what have you. So they're the effects that we're looking at. And in EIA terms and as a practice in EIA, we're not usually in a position of having to try to mitigate further what are minor effects. So they're not significant effects.

00:33:39:00 - 00:34:10:23

Um, so what we uh, our view is that there may be, uh, there may not be, but there may be ways in which they can be mitigated further, but it's almost certainly going to require a substantial amount of detail from a contractor in terms of exactly what they're planning to do pretty much on a week by week basis, for us to be able to consider how we may be able to mitigate those potentially significant cumulative effects further.

00:34:11:10 - 00:34:58:06

Um, so that's that that's what the reason why what probably that should have said is there's no mitigation is additional mitigation has been identified. Because what I would say and if I could ask my colleague to bring up, um, the, uh, Construction Environmental Management plan, appendix B, uh Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments is really just to identify that there are that's come up. There are already mitigation measures in which we believe, um, which we're not able to use at the moment to moderate or modify our view on whether these effects are significant or not, but we believe in time will help.

00:34:58:11 - 00:35:29:10

So an example being JG 27, which is community liaison. And this is a commitment to um, to make, uh, liaising with the local community and local businesses throughout construction, um, identifying uh, periods of noisy activities, um, heavy traffic, uh, start and end dates of phasing because to some extent, uh, a lack of knowledge about how long an effect is going to last or so it can be part of the problem.

00:35:29:12 - 00:36:03:26

Knowing that it's only going to last a couple of weeks is better than obviously better than not knowing when it's going to stop. So but a key part of this, uh, mitigation measure is also that, um, there will be a contact number, there will be liaison, and there will be a contact number so that members of the public can raise any concerns. So if there are particular contributing factors that are apparent at that time, um, that, that are tipping things over it, you know, particular times of the week or what, whatever that might be, that there is a mechanism there for people to raise those concerns.

00:36:03:28 - 00:36:38:09

And I do understand that that that it's reactive and it's dynamic, but there will be the opportunity there for people to raise and those concerns. And there is a commitment there to, uh, to logging those to, to, to demonstrating how they've been responded to. And if obviously we're going to be in that community for a number of years, we want to be working with the community, uh, and we will be looking at any opportunities to further reduce those, those cumulative effects through, um, through that process.

00:36:38:26 - 00:36:45:10

We also, if I can ask my colleague to bring up the construction traffic management plan for Suffolk.

00:36:48:04 - 00:37:24:26

Uh, so this is, um, on page 40. Um, they see construction, traffic management and travel plan for Suffolk, I should say. Uh, and another another aspect is, is bringing in this role of a transport coordinator, uh, which is vital to this. And you'll see from the measures that are listed. Um, it's so that the this coordinator will be identifying, um, successful measures, areas for improvement, uh, promoting the tmp tpi with the construction team and, and staff, um, monitoring the traffic.

00:37:25:10 - 00:37:56:14

HGV, for example, are only using the routes that we've identified. Um, looking at the timings of HGV arrivals and departures. So there's various things in there. The other aspect that I would say with this is we know already that both, um, Sizewell C and SPR have transport coordinators in place, and those transport coordinators are coordinating together. So this is something that we would we would, we would plan to to do as well.

00:37:58:14 - 00:38:33:20

Um, obviously straying into into a project there. But the reason I mention this is that traffic is actually contributes to at least two of the contributing impacts. So traffic noise and traffic disruption, which is the severance and what have you. So given that it's two usually of the three topics impacts that are contributing to inter project cumulative effects, addressing the traffic is is a key way that we will be able to further mitigate, um, those cumulative intra project cumulative effects.

00:38:34:06 - 00:39:14:09

That's all understood. And um, I suppose without wishing to go down the kind of traffic specific things which we're going to have some time for further down the agenda, I think, again, my point is this really, you did talk about the specific causes of those toxic effects being mitigated separately. Um, but my point would be this really, I think that we'd appreciate some help, really, with regards to what your position is in terms of whether that cumulative effect, when it's considered not on a topic by topic basis, could be addressed with some wider form of mitigation or compensatory mitigation.

00:39:14:11 - 00:39:48:12

Um, that's perhaps one best dealt with, uh, the next written deadline, please. Because, um, yeah, again, I'm just mindful of the, um, IP environmental impact assessment regulations. Um, and the requirements are with regards to avoiding, preventing, reducing or offsetting any identified significant adverse effects on the environment. Um, again, I think we'd like some help really with regards to how your particular, um, submitted information achieves that.

00:39:48:20 - 00:40:00:12

Um, I know that we need to keep on track of, uh, what's quite a quite tight deadline, but, um, there is one raised hand. Um, is it David Mackay? You've got a hand there, please.

00:40:00:28 - 00:40:19:26

Yes. Thank you sir. I'm reassured by some of these questions you've been asking, but I wonder if I could. I should say I'm an Aldeburgh resident, and I'm speaking in a private capacity unrelated to any of the roles from which I am retired. What I what concerns me about the

00:40:21:12 - 00:41:00:21

process you've been discussing with the applicant is the validity of the seed corn, the basic evaluations that are made that then give rise to what are superficially convincing conclusions. I will just give you one. I'll just give you one example and then I'll shut up. The one example I give you, unsurprisingly, from Aldeburgh, which is the Aldeburgh roundabout, the Aldeburgh roundabout, following the Scottish Power process, was judged by, as it were, your former colleagues, in the following words.

00:41:01:15 - 00:41:37:10

The proposed development will have adverse transport and traffic impacts during construction, particularly during transport of Ale and in respect of HGV on the A1094 and at Aldeburgh. Against that background and before one, a motorbike from Sealink moves forward. One moves to look at the evaluations that are being discussed and one finds that that roundabout scores, I think nine negligible.

00:41:37:25 - 00:42:04:07

And that does suggest that I would. I respectfully submit that the in situation were unfortunately cross examinations not available. I do respectfully suggest that the inspectors look very closely at the underlying evaluations before reaching views about the conclusions that have then been drawn from that. Thank you for your time.

00:42:05:07 - 00:42:35:10

Thank you for that, and would be grateful if you could put that in writing and submit that at the appropriate deadline. And obviously, that would be a way for the applicant to respond to that. Um, I'm just aware that we've got a lot of the agenda still to get through, but there are two raised hands. If I could ask for some very, very brief submissions, if I may, just so that we can get through all of the items that we need to on the agenda. Um, Minister, Marcia's first, please. Just briefly.

00:42:38:20 - 00:43:02:02

Thank you. Um, we believe that electromagnetic interference in relationship to the consented application to develop Manston Airport was not included in app 87. We would request, please, is it possible for the inspectors to request an investigation into this and a response from the applicant? Thank you.

00:43:05:08 - 00:43:20:18

Okay. If you again, if you could submit that request in writing at the appropriate deadline. That would be helpful. Um, Mr. Burton, is there anything briefly you wish to raise on this item before we continue the discussion on cumulative effects? Thank you.

00:43:21:20 - 00:44:03:09

Yes, please. Thank you, sir James Burton, on behalf of Suffolk Energy Action Solutions. Um, yes, it's a question. Um, and it comes with a foundation. The question is have I we correctly understood, based on what Mr. Pilkington has just told you in answer to your question, sir, that the way that the applicant has approached, uh, mitigation, um, anxiously or perhaps otherwise has depended, um, in terms of these intra project cumulative effects on whether or not it regards, um, an impact as of minor significance or otherwise.

00:44:03:11 - 00:44:25:01

And my understanding from what this hooked into said is that, if minor, it has been less anxious as regards mitigation. Now, I raised this, of course, specifically, um, given what you've just discussed as regards transport, not limited to that, of course, but as regards transport, where as you'll be aware, sir, and your colleagues will be aware, um,

00:44:26:20 - 00:44:58:07

um, turned to and obtained from specialist transport consultants. So this may well very much a matter for you, especially as transport consultants. DGA, um, quite a rigorous analysis of of what has and hasn't been done here. And so is relevant representation, of course, sets out a failure to assess by way of the full transport assessment, with some very serious impacts that are actually uncovered when one does the work properly.

00:44:58:10 - 00:45:06:07

I won't regurgitate that. You've seen it. It's all there. I know you're aware of it, but that's where the question ultimately springs from. Thank you sir.

00:45:08:07 - 00:45:21:21

Thank you for that. And I think due to the need to keep on track with regards to times today, that's perhaps one, um, that we can look at in a written format. The next deadline, please. Um.

