



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Sea Link
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Day 3 - Part 2
Date:	27 March 2026

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

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

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

File Name: SEAL_27MAR26_ISH3_PT2.mp3

File Length: 01:04:59

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:07:06 - 00:00:11:21

Okay. The time is now eleven forty five, and issue specific hearing three is recommenced.

00:00:13:08 - 00:00:34:00

And we're moving now on to the topic of Dobinson's bats in Peggall Bay. In its response to second written questions, Natural England identified the Dobinson's bats forage in the Interstaddle area off Kent. Explain how you deliver mitigation in respect of lighting impacts on Dobbenton's bats in Pegor Bay between April and October, as suggested by Natural England.

00:00:34:27 - 00:01:06:25

Doctor Strangely, on behalf of the applicant, I'd like to take a step back on that explain and why we do not consider that mitigation is required associated with the the cofferdam, which is what we're referring to here, I think. So in our response to two e col twenty seven sorry, in our response regarding lighting and bugs on birds in Pangwa Bay, we described the lighting approach to the cofferdam and stated that lighting would be directed inwards towards the working area of the cofferdam. There is no requirement for lighting of the wider working area of sorry, cofferdam erection.

00:01:06:27 - 00:01:31:21

There is no requirement for lighting of the wider working area of twenty one thousand six hundred square meters. So in other words, we're talking about a fairly localized area. Therefore, due to the design approach that we've just discussed, or I've just said rather, the area to be lit, if you work it out, is gonna be considerably less than zero point five percent of Peguah Bay. So Peguah Bay is six fifteen hectares, we're talking about considerably less than two,

00:01:33:26 - 00:01:46:20

even allowing for certain lights will be on the cofferdam. Now that's relevant because Dobington's bats have extremely large foraging areas as a number of species of bats do. They have been recorded foraging up to ten kilometers from their roosts in a night.

00:01:48:17 - 00:02:26:19

Moreover, from the literature research I've done, intertidal mudflats are not flagged as a particularly key habitat for Dorbenton's bats. They are more commonly associated with freshwater bodies like rivers, canals, lakes. Although I'm sure that if they live near the coast, they will forage over the sea as well at times. So even in a worst case, an extremely small amount of their potential foraging area would be affected. And we do not think there's any we will obviously put this back to natural England, but we do not think there is any requirement for mitigation beyond the controls that are already associated with the light of the Kafka dam, given the very small part of their potential foraging area that is affected.

00:02:26:26 - 00:02:29:15

And sorry, just in relation to the hoverboards as well?

00:02:32:23 - 00:02:56:01

Well, there is no lighting on the hoverboard that I'm aware of. No. Sorry. You called me out there. There is no lighting on the hoverboard, so that doesn't arise. And we won't be doing as I said earlier, we won't be doing any vegetation move on the port, there's no habitat losses there. So Dorbenton sorry, I should have said Dorbentons are known as the water baton as much as they generally forage over water, which is why there's the reference to Pegwell Bay. It's primarily they

00:02:56:03 - 00:02:58:14

are associated with fresh water bodies. But if they live

00:02:58:16 - 00:03:10:07

near the coast, I'm sure they will also forage around there. I don't think Naturalin specifically mentioned Pegwell Bay. They just made a general allusion to them foraging around the Kent coast and then jumped straight to talk about mitigation. But I don't think that is a requirement.

00:03:13:08 - 00:03:22:04

And so in relation to the conversation site and the ditch network, is there a similar context there for Dobington's batts?

00:03:22:26 - 00:03:40:13

Only for all the batts. So there are there is batt activity around that area, but we've already taken that all into consideration with regards to things like discussion of the lux levels for operational lighting and the fact that extend ten meters or so beyond the lighting fixtures, which is well away from the kind of features that we're talking about, the most sensitive features.

00:03:42:09 - 00:03:43:29

I mean that area is

00:03:46:26 - 00:04:09:23

basically the impact of lighting on bats is the controls would be there to protect all bat species and everything we're doing. The assessment basically covers all species of bats that we have recorded and those that we haven't. Because any bat survey, you have to remember, I mean, we talk quite extensively about it. So you have to remember that any bat survey is only ever going to be a sample. However thoroughly you want to do it. And I have one from you repeat it, it will only ever be a sample. Thank you.

00:04:09:27 - 00:04:12:00

Okay. Thank you. Karen McKenzie.

00:04:15:00 - 00:04:53:10

Thank you, sir. I know this is not an opportunity for cross examination, but I did notice earlier on the discussions when the gentleman was talking about lighting for HDD drilling that he was indicating that this would be sort of a twenty four hour operation. And our understanding of the construction method between Pegwal Bay, Cofferdam and bringing the cable online to the converter station is

through HDD. So surely that means that throughout the twenty four hour HDD operation for the drilling, that it will be continuously lit, or am I misunderstanding it?

00:04:53:13 - 00:05:04:18

The the applicant has just been discussing twenty four hour lighting and the fact that it's a small part of Pegwell Bay. So I think I think we've addressed that point. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Miss thank you. Mister Stevens?

00:05:06:06 - 00:05:44:17

Thank you. Said earlier I wanted to address a few items, and it's actually come up again here in terms of lighting. I understand that the applicant has said that there'll be no lighting on the Hoverport site and therefore won't be a disturbance. But TDC, who are opposed to the use of the hoverboard, have said that, obviously, if permission is granted, they would seek commitments in rep four one six zero section one point one point one one, they state that all entry and exit points must incorporate wheel wash facilities.