00:45:23:28 - 00:45:38:28

I think that I've covered everything that I've got time to at this particular stage. I know that the first part of that agenda item. So I'm now going to hand over to my colleague, Mrs. Thomas, who's going to pick up on the next part of this agenda. Thank you.

00:45:39:21 - 00:46:10:27

Thank you. So following. Following on from Mr. Regan's comments in relation to inter project cumulative effects, an example where the essay needs some additional information is with regard to shipping and navigation. So the applicant set out the cumulative effects for the offshore project in part for marine chapter 11 into project Cumulative effects, which is app zero eight for table 11, 23 for shipping and navigation.

00:46:10:29 - 00:46:53:03

It concludes that there is no significant cumulative effect in relation to the reduction in under kill clearance. I'm trying to understand the reasoning behind this, as there is very limited explanation in the offshore into Project Cumulative Effects chapter. Um, and I'm, I am just focusing on one particular point today. Um, in the other. Sea users part four, chapter nine app 082, paragraph 9.92. It states that where burial cannot be achieved, rock backfill or external protection may be required by the soil or rock conditions are too hard to achieve effective burial or third party assets across the route.

00:46:53:11 - 00:47:24:29

Expected areas of rock backfill are located between km point or KP 38 to KP 58 and KP 81.5 to KP 96.5. So my question is, does this mean that in the sunk and other areas that are important to shipping, there is potential for cables not to be buried and external protection will be needed, particularly where they are then crossing other cables.



00:47:25:01 - 00:47:30:07

Can the applicant just explain what is meant, please.

00:47:31:17 - 00:47:59:06

Thank you, ma'am. Sarah Shaikh for the applicant. Yes, ma'am. We do have, um, relevant experts to address this. We have got Natalie Hurst, who is the lead marine consents officer. Um, and we also have supporting her, Andrew Holmwood, who is the senior marine project officer. And we have got Mark Anderson, who's a lead shipping and navigation consultant. So I'll ask Natalie Hurst to address this first please.

00:48:02:00 - 00:48:35:02

Good morning. Thank you. Thank you. Hurst, for the applicant. Um, I'll start by, if I may, summarizing the three key topics which broadly encompass this question. Um, and then I may refer to more specific answers we have provided to the work protection backfill query for 1.02. So in summary, three key topics need to be taken into consideration when looking at the cumulative effects and implications of cable burial depth for under kill clearance.

00:48:35:04 - 00:48:46:00

These are stakeholder engagement, geographical extent of the issue and finally implications of the implication. Conclusions. Due to the technical nature of this question and following.

00:48:46:15 - 00:49:05:18

I'm going to interrupt you because I just asked one specific question and we are really limited for time. I'm sorry to interrupt you, but so it was just is there potential in the sunk for cables not to be buried and external protection needed, particularly where they are crossing other cables?

00:49:07:07 - 00:49:18:27

If I could hand over to our shipping and navigation lead, Mark Andersen. And also note, we're happy to provide a full technical note following this question with further detail required.

00:49:19:01 - 00:49:21:15

Thank you. I'm sorry to interrupt.

00:49:23:13 - 00:49:37:08

Andrew Homewood for the applicant. In the sunk region, the primary means of cable protection is by lowering. And so we don't anticipate, um, any rock protection above sea level. Seabed level.

00:49:39:08 - 00:49:42:08

Primary means is by lowering the cable beneath the seabed.

00:49:43:23 - 00:50:07:15

Okay. So how does that then correlate with what it says in paragraph 9.9.2? Um, where it says rock backfill or external protection may be needed. I just I just want to understand and I'm not trying to be difficult, but I just, I just need to understand whether that those two things correlate.

00:50:08:08 - 00:50:46:09

Andrew Homewood for the applicant, the the rock backfill referenced in that section of the document, I think refers to rock backfill within the trench and therefore primary means by lowering. And then in certain areas, the high risk areas where it's heavily trafficked. The intention is to place rock backfill in the trench to 80% of the height of the trench, which is below sea bed level. And then, of course, in any locations where we are crossing other assets, there may be the requirement for a. If we are the crossing party to install a rock protection berm is the only other case where we might construct a structure above seabed level.

00:50:46:13 - 00:50:59:29

Okay, so that needs to then be taken into consideration in the cumulative effects, which I don't think at the moment it is. So that is something we would want addressed. Um,

00:51:01:25 - 00:51:02:14

so

00:51:04:11 - 00:51:12:19

okay with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency like to make any comment on on these what we've discussed. Yes.

00:51:12:21 - 00:51:53:07

Thank you ma'am. Helen Croxton from the Maritime and Coastguard Agency. So yes, because of the um, the complexity City of the area that were in question. Here. It's very busy with converging marine traffic heading in and out of the busiest ports in the UK. It's highly constrained area, dense maritime traffic, challenging environmental conditions, specialist pilot boarding arrangements going on and the presence of deep draught vessels potentially up to 20m in the future. So the NCA would be seeking to ensure that the cable is sufficiently buried and we support the ports in the request for up to 22m from chart datum.

00:51:53:09 - 00:51:58:25

And we would also like to see this secured through the development consent order. Thank you.

00:52:00:07 - 00:52:20:12

Thank you. Um, I would I don't want to spend too much time on this today, but I would like, um, both the applicant and the, um, and the MCA and other, um, stakeholders to provide information on the existing um

00:52:21:27 - 00:52:52:11

um depth below chart datum in those key areas, and how they may be affected by cable crossings and any other protections in terms of reducing, um, under kill clearance. And could you also give consideration to whether there are adequate controls in the draft development consent order. Um deemed marine licence on under kill clearance. So I think condition 12 three deals with it during maintenance.

00:52:52:13 - 00:53:39:05

But there is I have not been able to say, well perhaps you could point me towards a similar control for construction and also, um, whether the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, um, would want to be a consultant for such conditions. Um, I also wanted to raise another point, but in the interest of efficient use of time. I will raise this as an action point. It seems that some ports have not been consulted on the navigational risk assessment app 2003 for example Medway Port Tilbury and London Gateway Port and I would like the applicant to address how they will deal with need for additional consultations.

00:53:39:23 - 00:53:49:27

Um, I see we have some hands up. Can I take DM first? David Mackey, is that. Or is it a legacy hand?

00:53:52:18 - 00:53:54:17

I think you spoke on the previous item.

00:53:56:13 - 00:53:57:20

I apologize.

00:53:57:26 - 00:54:02:17

Okay, so, um, can I go to Francis Tyrrell, please?

00:54:04:00 - 00:54:40:14

Ma'am. Thank you. I wasn't sure ID be coming to the ports to speak or not. I'm Frank Marshall Goddard, on behalf of London Gateway Port. Um, I appreciate that. Time is pressing. With the length of this agenda. Um, so I won't go into the detail of the London gateway's position on many things. I just want to make a couple of points. One, um, this agenda item is under the heading of cumulative impacts, I think. And I expect you will appreciate this already. But one important thing to appreciate is that the ports concerns and the impacts about depth, um, are a direct effect of this scheme.

00:54:40:16 - 00:55:11:03

So they're not only a cumulative concern. So work number six specifically. And as I think I've said at the preliminary meeting, London Gateway Port has no no other concern about this project apart from work. Number six. Um, it in itself has the impacts that we're concerned about. Um, in itself needs to be mitigated. Um, and that's in relation to both a requirement as to depth, but also some input into the methodology of how it's constructed. Um, so that's the first point I just wanted to make.

00:55:11:05 - 00:55:47:10

Uh, secondly, um, and I should add, there is also then an additional cumulative effect in terms of this point of cable crossings and how that fits with the other schemes such as five estuaries and North Falls. But um, there is that base effect, even the absence of those projects. Secondly, I just wanted to mention, and you have touched on it already, and I think this just I wanted to raise it now to see if we should expect any more documents to become be forthcoming from the applicant. Um, there are various statements, for example, in the project description as 94 and elsewhere.

00:55:47:12 - 00:56:19:00

Have you alighted on, um, in terms of how things will be in depth in 5% here and 5% there, if we look there in the actual documents, the DCO, uh, the current version being a s 88, um, that DCO itself or in the D marine licence, which is uh, schedule 16 to that document. Um, we see nothing at all about

these sort of base assumptions as to how things will be done. So it'll be useful to understand how they're to be secured.