00:05:44:29 - 00:05:47:06

Now I can't imagine that Sorry.

00:05:47:08 - 00:06:00:07

That that is jumping ahead in the agenda again. So have you got specific comments about Dobinson's bats or, lighting and bats? I'll take it now. But otherwise, can you hold on for a second?

00:06:02:02 - 00:06:11:05

Well, it was just that the obviously, the lighting at if there is lighting at Pegwell, it would affect the bats. But I'm quite happy to come back later. Sorry. I've jumped the gun.

00:06:11:08 - 00:06:13:05

No problem. Okay. Thank you.

00:06:20:26 - 00:06:23:18

Were there any further comments about Dorvington's bats?

00:06:26:05 - 00:06:41:00

No. In that case, move on. So now we are about to talk about Pegwell Bay and the former Hogwarts Access. So can the applicant provide an update on the March nineteen workshop with National Trust, which I understand was due to consider matters including impacts on Pegwell Bay?

00:06:42:11 - 00:06:50:17

I cannot because I've not been involved in that. I'm not sure if there's anybody here who would be able to provide such an update. We may have to take that away.

00:06:53:21 - 00:06:56:27

I'm not sure. Think that's probably for the lands team and they're not here.

00:06:56:29 - 00:07:01:16

Would it be possible to add that to as an action point then in that case?

00:07:01:18 - 00:07:03:02

Yes. Can you just give

00:07:03:04 - 00:07:23:11

us a little bit So I understood there was a March nineteen workshop in National Trust, which was going to consider a range of matters, but including impacts on Pegwell Bay. So I'm only interested for the purposes of this discussion, I'm only interested in the impacts that have been discussed, any mitigation measures that have been agreed rather than the wider land negotiation matters.

00:07:27:26 - 00:07:31:28

I've made a note of that. I we will take that away and then share it with colleagues. I I'm

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

not Thank you. Not

00:07:32:27 - 00:07:33:26

Not involved that meeting.

00:07:34:13 - 00:07:35:23

Got a hand from Emma Waller.

00:07:37:12 - 00:07:59:15

Emma Waller, Kent Trust. I'd just like to say that if there are any kind of workshops around impacts to Pequa Bay, it'd be quite nice if Kent Wildlife Trust could be included in those meetings and workshops as we are a landowner and long term land manager of Pegua Bay. So it'd be yeah. If we can be included in anything like that, that'd be nice.

00:08:00:21 - 00:08:02:01

That's noted. Thank you.

00:08:07:08 - 00:08:09:27

And the offset distance from the entire works area

00:08:10:02 - 00:08:15:05

Sorry to interrupt. We do actually have someone here who can help with that meeting. Miss Jones.

00:08:15:24 - 00:08:17:05

Miss Jones, please.

00:08:17:27 - 00:08:32:03

Robin Jones on behalf of the applicant. Yeah. I can confirm that we did schedule a meeting with the National Trust nineteenth of March. However, they did cancel based on the SOCG that we had sent them, and they were still reviewing.

00:08:34:03 - 00:08:49:13

Early indications show that they are very happy with what we've provided within the SOCG, and it's just a few minor elements that they want to discuss further. And we're just waiting whether that's by email or another meeting just to confirm that. Sorry.

00:08:49:15 - 00:08:50:00

I just

00:08:50:02 - 00:08:50:22

rang down the hall.

00:08:51:18 - 00:08:52:10

Okay.

00:08:53:28 - 00:09:04:19

Thank you for running down the hall. We'll in that case, I'll I'll just look at the statements common ground and see what's being discussed as part of that. Thank you.

00:09:06:26 - 00:09:08:02

So

00:09:10:14 - 00:09:38:29

the next question I had is the offset distance from the intertidal works area to the salt marsh has been extensively discussed, and I appreciate the reasons have been given for the minimum fifty meter offset. I remain somewhat confused by the distinction between the cofferdam and the exit pit location. Is the applicant able to explain how the cofferdam relates to the exit pit and why the cofferdam would be at seventy five meters and the exit pit would then be at one hundred and five meters?

00:09:41:16 - 00:09:43:18

Somebody is coming. Who will be able to do that? Thank you.

00:09:46:03 - 00:10:04:09

Jim Wriggall for the applicant. Basically, the cofferdam is about thirty meters in length, and the HTD exit point will be roughly in the center of the cofferdam plus or minus five meters. So the western edge of the cofferdam will be

00:10:06:00 - 00:10:25:17

probably fifteen meters closer to the salt marsh than the HDD exit point. And I guess the other thing is that the distance between the exit points and the Copper Dam, the exit points between the salt marsh changes a little bit because the salt marsh is slightly at an angle to the the coast.

00:10:27:17 - 00:10:58:27

Sorry. And in terms of the exit pit itself, how actually big is the exit pit? I suppose what sits behind the questioning here is really, is there any way to move that cofferdam further away so we have greater

than the fifty meter offset from the salt marsh for activities within Pegwell Bay? But just if you could just explain HDD exit how sort of big that is within that Cofferdam, sorry.

00:11:02:17 - 00:11:12:09

Tim Reagall for the applicant. I'm not sure where the fifty meters has come from because it should a be greater distance than that. The exit pit is actually inside the Cofferdam.

00:11:13:03 - 00:11:18:21

So the fifty meters is the buffer for any activities from the salt marsh edge?

00:11:21:07 - 00:11:31:26

Tim Riegel for the applicant. What that is referring to is for construction of the cofferdam. So when you're putting the cofferdam in, need to get excavators with fiber pile

00:11:33:18 - 00:11:35:18

attachments on them to install

00:11:38:12 - 00:11:50:09

the sheet piles. So that's relating to the equipment that would be used to construct the cofferdams. So the cofferdams themselves is going to be a lot further than that fifty meters from the

00:11:51:08 - 00:12:14:25

Yes. I suppose so what I'm asking I'm just trying to understand the dimensions of the exit pit, which then relates to the location of the coffer dam, which then relates to the area of works between the cofferdam and the salt marsh, if that makes sense. So it's kind of what is the degree of flexibility? And is there any way to move from fifty meters to, say, seventy five meters? Or

00:12:17:08 - 00:12:31:20

how far away from that salt marsh edge can we get? Because clearly the salt marsh is a sensitive habitat, part of the designated site, and I'd like to see as much offset as possible from that area. And it is something that has been raised by quantities as matter of concern.

00:12:32:01 - 00:12:36:11

So I think Mr. Homewood might be able to help with this specific point.

00:12:36:13 - 00:12:37:00

Thank you.

00:12:39:12 - 00:13:16:20

Good morning, sir. Andrew Homewood for the applicant. I think we're talking about the two react commitments, the one hundred and five meter offset to the permanent works, the HDD exit, and the fifty meter commitment to be away from the South Marsh for the temporary working area. So that's the difference, temporary case versus the permanent case. I do understand the question and the argument to maximize the distance in both the temporary and the permanent. I think we'll take that one away, but we feel that fifty meters for the temporary case adequately mitigates impact to the salt marsh.

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

But notwithstanding that, we can talk across disciplines and come back to you in writing at deadline six.

00:13:23:22 - 00:13:30:08

That would be helpful if you could. Did Ken Model Lifetrust want to come in on that point at all?

00:13:33:00 - 00:13:34:03

No. I think we'll put

00:13:34:05 - 00:13:37:16

our concerns and issues in writing at deadline six.

00:13:37:21 - 00:13:38:15

K. Thank you.

00:13:45:07 - 00:13:47:09

In the absence of ability to

00:13:49:00 - 00:14:14:26

move the and obviously, I'm jumping ahead as to what you may or may not come back with, are there any other potential measures to restrict or control activities in the area between the Kough Dam and the Salt Marsh so that if you can't avoid activities altogether, is there any way to sort of reduce the amount of activity within that sort of specific area to the west side of the works.

00:14:16:19 - 00:14:27:26

Andrew Holmes, the applicant. I think we'll need to take that one away and get back in writing considering the nature of activities coming from different disciplines.

00:14:29:24 - 00:14:32:03

Thank you. And again, for deadline six.

00:14:33:04 - 00:14:34:01

Deadline six.

00:14:34:03 - 00:14:34:20

Thank you.

00:14:40:03 - 00:14:59:19

So the applicant's Ecology and Biodiversity chapter identifies negligible effects from disturbance on the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay, SPA, and Ramsar. Given the duration of works within the bay, which is an important foraging area, the twenty four hour nature of the lighting and noise disturbance, proximity to roosting and foraging areas in the foreshore,

00:15:01:27 - 00:15:34:01

and the greatly extended area of works that we've seen in more recent marine anthology plans, plus the potential for periodic and noisy activities such as piling hovercraft in emergencies, the short offset distance between salt marsh and vehicles accessing the hoverboard, and the possibility of excavation of stuck drill equipment and or unexploded ordnance. Does the applicant still maintain that there will be a negligible effect from disturbance, Standing Coast and Sandwich Bay, SPA and Ramazar, due to the proposed works?

00:15:34:03 - 00:15:39:01

Can I just clarify here? You mentioned the ecology chapter.

00:15:39:03 - 00:15:45:20

So so is this This is a this is a likely significant effects question, not an HRA related question.

00:15:47:08 - 00:16:22:21

So so, the what I was getting at there was that the the so document six point two point three point two, which is the kind of terrestrial ecology ecology and biodiversity chapter deals with the terrestrial scheme. So so the other impacts that you talked about everything within Pegwell Bay, the birds, etcetera, that's part of the marine scheme, which is why it wouldn't be discussed in the terrestrial ecology chapter. So so the terrestrial ecology chapter effectively draws the line at the HDD drive pit and the the hoverboard, by which I mean literally the the physical hoverboard and wildlife on that.

00:16:22:23 - 00:16:41:04

Once you move from the hoverboard into the intertidal zone, that falls within the marine scheme and is there, which I'm not involved in, but is assessed in the marine ornithology chapter and the various other marine benthic ecology chapters and that kind of thing. Then obviously, report brings those things together.

00:16:41:08 - 00:16:47:23

I have been flitting between many, many documents, so I've probably just lost track. Thank you for that point.

00:16:50:04 - 00:17:07:28

I'll move on to my next question then. Paragraph 2.8.221 of NPS EN three states that applicants must develop an ecological monitoring program to monitor impacts during the preconstruction, construction and operational phases identify to the actual impacts caused by the project and compare them to what was predicted in the EIA and HRA.

00:17:10:05 - 00:17:15:13

Do we have that at the moment in Pegwell Bay for the the works activities in Pegwell Bay?