00:56:19:05 - 00:56:52:11

And in particular, the steam room license does reference a number of plans. And I'm just wondering if we would expect to see any plans to be forthcoming soon so that we can take into account what they're saying. In particular, there's the cable laying and burial plan. Now, to my knowledge, that doesn't yet exist, either in its complete form or in an outline version. Uh, there's the cable protection plan again. I haven't seen that either in its complete form or outline version. There is an outline navigation installation plan, but I don't think that's going to be addressing the issues we're concerned about, about depth.

00:56:52:13 - 00:57:50:16

And there is a cable specification installation plan. And again we haven't seen that in detail or its outline form. If the answer is to be don't worry, these things will be dealt with in those plans, then it is important that we see those and yourself more importantly, see those as soon as possible. Um, so those are the main points. I mean, it was useful to give a heads up. I think. Has it been highlighted? London Gate Report will be requesting that a requirement to be included in the DCO to ensure that future dredging of the sunk area to 22m below chart datum is possible, but future dredging of the north east spit area to 15m below chart datum is possible, and that London Gateway port, either via conditions on marine licence or by protective provisions, have an approval right of the relevant bits or the relevant plans that are just referenced in the marine licence that relate to the way that cables are going to be laid in this area.

00:57:50:24 - 00:58:16:09

Um, we will explain in our written reps why it is important, and the fact that that gateway vessels bound for gateway can be cannot really be interrupted for more than a certain period of time otherwise. Essentially, vegetables in supermarkets run out. So we'll go into explain why we need to have that say. We're not just trying to be nosy and get involved in things. We don't need to. Thank you, ma'am. That's all I want to do. My head's up.

00:58:17:01 - 00:58:35:03

Thank you. Um. And just very. We. I think we've got time just for one more speaker. So, um, Miss Fowler, briefly, I'm sorry to to make it brief. Obviously, there will be the opportunity to submit written comments at deadline. One a thank you.

00:58:35:18 - 00:58:38:27

Mrs. Vicki Fowler, on behalf of the Port of London Authority.

00:58:38:29 - 00:58:40:17

And I don't plan.

00:58:40:19 - 00:59:12:09

To repeat what Mr. Tyrrell has said, but but just to make one point very clear, when we talk about concern with Underhill and Ference, but what we're concerned about is the safeguarding of future debts. Um, so and as with as Mr. Cheryl, um, referenced effectively, we would be looking for a

requirement. Effectively to preserve that ability to dredge to particular depths. So in some respects, what the existing depth is.

00:59:12:21 - 00:59:28:27

Um, obviously it's important, but but it's more about we need to be able to dredge, um, certain parts, um, within the channels to make sure that the future bigger vessels can actually access the ports. The just that point of clarity. Thank you.

00:59:28:29 - 00:59:30:04

Thank you very much.

00:59:32:00 - 00:59:35:09

If there's no further hand up, um,

00:59:37:06 - 00:59:57:09

I will just, um, summarize that we request a thorough review of the cumulative impact assessment for shipping and navigation with more information on the possible worst case scenarios. Um, in terms of navigable depths in important shipping systems. Um.

00:59:59:28 - 01:00:15:00

Thank you. So if the applicant could submit the post hearing submissions at deadline one, and interested parties can submit their comments on that at deadline one. A I will now pass to my colleague, Mr. Rennie, who will be covering the next part of the agenda.

01:00:17:18 - 01:00:54:21

Good afternoon. Um, yes. Firstly, um, as the applicant would be aware, there is substantial concern about potential cumulative traffic impacts. We heard much about this last week in the Suffolk open floor hearings, for example. It is also a concern for some groups and organizations, such as Suffolk County Council. Um, Suffolk County Council themselves stated in their relevant representation that there is a lack of cumulative assessment regarding the impacts of traffic from these projects, and with the applicant presuming that previous projects have mitigated their harm.

01:00:54:23 - 01:01:38:19

The Council does not concur with this. Um within the documents for both Suffolk and Kent. The onshore scheme into project cumulative effects. The applicant has set out the cumulative effect assessment for traffic and transport. It is frequently concluded when considering the cumulative effect of the proposed development, with other large developments such as Sizewell C, for example, that as the effect of each individual development is either negligible or minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, the applicant considers it likely that the overall cumulative effect would not be significant or would be not significant.

01:01:39:06 - 01:01:55:25

My question is, how can the applicant be so sure that the peak times and constructions would not overlap? This is given that the national grid is not in control of all these other developments, which could potentially construct faster or slower potentially than anticipated, thus for the applicant.

01:01:57:15 - 01:02:14:16

So The. Thank you, Sarah Shaikh, for the applicant. So I'm going to ask, um, Mr. Jeremy Dorsey, who's our transport planning lead, to address that specific question. And he is also supported here by Chris Bolton, who's a transport planner.

01:02:15:10 - 01:02:15:29

Thank you.

01:02:16:19 - 01:02:17:04

Good morning.

01:02:17:06 - 01:02:17:21

Jeremy.

01:02:17:23 - 01:02:19:23

Dortch for the applicant. Um, yes.

01:02:19:25 - 01:02:20:11

You're quite.

01:02:20:13 - 01:02:21:18

Correct. We've assessed.

01:02:21:20 - 01:02:22:05

The.

01:02:22:10 - 01:02:23:29

Cumulative impact on.

01:02:24:01 - 01:02:25:03

Traffic and transport.

01:02:25:05 - 01:02:25:20

And.

01:02:25:22 - 01:02:26:07

The conclusion is.

01:02:26:09 - 01:02:27:29

No significant effects.

01:02:28:16 - 01:02:29:19

Um, in terms of.

01:02:29:21 - 01:02:31:17

Your question around scheme overlapping.

01:02:31:19 - 01:03:14:15

Where it's in each applicant's interest to make sure we work to a programme, it's efficiency and delivery and need bases that we've heard earlier. So, you know, we're all looking to do that and to to work efficiently. Um, as you're also aware, sir, the cumulative schemes, um, the peak traffic generation is at different times within when we've been the period of the projects, so there's no overlapping in terms of peak construction. However, we have done a very worst case sensitivity test whereby we've looked at what happens if in a very unlikely basis, that the schemes overlap in terms of peak construction.

01:03:14:17 - 01:03:18:28

And again, the conclusion is there's no significant impact.

01:03:24:15 - 01:03:26:10

Okay. Thank you. Um.

01:03:30:08 - 01:03:30:23

So.

01:03:33:12 - 01:03:37:22

You've mentioned about I think there's the um.

01:03:40:08 - 01:03:56:26

You mentioned about the other peak times for the other projects. Um, and you've mentioned about the sensitivity test as well. But, um, in terms of when these peak construction times are, how have you assessed that information? Has that come from the other developers, and also how up to date with those figures be.

01:03:58:11 - 01:04:29:27

Showing out for the applicant. Um, obviously in terms of Sealink, that's down to experience. Um, previous experience on very similar projects and our national grid. Looking at programme for construction, traffic and delivery in terms of the third party schemes. Um, let's take for example Sealink and the windfarms. They are based on their ES chapters. Um, looking at the peak of their construction impact and obviously their programmes.

01:04:30:00 - 01:04:52:28

And with regard to line link, for example. Um, this given similar similarities with regards to Sealink um and the, the project is programmed about two years after Sealink. But again we've, we've used a similar, um, assessment to Sealink or line link, given the similarities and nothing else um available at this point in time.

01:04:53:00 - 01:04:54:22

Did that come from? Yes.

01:04:56:10 - 01:05:33:03

Okay. And in terms of sort of overlapping peaks, as we were mentioning before, um, isn't it a bit overly simplistic to focus on the peak, if you like, of another project and when that's anticipated to occur? What I'm thinking about is, for example, could there be other times of high construction traffic levels at different years for other identified projects, which might not be the actual peak, but could still be at a high level that could cause potential for significant traffic impacts in cumulation with ceiling's construction traffic profile.

01:05:35:20 - 01:06:06:09

Jeremy. Doubts for the applicant. And we've very much looked at this sort of worst case on worst case. So everything. Yeah. Is the sort of peak traffic levels. Um, and as I reiterate with, with everything overlapping, um, the conclusion is there's no significant impact. And just to help use a deadline one, there would be a very detailed report about cumulative traffic and transport, which looks at a range of scenarios and sets. It sets basically all out and how we've delivered those conclusions.

01:06:07:04 - 01:06:26:14

That's that's good to hear actually. Um, the following, um, it's comments about the cumulative traffic assessment. Can I just bring in Suffolk County Council please. Um, and I'd just like to ask what you would expect to see as part of a robust traffic cumulative effects assessment over and above what the applicant has submitted so far.

01:06:28:16 - 01:06:59:17

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, sir. Um, two two initial points. Uh, in relation to that, first, we do have outstanding concerns about the adequacy of the applicant's approach to cumulative, uh, traffic assessment. We're proposing to set out the detail of those concerns in the Local Impact report, which comes in at deadline one. Um. Having said that, in relation to that last answer, obviously if we're to receive.

01:06:59:19 - 01:07:41:17

New information from the applicant, but that only comes in at deadline one, then obviously that won't be captured in what we say in the local impact report. And so I'm afraid there'll be a little bit of a ping pong of successive, um, comments on that. Uh, then the second, uh, matter, which is, I think probably related to more particularly to a direct answer to your question, if I could bring in Mr.. Steve Mary, who is the highways transport manager for Suffolk, to give you, at least in a thumbnail sense, uh, the headlines of what he would be expecting to see in an assessment which he's obviously not yet satisfied that he has seen in the applicant's assessment.

01:07:41:19 - 01:07:45:05

So if I'll ask Mr. Mary if he could comment on that, please.

01:07:45:15 - 01:07:46:06

Thank you.

01:07:46:26 - 01:08:29:16

Good morning, madam. Steve Mary from Suffolk County Council. Uh, I would actually, in the first instance, dare the panel to, uh, peer statutory consultation response. Paragraph 8.3 will make this available as part of our deadline. One submission where we were asking for a sensitivity test as a



minimum on the A12 between seven hills and the the main part of the site. So Oxford, that's the main part of it. Um, we would be looking for some realistic, uh, worst case Rochdale envelope scenario for the intra project, uh, impact.

01:08:29:22 - 01:09:05:21

I would steer the, the panel to there's some information in the Scottish Power examination. So for example, I would challenge some of the comments made about, um, there not being peaks overlaid on top of each other. The the Scottish Power um HGV numbers. They have a peak at the beginning when the whole road is built and the peak at the bottom at the end of it when the whole haul road is removed. So clearly with the time scale of that project, there is a possibility that the removal of the Scottish Power Haul road will be at, at or close to one of the peaks for Sealink.

01:09:05:23 - 01:09:31:03

Bear in mind it does fluctuate. Um, so slightly concerned, I'll go into too much detail. There are a couple of other points I'd quickly make. Is that, um, it's not just ATVs. We're also interested in abnormal loads. And we do note that the applicant is not considered any of the structures between a port of origin and destination, only those within the study area. And also we will pick it up in a,

01:09:32:28 - 01:10:08:17

um, local impact report. Some of the sensitivities we would also be challenging, and one particularly that springs to mind is the sensitivity in terms of delay is that for. To have any magnitude. So it's actually magnitude not severity but have any magnitude 1 or 2 arms of a junction needs to be impacted. Now typically on the A12 which is the major conduit. Um we have a straight through A12 and 1 or 2 minor junctions. In that case, the delays for that minor arm are completely disregarded.

01:10:08:19 - 01:10:29:12

And that is a key concern partly because of the delays, but also safety. It does increase the risk of people jumping and the, the uh, there's a gaps. So I think we will elaborate on this in great deal of detail in our issue, specifically in our local impact report response. But I'm happy to take any questions you have.

01:10:30:17 - 01:10:50:02

No. Then that sounds that sounds good. Thanks for the contribution. Um, and as you said, if you could put that in the local impact report or, and right in any way, that would be very useful. Um, just. Can I just check if anyone is here from National Highways if they want to have any comments about their cumulative impact. Maybe to do the A12.

01:10:52:21 - 01:11:14:17

Down here. That's fine. Um, I didn't think there was. Um, so if I could just return. Uh, to the applicant. Um, just one last question. Really? Um, can I just ask why the application was supported by a transport assessment notes for Suffolk and Kent and not a transport appraisal. Keeping in mind the requirements of MPs in one.

01:11:16:10 - 01:11:55:28

Jeremy Dash for the applicant. Um, thank you for the comments so far, which will obviously take on board and address, um, appropriately. Um, in regard to your point there. We carried out a very

extensive scoping exercise with all the authorities. And therefore, you know, we've engaged with them closely and followed, um, an agreed route. And also just on that we met in person with Suffolk in early August, whereby we discussed this. Supplementary quantitative assessment note for deadline one and um agreed some, some certain um items that we needed to include in that.

01:11:56:00 - 01:12:00:25

So yeah, you'll be we'll be delivering that um, in timely fashion.

01:12:02:06 - 01:12:21:13

Okay. Thank you. Um, so, um, as I understand it from the applicant, then we are to expect a submission at deadline. One with more detailed, um, assessment of cumulative, uh, traffic effects, particularly for construction for the construction phase. Is that correct?

01:12:21:24 - 01:12:30:28

Yes. Sorry for the applicant. So yes. That's correct. It's not going to be new information. It's going to be more uh, further information just to explain in detail.

01:12:31:06 - 01:13:07:26

Okay. Well, in that case, um, I think on the basis that the applicant is going to submit some, uh, some further work or detailed work of. For the cumulative impact on construction phase traffic. We won't discuss this matter any further today with representations welcome on what is submitted by the applicant. Then a deadline one. So that would be a deadline to. Um, so, um, thank you for that. Um, and I won't take any more questions at this point because as I said, with that information, um, looks like it will be coming away shortly.

01:13:07:28 - 01:13:12:06

So I'll now pass on to Doctor Hunt for the next item on the agenda.

01:13:12:08 - 01:13:14:20

Thank you. Thank you.

01:13:15:07 - 01:13:16:02

I'd like to preface.

01:13:16:04 - 01:13:16:19

This part.

01:13:16:21 - 01:13:47:00

Of the agenda by saying that, um, relevant representations have raised many, many issues with the proposed landfill approach and the impact of directional drilling or HDD. This discussion will only touch on a few of the issues raised that I want to understand. At this early stage, my questions will be focused mainly on the applicant. If I haven't covered every issue of concern, it doesn't mean that it won't be covered at a later date. I'd also note that the RSPB has submitted additional comments on issue one, which will be made available at deadline one.

01:13:49:08 - 01:14:18:00

I'd like to start with the proposed landfall in Penguin Bay in Kent. Many interested parties have highlighted the impact of the Nemo link scheme on habitats within the bay. The examining authority understands that National Grid Ventures work works are intended to be delivered by HDD, but were instead delivered by open cut methods. Can the applicant explain what's different about Sea Link? That makes it more likely that HDD would be successful for this project?

01:14:19:15 - 01:14:36:08

Thank you sir. Sara Sheikh for the applicant. So in the first instance I'm going to ask Mr. Stevens, Seb Stevens, a senior project manager, to deal with this. But he's also supported by Mr. Tim Riggle Goal. Who is the lead engineering consultant?

01:14:40:06 - 01:15:13:22

Thank you, sir. Seb Stevens for the applicant. Um, so what I can speak to, uh, is the relationship between National grid electricity transmission, which is ourselves and National Grid Ventures, which I think is the context necessary to explore the difference between the proposed and indeed implemented methodologies. Um, insofar as the technical feasibility of a trenched solution is concerned, I'll hand over to my colleague, Mr. Wrigley, in the way that, uh, Casey indicated the first insofar as, uh, the emailing project, this was implemented by National Grid Ventures.

01:15:13:24 - 01:15:22:20

Um, as others have explained, National Grid Ventures is a different business entity to ourselves. Um, we're both part of the national grid.

01:15:23:09 - 01:15:39:26

I'm aware of the relationship between the two companies. So, uh, but clearly as sister corporations, uh, my first port of call would be to go to my sister corporation and find out what information had been gathered on a project. Um, so I assume there has been conversations between the two organizations?

01:15:40:14 - 01:16:12:09

Yeah. As you say, we discuss with national conventions as we would discuss with other companies, and our relationship with them is as it is with others, which is at an arm's length basis. But nonetheless, of course, we're aware of the enabling project. Of course, we've done the due diligence necessary to inform our own approach. I think the key thing to understand here is that the the methodologies would, you know, the methodology implemented by Linc was reflective of the needs of that project, the angle that the cable approach to beach, the different end points. All of this would have influenced their methodology.