00:17:18:29 - 00:17:22:17

I'm looking at my colleague who's nodding at me, but it's probably better if she answers directly. So

00:17:24:12 - 00:17:47:15

Robin Jones on behalf of the applicant. Yeah. I can confirm that just purely for the offshore scheme, we are developing noting the comments that received both our issues pertaining here specific hearing two, and Natural England that we are progressing a imprincipal monitoring plan, specifically for the offshore scheme. And this will include Pegwell Bay, and this will be submitted at deadline six.

00:17:51:25 - 00:17:53:25

That's good to hear. Thank you.

00:18:01:18 - 00:18:33:15

I want to ask now about the wheel wash. I appreciate Mr. Stevens has been patiently waiting to make some points. So I will ask my question, then I'll ask Mr. Stevens to come in as well. So the question was to Thanet District Council. Can Thanet District Council confirm whether it's now satisfied with the applicant's proposals in response to second written questions for access via the hoverboard in terms of use of track matting but no wheel wash, and the provision of a hoverboard condition monitoring plan.

00:18:35:25 - 00:18:38:02

Do we have Bennett District Council on the line?

00:18:38:26 - 00:18:47:09

Helen Johnson for Bennett District Council. Please can we come back to your writing on that on deadline six? I don't have my colleague at the hearing today with me.

00:18:47:18 - 00:18:49:16

That's fine. Yes. If you could, please.

00:18:52:19 - 00:18:56:22

And mister Stevens, did you have a a question specifically in relation to Wheel Wash?

00:18:59:19 - 00:19:35:08

Yes. I did. Because as you just had TDC, but the person is not not available. But they have in their rep four one six zero one point one point one one. They they state that should permission be granted, they would want a commitment for all entry and exit points must incorporate wheel wash facilities. Now I've I came in early because, obviously, I can't envisage a situation where you wouldn't have lighting for wheel washing as the vehicles are potentially coming in and out twenty four hours a day.

00:19:35:15 - 00:19:50:23

And, obviously, if there's lighting on the hoverboard to ensure that the vehicles are properly washed both in and out, then that has an effect on the back colonies and and so on. So that's why it's sort rushed in early, if that makes sense.

00:19:51:00 - 00:19:55:07

Yeah. I appreciate that. Thank you. Would the applicant like to respond?

00:19:56:17 - 00:20:29:19

I'll start and I'll invite colleagues to come in. So I haven't been specifically involved in discussions about wheel washes. If the wheel wash is included, then that will be to prevent the spread of invasive species and soil and all sorts of things like onto that the highway network. So it would be literally the entrance from the highway network, I assume, onto the hoverboard site. So even if lighting was required, it would be it would be very localized lighting at that very specific point, which is not on the hoverboard.

00:20:29:21 - 00:20:31:17

It is it is effectively on the road junction.

00:20:37:12 - 00:20:42:18

Wasn't the wheel wash from the hoverboard onto the So I'll have Laria.

00:20:42:20 - 00:20:43:08

As I said, I haven't

00:20:43:10 - 00:20:50:11

been involved. Ah, so you mentioned about the marine scheme here, which I that's something I haven't been involved in. I will have to defer to other colleagues because that's a detail I don't know.

00:20:51:23 - 00:21:13:00

And for the applicant, I think we need to take that one away and consider where any so called wheel washing would take place if it did. The associated task lighting, which would be very focused and any impact on species. But I'm not saying we we are, we're not, but I think that's something we have to take away in.

00:21:13:02 - 00:21:37:25

What I will just add to that, which which I've just realized, and it was actually a point I made earlier, that if this is if this is a wheel wash from as I said, I'm involved in the terrestrial scheme, that's why I'm not snugged. If this is a wheel wash from the hoverboard off the apron down onto the incisal area, as I said earlier, that is a great big expanse of concrete, which is not going to have much VAT activity in the like associated credits.

00:21:37:27 - 00:21:54:02

My understanding, and I may have misunderstood, was that this was related to the contamination issues at the hoverboard and the risk of carrying contaminated material from the brakes and concrete down into the intertidal area through the wheels of the vehicles.

00:21:55:17 - 00:21:56:16

So I think we

00:21:56:26 - 00:22:08:10

Well, that would still but the brakes and the concrete, as I understand it, sorry, we will take this away, I think. But my understanding is the brakes and the concrete are around those edges. But yes, this is an area I should probably not have tried to comment on.

00:22:08:18 - 00:22:20:01

Say that. For context, Mr. Stephens has provided us with photographs of a number of areas of breakage within the apron. Yes. Well, that helped at ISH two.

00:22:20:03 - 00:22:23:02

I remember that. Yes. Yeah. We will take that away.

00:22:23:04 - 00:22:26:20

Okay. Thank you. Emma Waller. Sorry.

00:22:33:10 - 00:22:36:16

Sorry. Was that was that me to speak, or was someone else about to?

00:22:37:01 - 00:22:39:03

Yeah. If you'd like to speak. Yeah. Please.

00:22:39:10 - 00:23:11:22

Emma Wallach, Kemp, Wildlife Trust. Can I just say if that there is gonna be light in on the hover port for these bill washes, then an impact assessment on the invertebrate to assemblage needs to be done? Obviously, as we've previous previously said, the hover port is a important habitat for numerous invertebrates, including moths and micro moths, as well as two fully protected species, the fire clear wing and the Sussex emerald. So any lighting, if gonna it's be on, obviously, all night, that would need to be taken into consideration.