01:16:12:18 - 01:16:43:18

Notwithstanding the discussion we've just had about the relationship between the two projects, we don't have any special insight as to the nature of their decision making at that time, but nonetheless, those things we have borne in mind. Um, of course, the marine licenses and the planning permission is necessary to implement the Nemo link project were granted back in 2013 and deemed appropriate, of course. Um, insofar as the technical feasibility of the of the trenches solution that we're proposing is concerned, I'll hand over to a colleague.

01:16:43:20 - 01:17:09:22

From a consenting point of view, I think it's worth saying that we're not proposing an open cut solution. So the powers that we're seeking pursuant to our order are such that we wouldn't be able to implement an open cut solution where we're absolutely confident that the methodology proposed is, of course, deliverable, and indeed is the methodology that we will implement. And the final point I'll make here, um, is that the methodology that we're proposing

01:17:11:09 - 01:17:19:16

involves installing the cable beneath the sensitive saltmarsh habitat. We won't interact with it in the way that Nemo Link did do.

01:17:25:04 - 01:17:26:26

Yeah, definitely.

01:17:29:26 - 01:18:01:22

Tim Riggle for the applicant. Um, just answering the question in terms of the the feasibility of the HDD. Uh, the feasibility is based on on previous projects. We've looked at the the length of the HDDs that we need to get beneath the saltmarsh from our starting position. Um, and designed all or planned all our, uh, approach based on that, um, previous experience, I've steered 120 different HDDs, everything from 100m to 4km in length.

01:18:01:24 - 01:18:36:04

Uh, and then as a consultant, I've been involved in 260 others. Um, so we've got a good understanding of the ground conditions we've undertaken. Uh, we've identified risks at the early stage. Uh, and then through ground investigations, we've got seven ground investigation boreholes along the route. Um, and then we've also had, um, geophysics right along the HDD route that's, uh, identified. And what we need to do in terms of particular methodologies to make sure that the the HDD is a success.

01:18:36:15 - 01:18:41:28

Um, so that's the the short answer to your question on that.

01:18:47:01 - 01:18:58:15

Okay. Um, so effectively the the answer is that you're confident in the assessments that you've already done, that HDD is feasible in this location.

01:19:00:09 - 01:19:18:02

Yes. Very confident. Um, the advantage of HDD is it's adaptable to different ground conditions. So uh, if we encounter anything that's unforeseen in HDD, the advantage is that you can you can go around it or you can adapt your your drilling equipment accordingly.

01:19:22:18 - 01:19:31:08

And I've asked a number of supplementary agenda questions about mitigation for Nemo link. Would you like to comment on any of those at this point in time?

01:19:34:25 - 01:19:40:21

I wasn't involved in an email link, so I don't have anything that I can I can add to that person.

01:19:40:23 - 01:19:41:14

Sorry, the.

01:19:41:18 - 01:19:43:02

The applicant in general.

01:19:43:15 - 01:19:44:26

Okay. Apologies.

01:19:48:24 - 01:20:18:15

Deb Stevens for the applicant. Um, but as I mentioned before, notwithstanding, uh, you don't want to go into the detail of the relationship between organizations. Nemo link was developed and consented, um, some 12 or 15 years ago, um, based on a different requirement, a different consenting regime and different circumstances at that time. Um, that's probably the limit to which we can talk about the remediation and mitigation, etc., which was implemented, uh, insofar as that projects concerned.

01:20:18:17 - 01:20:19:02

Yeah.

01:20:19:04 - 01:20:34:12

So if I could just add Sara Shaikh for the applicant I think we are dealing with that in your supplementary agenda questions. Um, 1.13 to 1.15. So we will provide you a response in writing.

01:20:35:25 - 01:20:45:06

Uh, that's fine. It was just whether there was anything particular that you wanted to say on those points at this point in time. If not, we can move on to the next agenda item. I'll look at the written response.

01:20:45:15 - 01:20:48:18

Thank you. So I think that that's where we'll be providing the information.

01:20:48:20 - 01:20:50:15

Okay. Thank you.

01:20:50:27 - 01:20:51:17

Um.

01:20:55:06 - 01:21:28:15

I'd like to turn to the potential HDD noise impacts from Sealink. Um, for the purpose of the Habitats Regulations assessment. The examining authority needs certainty of the measures that will be adopted to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the designated sites. To understand the mitigation required, a clear understanding of the noise impact is necessary. The environmental statement uses 60dB Le Max to assess effects on bird species. As I understand it, this level is based on average piling noise level of 91dB at ten meters.

01:21:29:23 - 01:21:40:01

Can you explain why piling noise is a worst case, given that vessels and hovercraft and vehicles and equipment could be operating in the intertidal area?

01:21:42:14 - 01:21:53:07

Thank. Thank you, Sir Sara Shaikh for the applicant. Um, we have, um, Mr. Adam Lawrence here who is going to be giving, um, assistance to you. He's the lead noise and vibration specialist.

01:21:54:08 - 01:21:54:23

Hi.

01:21:54:25 - 01:21:55:12

Adam Lawrence.

01:21:55:14 - 01:21:55:29

For.

01:21:56:01 - 01:21:56:16

The.

01:21:56:18 - 01:21:57:03

Applicant.

01:21:57:05 - 01:21:57:20

Yes, we've.

01:21:57:22 - 01:21:59:00

Got separate assessments have been.

01:21:59:02 - 01:21:59:24

Undertaken.

01:21:59:26 - 01:22:00:11

For the.

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

Different.

01:22:01:00 - 01:22:02:08

Ecological receptors.

01:22:02:10 - 01:22:03:05

And in.

01:22:03:07 - 01:22:03:22

Each.

01:22:03:24 - 01:22:36:15

Case, uh, for those assessments, they've started with the plant and equipment that's listed in AIP 090, which is the construction schedule. Each of those assessments looks at the different plant and equipment to determine those that are most appropriate for assessing each of the different ecological receptors, and then they determine relevant noise levels and follow a prediction procedure and assessment so that you end up having a noise assessment that is most appropriate for them.

01:22:37:03 - 01:23:10:02

Um, so there's a set of noise propagation rules that follow from source to receptor. Um, and the impacts are assessed against guidance to get an appropriate level of assessment. And those take into account the context of the situation. So there are two key reports are in app 078. We have marine ornithology and we've got impacts on waterbirds. The worst case assessment is that of maximum noise levels from vibratory piling.

01:23:10:04 - 01:23:41:08

And that assessment identifies different disturbance distances for different species, and concludes that once you've got best practicable means taken into account, we get a minor impact, which is not significant. And in app 077, which is marine mammals, that's been superseded by As 049. We're looking at marine mammals. There's a further document a technical note on noise impacts from sequence.

01:23:41:10 - 01:24:17:03

Can I just interrupt you? I'm familiar with those documents. I have read through them. My question was really in your list of plant, um, hovercraft is mentioned within the ES within the marine ornithology chapter, but it doesn't appear anywhere in the plant schedule. Hovercraft are obviously noisy pieces of equipment. They'll be passing around the intertidal area. You've also got vehicles, um, commuting through the intertidal area. So I'm just wondering how the assessment really takes into account the worst case of activity within the intertidal area if it doesn't include those elements of plants and equipment.

01:24:17:23 - 01:24:51:25

Okay. So I mean the assessments take. So the impact is looking both at the proximity and the duration of the impacts. So individual vehicles would pass by for short periods of time, whereas the piling would take place for a longer period of time. And so there's a balance of a very short term impacts versus impacts over a longer period of time. And it's also looking at the proximity between where the sources are and where the receptors would be.

01:24:52:15 - 01:25:09:25

But isn't it true that actually it's a totality of effect, because you'll have all of those things operating in the same space. So actually what you've got is effectively continuous noise from a range of sources operating in the intertidal area and then actually continuous 24 hour noise.

01:25:12:06 - 01:25:34:19

Yes. So so essentially the so the like the the hovercraft are only there for safety only. And so they would not be there in a normal day to day activity during the construction activities, whereas the piling would occur and the drilling would occur irrespective of any safety outcomes.

01:25:37:25 - 01:25:39:13

And what about the vehicles.