00:23:12:25 - 00:23:17:17

Thank you. If the applicant the if the applicant would like to respond, please.

00:23:18:04 - 00:23:48:12

As I say, with with regard to the wheel wash, I'm not even sure if there will be lighting, but that's something we will have to go away and look into. So this may be an entirely hypothetical point. But in any event, what I think we have discussed before is that so the fiery clearing moth and sussexual moth and the various other species that you get there. Well, those two in particular are associated with certain plant species, which are across the Hoverport. But most of the congregation of all of those species is in the northern area of the Hoverport before we come onto the concrete apron.

00:23:49:06 - 00:23:58:12

So we have react commitments that will identify where the key locations for those are and make sure that we route around them. That's all been discussed before because obviously this isn't a new point.

00:24:00:00 - 00:24:06:26

I think once we have seen, if there are any lighting approvals, then they will to be need designed sensitively, but that will be the case anyway.

00:24:06:28 - 00:24:29:25

I think that's what I need to understand is, is there nighttime lighting on the Hoverport? Is there then an impact on invertebrates? Because whilst they might be distributed on the northern side of the

Hoverport, if you have task lighting, which will whilst it might be directional, will still be quite bright and will be attractive to invertebrates presumably. I'd like to understand whether there is any potential for impacts, especially given their Schedule five species.

00:24:33:02 - 00:24:36:18

So yeah. James Booker, you're board. Just

00:24:37:29 - 00:25:09:25

to come in, we don't we've we've we've committed to put in track way down on the other port. Therefore, we'll do a condition survey. We'll look if there's any significant damage that we could then repair, and then we will put trackway down. So the wheels of the vehicles will not be picking up the contaminants from the concrete. It will be the reason for a wheel wash would then be to take the intertidal mud off the vehicles before they then tracked onto the highway, and that would be at the point of the highway or somewhere nearer to the highway off the hoverboard.

00:25:09:27 - 00:25:40:04

But we will take away the the point of contaminants and whether there would be any wash facility. What I'd also point out is this is a very short activity during the summer. Lighting, obviously, it's lighter at night during the summer, the daylight hours. And also, this is it's tide dependent. So you have you have to go on at low tide and come off at high tide, certainly with the wheeled vehicles. So that would also have an impact on how much and how frequent we would be on and off-site.

00:25:40:11 - 00:25:40:26

Thank you.

00:25:43:05 - 00:25:44:08

Emma Waller?

00:25:45:21 - 00:26:02:00

Emma Waller for Kent Waller Trust. Can I just ask the applicant if they've included invertebrates in the impact assessment for lighting that will be in Pegwell Bay around the works area, including the the HDD ex exit points?

00:26:03:06 - 00:26:14:01

Well, I think that's what the applicant is going to come back to us and confirm in their response. But can I just double check that that my is understanding is correct?

00:26:14:08 - 00:26:36:07

Yes. It is. I mean, the the so the assessment of invertebrates would would be related to those that we've just talked about, which are those around the vegetation. Once you get into the inside layer, that moves into the marine scheme. So they're the primary invertebrate interest, which would be my other colleagues, would be to do with those that live in the sediment environment and that kind of thing. So I think we would move it to there. But we will I think we've

00:26:38:00 - 00:26:39:28

that's something we will take away and come back to you.

00:26:40:11 - 00:26:43:00

Thank you. Mister Stevens?

00:26:45:05 - 00:27:10:11

Sorry. Just to come back on another point that was made earlier that the applicant wasn't allowed to access the site in time. I made the point on Tuesday that Edge Enviro were actually given permission by the Senate District Council in October twenty twenty five, so I don't know if the applicant wants to make any comment on that. Obviously, that's through you, obviously. Thank you.

00:27:11:05 - 00:27:17:24

No. I'm I'm satisfied that we've got the information we need there. Thank you, mister Stevens, for raising the point, though. I'd like to move on.

00:27:19:22 - 00:27:47:29

Penn County Council has indicated that reptile surveys should be undertaken in the whole report when necessary. And I've directed questions to KCC to provide more details as to whether it considers surveys are necessary and what the scope should be. I'm currently hesitant regarding the need for presenceabsence surveys on the basis that we already have confirmation there are reptiles present. But I am contemplating whether distribution surveys are necessary on the site.

00:27:49:26 - 00:28:19:12

And the applicant explained whether reptile distribution surveys could be carried out to understand the sensitivities sensitive areas of whole report for reptile species. And I appreciate this slightly overlaps with what we discussed issue specific hearing two, but I think it's sort of a progression of that discussion, hopefully. And I suppose the follow on to that question is, and is that something that could be done within the March April period so that information might be available to the Secretary of State at the point of making a decision on the project?

00:28:19:27 - 00:28:25:29

With regard to your second question, I think the answer is no. It couldn't be. But going back to your first question,

00:28:27:15 - 00:29:04:26

I do not see any need for any kind of reptile survey, including reptile distribution surveys. So the reptiles will be primarily so all these surveys are activity related. So you're surveying for them during the active season, and they will generally be found. What you do is you put out however you do it, you put out artificial refuges for them. And you will always do that. You won't go out into an area of concrete or tarmac and put down a refuge. You do it in the vegetation because that's generally where they're focused. So we can freely assume that there's a high likelihood that there are at least two of the species of common reptile, common lizard and slow worm present within the vegetated areas.