01:25:39:19 - 01:26:18:02

So but and but then the vehicles would be there in and out. So the the the it's looking at the different relative levels of each of the items of equipment and the, as I say, the distances between those vehicles and where the receptors would be. So the each assessment has taken which is the worst case impact. And and that looks, as I say, both at the Distance between where the receptors are and the source would be, and where and how long and how noisy each of the different.

01:26:18:13 - 01:26:20:18

Excuse me, each of the different activities is.

01:26:21:00 - 01:26:44:19

But, um, your assessments indicate, uh, 99 DB uh, as a level for a 20 tonne excavator, which is actually louder than the piling noise level. I appreciate it's potentially a shorter duration, but we are talking about loud noise level, uh, presumably propagating over a longer distance. So, uh, potentially that could be more disturbing than some of the elements of piling.

01:26:45:18 - 01:27:12:26

Yeah, but the vehicle would be in and then out. So it's a moving source. It passes by the receptors. And then then so is that is the maximum noise level when the vehicle is closest. Whereas the piling happens continuously from the same place. And so the length of the duration of impacts longer. And that scores more for want of a better phrase in terms of impact.

01:27:13:24 - 01:27:36:18

But you are passing directly by the marsh areas and directly through the middle of the designated site. I'm sorry, I'm struggling to see whether there has been a sort of a kind of a full assessment of the a comprehensive assessment, effectively, of the impact on the species within the designated site and that use the intertidal area and the surrounding areas for breeding.

01:27:39:17 - 01:27:53:18

Yeah. I think the the answer will be that we have to look into that and check. I having looked at the documents, I'm confident that the they report the worst case impact. Um and I can go back and review.

01:27:55:15 - 01:28:03:19

Okay. Thank you. I think in the interest of time, we'll move on for the moment, but I would like that, uh, that detail, if you can provide it. Um.

01:28:03:27 - 01:28:13:21

Sorry to just jump in. Sorry for the applicant. I do believe that we are providing an updated noise modelling report that deals with these points by deadline one.



01:28:15:09 - 01:28:25:06

Thank you. That will be helpful. And will that effectively take into account the cumulative assessment, the cumulative impact of those various noise sources?

01:28:25:17 - 01:28:31:17

As I understand it, yes. If that's not correct, I'll be correct. It will you say yes?

01:28:31:19 - 01:28:44:19

Yeah. Thank you. Um, currently, no restriction is placed on the permitted piling noise level. Should a cap be imposed, for example, to cap at the piling noise at the worst case level of 91dB at ten metres?

01:28:47:03 - 01:29:32:00

Um, Adam Lawrence for the applicant and essentially the the mitigation that you were put in for the piling will depend on the final, uh, arrangement that happens in place. And so once the final Selection of plant is in place there. The assessment will be redone to confirm what those noise levels would be, and if we need to put mitigation in place to get those noise levels minimized, and that will go into place because we are we've got the commitment to use best practicable means, and the assessments assume that best practicable means is put in place.

01:29:32:11 - 01:29:55:01

And so the assessment shows with the piling that we have that minor impact, which is not significant. And whatever reassessments happen as things get refined and improved and better information is available, then that best practicable means can be adjusted as necessary in order to keep that impact as not significant.

01:29:57:07 - 01:30:28:24

Thank you. That's understood. Um, I think we will probably want to come back to the point about best practicable means, but we won't talk about that in this session. One thing I would say is that I understand that the the best practicable means does take into account a ten decibel reduction using best practicable means. Am I on land? I can see how hoarding can be erected around a site to achieve this, but is this actually a realistic option in the intertidal area?

01:30:30:23 - 01:31:02:05

Um, so in terms of intertidal areas, your the, the, the appropriate best practicable means would be making sure that we have the right source levels for the equipment in the first place. If sources are directional, then they can be orientated so that the noisier elements are directed away from the receptors. There are options on how you operate that equipment to minimize noise.

01:31:02:07 - 01:31:18:19

So you can use you can operate it in order to minimize noise rather than to do the piling or drilling or whatever most rapidly. So there are ways that those can be. You can you can refine the noise levels as you go.

01:31:21:15 - 01:31:52:18

Going back to my original point at the start of this agenda item, obviously from an HRA perspective, we do need certainty around the actual mitigation that will be implemented in this case law that relates to that. So at the moment, I'm left with a degree of uncertainty around what the precise mitigation is. So in terms of making recommendations, the Secretary of State and a conclusion around habitats regulation, I think that is something we might need to establish in more detail on as we go through the course of the examination.

01:31:53:07 - 01:32:23:22

I would just note that part of the agreement is that some of the activities are being programmed so that they occur at a different time, so that the activities would occur when those sensitive receptors are not in those locations. So there's a there's a as a timing element as well as the how noisy it is whilst the activity is happening. If the receptors are not there, then that mitigation doesn't need to do the same job because the receptors aren't there at those times.

01:32:24:24 - 01:32:26:28

So there's there's a programming element as well.

01:32:27:16 - 01:32:59:29

Yeah, I'm aware of that. Thank you. Um, I'm conscious there are two hands up. I will come to you, but I just need to cover off a last question to the applicant. The noise assessment effectively rules out to stay a disturbance based on the short term and temporary nature of the works in Bedwell Bay. How? They will involve 24 hour working, lighting and noise that will all give rise to disturbance for species that are foraging, foraging or nesting in the bay, and indeed for seals as well. Can you explain how the environmental statement takes account of multiple sources of disturbance at night.

01:33:00:27 - 01:33:10:21

In concluding, the effects would not be significant, and it may be that this is in part of the cumulative note you're addressing. But if you have any comments now that I think that would be helpful.

01:33:19:12 - 01:33:31:27

I'm going to hand over here. Please introduce yourself. Neil Neil Gates, um, who is, um, the lead marine ornithology specialist. So I'll hand over to you, please.

01:33:32:17 - 01:33:36:04

Uh, afternoon, sir. Neil Gates for the applicant. Um, yes. I think we'll.

01:33:36:06 - 01:33:39:22

Provide a more detailed response to this, because I note these are the questions.

01:33:39:24 - 01:33:40:09

Which.

01:33:40:11 - 01:33:40:26

Were.

01:33:40:28 - 01:33:42:12

Provided in the supplementary agenda.

01:33:42:16 - 01:33:43:01

So more.

01:33:43:03 - 01:33:43:18

Details will.

01:33:43:20 - 01:33:44:15

Be provided.

01:33:44:17 - 01:33:45:22

On that. And I.

01:33:45:24 - 01:33:46:18

Think that's probably.

01:33:46:20 - 01:33:48:19

The best place to to deal with that.

01:33:48:21 - 01:33:49:06

Because there's.

01:33:49:08 - 01:33:49:23

A lot of.

01:33:49:25 - 01:33:50:10

Technical.

01:33:50:12 - 01:33:51:01

Detail and um.

01:33:51:16 - 01:33:52:01

A lot.

01:33:52:03 - 01:33:52:18

Of.

01:33:52:20 - 01:33:53:05

Noise.

01:33:53:07 - 01:33:57:12

Input to include. but yes in in summary and.

01:33:57:14 - 01:33:58:05

We've used.

01:33:58:07 - 01:34:05:16

The, uh, the noisiest piece of equipment going back to my colleague. Um response there.

01:34:05:18 - 01:34:06:03

Um.

01:34:06:06 - 01:34:07:17

And I think, yes, we'll.

01:34:07:19 - 01:34:08:04

We'll.

01:34:08:06 - 01:34:18:03

Look at that and deal with it in a, in a written response. Thank you. Um, if I can ask, uh, in terms of the hands up, we have, uh, Miss Walla.

01:34:21:11 - 01:34:43:17

Walla, representing Kent Wildlife Trust. Uh, so, firstly, I just wanted to point out that for Nemo, National Grid stated throughout the DCO process that trench list techniques were feasible, but for whatever reasons, they went back on their commitment. So I do find it very concerning that you haven't contacted and engaged with National Grid Ventures as to why they then couldn't use H2.

01:34:43:19 - 01:34:47:27

Sorry, Miss Wallach, can you direct any comments to me rather than to the applicant, please?

01:34:48:00 - 01:35:22:22

Oh, sorry. Apologies. Um, yeah, we find it then. Concerning why the applicant hasn't contacted National Grid Ventures as to why they then cant use HDD and therefore understand why we do have these kind of trust issues and concerns that HDD will then not be used for stealing. I also wanted to point out that Wildlife Trust is both a landowner and long term manager. Sandwich and Pequot Bay, and from our long term management and interaction of the site, we can state that with certainty that the salt marsh has not recovered from Nemo.

01:35:23:13 - 01:35:58:03

Open cut trenching has left a permanent scar. What was once saltmarsh vegetation is now open water. The trenching severed the bank that separated the brackish lagoon from the tidal system, altering the hydrological function of the salt marsh. This breach allowed salt water to permanently flood the lagoon, resulting in the complete loss of freshwater that was heavily used and relied upon by birds and invertebrates, It's directly damaging and impacting the integrity of Atlantic Coast and Sandwich Bay, Spa, Ramsar and SAC.

01:35:58:10 - 01:36:32:17

The bank was not reinstated despite national grids promising that they would. They also claimed with Nemo links in the Nemo links environmental statement and subsequent project documents, that the

salt marsh impacts would have, quote, short term effects with no significant impacts, and, quote, temporary loss of vegetation expected to recover within 2 to 5 years. However, we are nearly eight years on and the salt marsh has not recovered. The brackish lagoon has been permanently altered and the vegetation has not reestablished to pre impact condition.

01:36:33:00 - 01:36:48:09

And therefore, how can Kent Wildlife Trust, Natural England and other interested parties have confidence in National Grid's current assessment of impacts for Sea Link? Where previous assessments about impacts were so significantly and demonstrated wrong.

01:36:49:24 - 01:36:54:03

Thank you. And the next hand was from.

01:36:56:09 - 01:36:58:24

Uh, Mr. Harrington from the Environment Agency.

01:37:00:08 - 01:37:25:09

Thank you, sir. Morgan from the Environment Agency here. A question I would like to clarify is I note that a lot of the discussions have been focusing on impacts to ornithology and marine mammals. I'd like some confirmation that there will be indeed some assessment of impacts to fish species, such as river lamprey, which I know myself can be considered under habitat regulations assessment.

01:37:26:23 - 01:37:44:00

And we are looking at all of the various impacts. We're just covering some of the sort of initial points at this. At this stage, if you have a particular point that you wish to make at lamprey, around lamprey that you haven't already made within your relevant representations, then please do so.

01:37:45:27 - 01:37:57:16

Oh no, that's okay. Thank you. I don't have my fisheries specialist on this call, but perhaps we can see with the applicant's submission later in November if something comes up from that.

01:37:58:23 - 01:38:30:02

Thank you. All right. Um, I now want to turn to matters that affect both Suffolk and Kent in the supplementary agenda. I've asked about, um, HDD drill rig assumptions. Can I ask, have you made any allowance for activities such as mud pumps, winches or flocculation tanks within the noise assessment? And can you provide any information on the liking, working methods, noise, noise levels or tonal properties of such plants to justify their omission from the assessment, if indeed they will be used?

01:38:37:06 - 01:39:04:11

Tim Riggle for the applicant. Uh, the site layouts we've provided, um, uh, indicative layouts for the for the HDD equipment that includes plant and equipment such as the the drilling fluid recycling and the mud pumps. Um, and the noise levels for those have been, uh, have been used in the assessment, I believe. But I'll, um, I'll pass across to Adam, I think, to, uh, to give the details of the noise assessment.

01:39:05:15 - 01:39:06:00

Yep.

01:39:06:02 - 01:39:36:20

Adam Lawrence for the applicant. Yes. So each of the different noise sources has a noise level that's associated with it. Um, and those noise levels have come either from, uh, British Standard five, two, two eight or from representative data taken from other sources. Um, and so each of those is a fairly robust source level or doing the relevant assessments.

01:39:37:14 - 01:39:37:29

Um.

01:39:41:00 - 01:39:41:15

And to.

01:39:41:17 - 01:39:42:02

The.

01:39:42:04 - 01:39:51:00

To the specific point in terms. So mud pumps are taken into account. Winches for any sort of pulling of equipment.

01:39:51:18 - 01:40:32:03

The the list of equipment that's in the that schedule. I don't remember exactly what's in and what's not in, but we've looked at which of the pieces of equipment are being used and then how noisy each of those pieces of equipment are. And then for the assessment, we've used the worst case assessment, which is the noisiest piece of equipment, which is often the piling rig or the drilling rig. Um, and by demonstrating that there isn't a significant impact from those sources, any other sources would have a lower level and therefore a smaller impact.

01:40:32:05 - 01:40:37:29

And if the noisiest one is not significant, then anything that is lower than that would also not be significant.

01:40:38:16 - 01:41:03:28

Yeah. Um, so I don't think I saw anything around winches or flocculation tanks within there, which I am conscious are quite noisy pieces of equipment. So what would be helpful from my perspective is just to confirm what the typical noise outputs are from those pieces of equipment. So we just have that confirmation as part of the noise assessment. So we're clear that what is assessed as worst case actually is the worst case.

01:41:04:21 - 01:41:07:23

Okay. I'm sure we can pull something together for that.

01:41:07:25 - 01:41:11:26

Okay. Thank you. Uh, could we have that for deadline one day, please?

01:41:16:27 - 01:41:32:14

So moving on. The environmental statement that highlights the need for further ground investigations to inform HDD. Can you explain what the scope and nature of these investigations would be? For example, would there be a need for further boreholes along the alignment?

01:41:37:10 - 01:41:45:15

I could. Thank you Sara. For the applicant, I'm going to ask, um, Natalie Hurst, the lead Marines consent manager, to deal with that, please.

01:41:48:21 - 01:42:20:02

Thank you, Natalie Hirst, for the applicant. So the DTO application includes and has assessed across all topics various pre lakebed survey that would be required to reconfirm seabed condition. These include geophysical surveys geotechnical and benthic surveys. Requirements to complete pre-construction surveys have been identified in the DCO application document app 045 part one introduction. Chapter four description of the proposed project.

01:42:21:10 - 01:42:45:23

Specifically, UXO surveys have not been included due to the high level of uncertainty with the number of locations of the UXO along the offshore cable route. It's a recognised standard practice for UXO surveys and clearance to be subject to separate marine licence. This approach to UXO surveys has been set out in full in Application Document 6.2.4 Marine Mammal. Chapter four,

01:42:47:11 - 01:42:51:03

Document Number app 077I.

01:42:51:08 - 01:43:08:24

It is what I'm specifically looking to understand is what the additional surveys are that are still to come, because obviously those surveys could potentially take place within the designated sites. So I want a clear understanding of what the totality of impact is on the designated sites.

01:43:09:17 - 01:43:16:04

So if I could just jump in for the applicant please. Sorry. Mr. Ridl will be able to deal with that specific point.

01:43:17:03 - 01:43:50:22

Timber for the applicant. Um, in terms of additional surveys at Pago Bay, um, the likely surveys that they're going to need are either ground investigation boreholes or other intrusive techniques such as CPT sampling or CPT testing in the intertidal area so eastward of the edge of the salt marsh around the exit. Basically around the HDD exit location. And that's because there's there's no no real information at that location.

01:43:50:24 - 01:44:27:12

There's one Nemo borehole that we've used in, uh, that's further to the north, I think that's probably about 90m to the north. Um, so that the, uh, the testing would be to identify, uh, groundwater pressures in the, um, in the underlying chalk. That would be one of the aims, as well as identifying

the, um, or confirming the boundary between the chalk and the overlying Thanet Formation that, um, acts as a as a, um, aqua cloud or aqua on top of the, of the aquifer.

01:44:27:28 - 01:44:40:27

Um, the main the main thing is probably looking at about 3 or 4, Intrusive investigations in that area. Um, and probably accessed terrestrially.

01:44:43:26 - 01:45:08:27

Okay. Um, I'm conscious of time, but is there a way to summarize that in terms of the, uh, additional investigations, the likely durations of those and the the likely time of year that those would be occurring? What I'm really trying to understand is what the impact is from an HRA perspective, and the impact on the the designated sites and the qualifying features of those sites.

01:45:09:14 - 01:45:32:18

Okay. Uh, we can put something together into technical note, but at a high level, the, uh, a borehole, it's typically two days to, to drill a borehole. So you're looking at, say, eight days of borehole drilling. If you've got a CPT, if you're using CPT instead, you can potentially do all those four in in one day. Uh, depending on the, on the tides at the time.

01:45:36:04 - 01:45:36:26

Thank you.

01:45:38:21 - 01:45:39:12

Um.