00:29:05:23 - 00:29:37:26

But yes, we have had and this was discussed at ISH too that they can go into areas of outstanding and yes, they can. But if they do that, then they are more exposed to predation. So they don't generally do that. They generally stay close to cover. And then if they will they may nip out and bask of in a tarmac

road. But as soon as the truck comes along or something like that, then they are extremely sensitive to those kind of things and they will just move out of the way. They recognize these things coming along. So I think we know where the reptiles are likely to be just from looking where the vegetation is going to be.

00:29:38:06 - 00:29:56:07

And our entire proposals for the hover pot are to avoid going through vegetated areas, to avoid tracking over vegetation, to use the hard standing areas wherever we can. You don't really need a distribution survey to know where the reptiles will be. They will be where the vegetation is.

00:30:10:20 - 00:30:11:06

Thank you.

00:30:17:05 - 00:30:18:11

Mister Stevens?

00:30:21:20 - 00:30:43:26

Must apologize. I keep jumping in here. But the applicant has just said that the the reptiles and so on will be where the vegetation is. And in rep four zero eight nine one point one point seven, there's the applicant has stated that no vegetation clearance, although some pruning back of shrub bushes will occur.

00:30:45:27 - 00:30:57:22

I would I would question that, and I'd obviously, I sent in a a detailed representation on that. It rep five one five four. That clearly isn't this isn't the situation.

00:30:57:24 - 00:30:58:09

And I

00:30:58:11 - 00:31:16:28

and I know that the examining authority did an unsupervised visit to Pebble Bay and will have walked that route, so they should be aware that there will need to be vegetation clearance, which the likelihood is, as the applicant has just stated, that will contain these these species. Thank you.

00:31:19:24 - 00:31:21:05

Thank you, mister Stevens.

00:31:24:15 - 00:31:27:14

Would Danfox like to come back on that point briefly?

00:31:27:29 - 00:31:58:06

Yeah. Briefly, we I have spoken at length with the engineers who have walked that route. My surveyors have walked that route. We've walked around the site. They have confirmed to me, the engineers have confirmed to me that they would not need to do vegetation removal except the pruning. I don't know specifically what location he is talking about. If wanted he to mark it up, could look at that. But from what we've seen, there are open areas through I mean, there may be the odd

little plant here and there. But when I talk about reptiles, they need cover. So they are in the main vegetated areas.

00:31:58:08 - 00:32:19:29

And there are, from what I understand, open areas that are wide enough that we can use them. I think Mr. Holmwood at the last ISH2, because again, this was discussed at ISH2, talked about the fact that ultimately, we will if we need to use slightly smaller vehicles or less wide vehicles, that's what we will do do what we to need to do. But there are no proposals for vegetation clearance on the hoverboard. Thank you.

00:32:26:19 - 00:32:27:22

Emma Waller.

00:32:29:15 - 00:32:59:02

Emma Waller, Kent White Off Trust. Obviously, I don't wanna repeat what we've already been saying about impacts to the larvae stages of fire clearing moss, but those odd little plants that the applicant mentioned are most likely dock plants, which are the food plant for fire clearing larvae. So any tracking of those or laying down of the matting could have the potential to kill the larvae of fire clearing moths.

00:33:00:00 - 00:33:02:05

Thank you. I think that's noted. Yep.

00:33:05:02 - 00:33:17:27

I'd like to move on to item thirteen point five on the agenda, which is control of activities under requirement five and six, including consideration whether the outlined landscape and ecological management plan should contain more specific survey methodologies.

00:33:19:15 - 00:33:45:27

Draft DCA requirement five secures mitigation in of respect pre commencement operations in Part one, Section one. The primary control is the REAC. However, the REAC does not appear to be inclusive of all of the ecological survey requirements in the associated outline landscape and ecological management plan. Can the applicant explain how pre commencement surveys for species such as bats, reptiles, dormitory are actually secured based on the current wording of DCA requirement five?

00:33:46:26 - 00:34:03:24

I may have to defer to a legal colleague on this. What I I I have not drafted been involved to draft the DCA requirements. I did note the DCA requirement six does explicitly list the lengths, which are obviously the the mechanisms who actually be secured. I don't know if anybody has any further to say to that. Sorry.

00:34:03:26 - 00:34:08:22

I I could ask mister Parker to comment on on this aspect.

00:34:13:00 - 00:34:44:20

James Parker for the applicants. So I don't know if this helps. Maybe I've misunderstood the question. The intention of the drafting is that under five-two, as I may have misunderstood, sir, in which case, my apologies, that all pre commencing operations carried out in accordance with, and then we say sorry, this is five-three, forgive me. The plans listed two, including the REAC. And all outlined schemes, etcetera, are listed at six one.

00:34:45:02 - 00:34:50:10

So forgive me if I've misunderstood. So your point, sir, was that the REAC does not contain

00:34:51:26 - 00:34:53:26

which aspect, sir? Forgive me.

00:34:54:29 - 00:34:58:17

I'm sorry. I'm just scrolling down to requirement five.

00:34:59:14 - 00:35:01:14

So I can just double check this.

00:35:01:16 - 00:35:08:16

It's page ninety nine of the latest version. Certainly, hard copy. Thank you, mister Burns. Confirmed electronic one zero two.

00:35:20:02 - 00:35:31:29

So in requirement five, all works forming parts of authorized development must be carried out in accordance with management plans, schemes, strategies listed in subparagraph two. Subparagraph two lists the register of environmental actions and commitments.

00:35:33:26 - 00:35:38:27

However, the register of environmental actions and commitments doesn't include all of the

00:35:41:21 - 00:35:48:18

of the survey requirements that are outlined in LEMS. And my understanding is at the moment, the pre commencement operations

00:35:51:16 - 00:35:59:23

could occur without triggering effectively the need for the various surveys. Just like confirmation, that's not the case.

00:36:02:20 - 00:36:07:24

James Park, the applicant, unless others wish to come in, we may have to take that one away, I think.

00:36:08:25 - 00:36:09:22

Yes. I mean, I

00:36:11:10 - 00:36:24:23

This might be an easier matter to have in writing. So if we provide an action which specifically sets out the the the point, and we can provide that to you afterwards to to respond to if that would help.

00:36:24:25 - 00:36:33:23

Yes. Thank thank you, Simon. I'm I'm sure it's not the intention to avoid avoid that process, but we'll yes. An action point coming and back to you in writing.

00:36:37:18 - 00:36:58:16

And then ESSA for council suggests that operation of the authorized development doesn't fall under the different definition of all works forming parts of the authorized development in requirements five and six. This is because the definition of authorized development relates to works rather than operation. Can the applicant suggest alternative wording to ensure that control plans apply to operational activities?

00:37:00:23 - 00:37:02:18

James Park, the applicant.

00:37:04:10 - 00:37:35:16

It's come to our attention, and there probably does need to be an adjustment at fiveone and also at sixtwo, such that slightly more conventional wording works obviously pertains generally to construction. And the proposal for deadline six would be the simple removal of the words all works forming part of, such that the wording is the authorized development, and that therefore covers all aspects of the authorized development set out in schedule one.

00:37:36:01 - 00:37:48:24

So that's sort of a slightly more usual formulation. And then the same point would apply therefore at six So I think it's just a drafting point again at six two, so deletion of the words. The works effort I

00:37:48:26 - 00:37:49:14

can't now read it because

00:37:49:16 - 00:38:03:23

I've to scrub it out of my own copy. The works for each stage, you delete those words at six two. So just read the authorized development must be carried out in accordance with, etcetera. Hence that it applies to all aspects of the authorized development.

00:38:06:19 - 00:38:15:01

I think that addresses the point, but I'd like to see that in writing. Mr. Burton, I know you raised this yesterday. Did you want to come in?

00:38:17:02 - 00:38:52:04

James Burton for Seas. Thank you, sir. Two points. On this specific point, perhaps the applicant might consider using the word operational or similar as was done in the SBA order. I have a second point, Sarah. I don't know if you want to hear it now or later. It just concerns requirement six and what that does and doesn't do in order to secure for the life of the project the landscape and ecological mitigation in ALEMP?

00:38:52:06 - 00:38:53:10

Yeah, please go ahead.

00:38:54:02 - 00:38:55:05

Thank you very much.

00:38:57:27 - 00:38:58:26

Requirement six,

00:39:01:11 - 00:39:36:04

let us assume that the applicant includes some wording in requirement five and indeed six that that covers operation. Nonetheless, could I encourage them to look carefully at subparagraph three and indeed subparagraph four? Because at the moment, there is some concern that subparagraph three only deals with landscaping works, whereas the LEMP does include landscape and ecological works.

00:39:36:06 - 00:40:14:00

We wouldn't want anything to fall through the cracks there. And similarly, because subparagraph four is only concerned with any tree or shrub, that does raise a question over and I only give this as an example, the acid grassland restoration area that I see in the latest length is a six hectare area has been identified, but that there looks at least a risk that that might fall through the cracks. We would also, of course, generally ask for securing these things over the lifetime rather than what I appreciate is a fairly standard clause for five year failure after planting.

00:40:14:02 - 00:40:16:05

But those are my points. Thank you, sir.

00:40:16:07 - 00:40:23:06

Thank you, Mr. Burton. And following on from yesterday's discussion, I assume you'll include this in your commentary on the DCO.

00:40:23:16 - 00:40:27:27

Yes, sir. Flags with this is a DCO suggestion.

00:40:27:29 - 00:40:30:11

Thank you. Would the applicant like to respond?

00:40:31:03 - 00:40:59:11

If it assists on, six three. I've been already busily scribbling on my version to delete the word works. If that assists, all landscaping must be carried out. But, I mean, we're we're all ears. The policy intention is well understood. And the point on six-four, I hadn't appreciated, but again, we can turn our mind to that. And if it's simply anything planted, again, we're very happy to ensure that the drafting follows the intention, but we can definitely reflect on that. Thank you, sir.

00:41:00:19 - 00:41:07:25

Thank you, if you could. And again, a response at deadline six, sort of summarizing those points would be helpful. Thank you.

00:41:10:10 - 00:41:12:22

Were there any more comments on this agenda item?

00:41:15:06 - 00:41:21:06

In that case, we'll move on to the last agenda item, which is around biodiversity net gain.

00:41:25:13 - 00:41:31:10

can the applicant provide an update on progress towards signing off legal agreement to secure the ten percent net gain commitment?