01:45:41:16 - 01:45:56:10

Sorry. One final point just on that, then, is, uh, it would be useful in providing that information as as a written summary to signpost to where those effects have been assessed in both the ES and the HRA. To assist me. Thank you.

01:46:00:03 - 01:46:09:25

So can I now just ask if anyone else has any comments they wish to make in relation to trenches crossings that aren't already outlined in relevant representations?

01:46:20:14 - 01:46:26:24

I don't see any hands up at the current time. Just going to take a brief pause to consult my colleague.

01:46:40:15 - 01:47:11:19

We're conscious of time and the upcoming open floor hearing. Agenda item seven is around the reporting of significance, and it's a technical point from my perspective. What I propose to do is turn that into a written question. But to briefly outline, it's just to understand, uh, that within the reporting of significance of effects for ecology, there appears to be a considerable overlap between construction effects and operation effects within the reporting.

01:47:11:21 - 01:47:27:26



And I want to understand whether there's been an element of double counting or offsetting of effects. Um, by the way, the assessment has been set out. Um, but I will turn that into a written question. Um, and, uh..

01:47:29:27 - 01:47:37:13

Add that to the the action list. So I'll now pass on to Miss Holmes for the remaining items on the agenda.

01:47:39:13 - 01:48:13:19

Thank you. In the interest of time, I'm not going to cover all the questions I had on work numbers and work plans at the moment. I do understand that the applicant is going to resubmit works plans at deadline one. Um, and in the interest of that, I just thought it would be helpful for me to just explain the concerns that we have in relation to the work plans. Um, quickly here. Could you, um, could the applicant just display the land plan? So sheet one of six, that's PDA zero five. And zoom in so they can just show plot 111, please.

01:48:15:21 - 01:48:28:25

And then also, if this is testing technology, can you also show the, um, the works plan sheet one of six. That's app 021 showing the corresponding area on the works plans.

01:48:31:25 - 01:48:34:25

If you could show those two side by side, that really helpful.

01:48:47:27 - 01:49:21:12

So we we do know there's a number of areas across the odd limits where there's large areas of white on the works plans. And in these areas, it's unclear to us the extent of the works that are happening or the arrangement of any works in that particular area. So the two images that I wanted to show are sort of by way of example, in this location, it's showing an access track, but it also explains on that works number that there would be environmental mitigation, landscaping, drainage, lots of other items of work happening in that area.

01:49:21:14 - 01:49:47:09

And from those works plans, we cannot tell where that work is. If there's drainage, we can't tell where it is, how big it is. If there's environmental mitigation, we don't know the extent of that mitigation. And these are very important items that we need to be able to discuss to determine whether compulsory acquisition should be recommended or not. Um, does the applicant just want to sort of come in on that point?

01:49:48:15 - 01:49:57:00

Yes, ma'am. Cyrus Shaikh for the applicant, Ali Leader, who is the, um, consensus advisor? Um, is going to take that point up.

01:49:59:03 - 01:50:32:18

I am the leader for the applicant. Um, so. Yes. National grid has agreed to provide a new version of the works. Plans to help the examining authority and the interested parties understand the uses of land. And this information on all the uses of land is presented across application documents. The focus of

the work's plans has been to focus on the the principal works as outlined in schedule one, rather than the associated development, and the associated development is instead shown on the associated plans.

01:50:32:20 - 01:51:15:07

So just sort of, for example, taking this plot. So the large plot to the south of the access road is for the provision of 12 hectares of land for ground nesting birds. And that set out in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, which is AIP 342, in number B14. Um, and similarly we have other areas. So for example, to the north of the converter station, which is on a another part of the sheet that you're showing to the north, we've got an area for a public right of way diversion and for a new hedgerow.

01:51:15:09 - 01:51:49:16

The new hedgerow is shown in figure three of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, which is Ace 059, and the public right of way diversion is shown in the access Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation plan, which is as um 011. Um, notwithstanding that, I completely understand that comparing lots of sets of plans and all this information to bring this together is proving challenging. And that's why we have agreed to provide a version of the works plans that that makes that a little easier for yourselves.

01:51:50:16 - 01:52:22:21

Thank you. Um, I know in terms of, say, for example, environmental mitigation, there isn't actually a plan that shows the exact extent of the environmental mitigation that we could kind of refer to. Um, having that information on the works plans would make it a lot easier for us to understand what the works are. We also and I'll roll over into an action point, but we also have concerns about the the number of work numbers you have. Um, we would expect. One of the projects we have seen works numbers for environmental mitigation and for drainage.

01:52:22:23 - 01:52:43:18

So all works to have works numbers. And again, that makes it a lot clearer in terms of what you are wanting to do. Um, but I will roll that over into an action point so you can consider it when you're when you're looking at any changes to the work plans. Um, in the interest of time, if anyone else did want to make a point on this, please can you submit it in writing? Um,

01:52:45:12 - 01:53:01:25

so I think because of the time, we'll move on to the final item, which is any other business, and we haven't been notified that anyone wish to raise any other business. Um, can I just check that that is still the case. I have one hand up. Um, MH.

01:53:03:09 - 01:53:03:27

Garnering them.

01:53:03:29 - 01:53:05:21

From the Environment Agency here.

01:53:06:06 - 01:53:06:28

That's the question.

01:53:07:00 - 01:53:07:25

For you at the.

01:53:07:27 - 01:53:08:12

Planning.

01:53:08:14 - 01:53:30:09

Inspector. We did notify via the survey that we wanted to raise this screening out of groundwater. Impacts from the Water Framework Directive assessment. But I appreciate it's worth me checking with you first if you think that's better saved for a written response later in the month.

01:53:30:19 - 01:53:38:20

Yes, if you could please raise any concerns you have. If you put them in a deadline, 1 or 1 A, then we can consider them in the examination. Thank you.

01:53:38:25 - 01:53:39:15

Okay.

01:53:39:25 - 01:53:41:12

And I have JB.

01:53:45:07 - 01:54:20:01

Yes. Thank you, Madam James Burton. Um, for action. Um, any action solutions? Um, madam, um, may I ask, given that we have, um, barely scratched the surface regarding need for the project, um, and frankly, we found the answers as they were given by the applicant. Deeply illuminating. Uh, and also, regarding another key area of concern. Cumulative traffic impact Will the examining authority be holding issue specific hearings on those matters?

01:54:21:18 - 01:54:43:02

So what I would like to say is that today's hearings have been about unpacking some of the main issues that have been raised in the relevant representations. I know there hasn't been time to get into a lot of detail today on these, but the purpose of the meeting was for us to try and gain a further understanding of them. We're only at the start of this examination, so there will be time to consider all these matters in more detail in the coming months.

01:54:45:14 - 01:54:50:17

Is there anything else I have left? Oh that's all.

01:54:51:12 - 01:55:23:13

Thank you very much. Francis Goddard, on behalf of London Gateway Port, I just wanted to return very briefly back to the documents I referred to shipping and navigation. Could I request that perhaps you take an action point for the applicant? Or just if we could just put a question through to the applicant as to whether or not versions of the plans I referred to the cable laying, a burial plan. The cable collection plan and the cable specification installation plan will be being produced or not anytime soon, and if so, when we might expect them.

01:55:23:15 - 01:55:30:17

It might help us just to frame our representations or responses to your your written questions in EV one three.

01:55:31:20 - 01:55:35:24

Yes, understood. Could the applicant quickly respond to that point, please? I think would be helpful.

01:55:39:00 - 01:55:44:17

Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Sarah, for the applicant. I'm just, uh, getting the quick answer.

01:55:47:29 - 01:55:50:12

Uh, Mr. Homewood, he's going to tell us.

01:56:05:12 - 01:56:10:18

Thank you. Ma'am. Can we come back on that, please? Just so we have a proper response.

01:56:11:01 - 01:56:43:15

Okay. Yes. Thank you. Um, I don't see any more hands, so we'll move on to item ten. So closing the hearing. Um, given the time, rather than go through the action points in detail now, they will be published on the project page of the National infrastructure website in the next day or two. Um, so if there's no other items relevant to this hearing, can I just remind all parties to provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline? One a, which is currently set for the 26th of November, and the recording of this hearing will also be put on the inspect to its website as soon as possible.

01:56:44:05 - 01:56:57:00

Um, before we close, we'd like to thank all today's participants for the time and their assistance in this hearing. The time is now 1:06, and this issues specific hearing on the scope of the development for the proposed Sealink project is now closed.