00:41:32:02 - 00:41:57:18

Lara Kupeshik for the applicant. Yes, sir. We have shared the heads of terms on the twentieth of February with the local authorities and received feedback from them on the twentieth of March. We've incorporated quite a number of the suggestions made by the local authorities, and we'll send the draft UUs back to them by the end of March and submit them at deadline six.

00:42:05:03 - 00:42:15:13

Thank you. And can I can you just explain whether there are any sort of significant outstanding matters that won't be agreed at the point at which we see that draft?

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

Well, there are some issues about monitoring reports, think. But I don't know if anybody else wants to.

00:42:30:02 - 00:42:43:16

So we'll update you on that. I don't believe that it's it's a unilateral undertaking in any event. My understanding at the moment, there's just just an issue about monitoring reports, but those aren't required because it is a voluntary BNG. So they don't need

00:42:43:18 - 00:42:44:03

to be

00:42:44:05 - 00:42:58:28

approved. The applicant has agreed to contribute towards fees for monitoring. So it seems to me that there isn't anything specific at the moment to pick up. But if there is anything, we will add that to our response at deadline six.

00:43:00:14 - 00:43:00:29

Thank you.

00:43:06:25 - 00:43:33:06

During issue specific hearing one and two and in the SQ2, I raised a number of questions about the possibility of achieving net gain on or close to the site. And we sort of talked about clearance of invasive species at the Hoverport site and Saxmandan, some of the BlueSpace's ideas. Can the

applicant give any indication of the selected location of their net gain proposals and what the scope of those proposals are?

00:43:34:22 - 00:44:02:16

Look, I'll turn to the applicant. We have included the landscape and provision to the south of the convert stations as part of the PNG delivery on-site. And we've also got some planting on the premise in the repairing corridor that would provide terrestrial habitat and increase the condition of a small section of the river promis. We did see the comments around WFD water quality at the promis and whether part of our BNG delivery could

00:44:04:05 - 00:44:11:04

work towards improving the WFD quality of the watercourse. We've spoken to the acquired quality team, attached to the projects, and

00:44:14:24 - 00:44:29:16

improvements condition to watercourses in relation to BNG has to do with physical aspects of the walk course and wouldn't be to do with water quality and things like that. So it's not something we could deliver as part of our PNG. And then in terms of off-site delivery,

00:44:32:17 - 00:44:50:13

we committed early on to deliver BNG in Suffolk and in Kent, which is why there's two metrics attached to the BNG report. And we're looking at opportunities within Suffolk and Kent to deliver kind of more meaningful nature recovery as part of our B and G delivery with wider environmental gains

00:44:51:29 - 00:44:54:28

that will be kind of within Suffolk and within Kent.

00:44:56:25 - 00:45:33:23

I suppose it's particularly that aspect I'm interested in. Clearly, there's a focus within biodiversity net gain policy on achieving that within the local area, if at all possible. At the moment, we don't seem to have a huge amount of commitments in the immediate local area. There are some you've obviously out the line them. So I'm just looking to understand where it is that you see that net gain proposal happening. And is it close is it proximal to the sites? Is it actually a long distance away? Is it the opposite side of the county? Is it next county? So can you say anything about what proposals are actually being explored?

00:45:37:00 - 00:45:57:26

We are in discussion with stakeholders within Suffolk and Kent, but it's all under NDA, so it's not something we can discuss further at this point. But we have made a commitment throughout the project to deliver a ten percent requirement for Suffolk and a ten percent requirement for Kent based on the metrics that we've done at at this point, which should then be updated at detailed design.

00:46:04:03 - 00:46:11:09

Do you think before the close of examination, you're likely to have any more information available about what those final schemes would look like?

00:46:14:06 - 00:46:29:12

It's difficult to say because the the unit requirement at the moment is quite high combined for the project and individually within Suffolk and Kent. So it's not like a town and country planning application where we need twenty or thirty units. We we do need a large number of units for the projects. And

00:46:31:00 - 00:46:41:21

I think to to jump the gun and commit to something now would would possibly lessen the the benefits to biodiversity that we can deliver as part of the BNG for the project.

00:46:43:27 - 00:46:45:25

I don't think it'd be something that we could

00:46:48:02 - 00:46:50:16

commit to before the end of examination.

00:46:52:04 - 00:47:20:12

I mean, to a certain extent from my perspective, if there's legal commitments, ten percent net gain, and it's clear what the basis is for that net gain and the numbers stack up, for the purposes of reporting, I can include that and give that appropriate weight within the reporting. But it would be useful to understand what those proposals are, if there's any possibility of giving more information about that before the close of examination. It's just making that point. I'm not expecting a response, particularly.

00:47:24:27 - 00:47:59:11

I appreciate for the applicant. So just so that you understand a little bit about the process, although it's not can't give you any specific proposals. The applicant is developing a procurement exercise at the moment, which is identifying providers of off-site biodiversity, and that is to support a portfolio of projects. And that's going to be procured through something called QUDM, which stands for the Qualifying Utilities Dynamic Market under the Procurement Act twenty twenty three. And that's going to involve a pre vetted pool of capable suppliers and works.

00:48:00:03 - 00:48:12:23

There's going to be a need for suppliers to demonstrate that biodiversity net gain schemes will in fact contribute to the wider environmental and societal benefits, including environmental education, learning and skills.

00:48:14:18 - 00:48:37:18

That process after discussions and so on have taken place with suitable providers will lead to those parties being invited to bid for opportunities. And applications are anticipated to open in early to mid twenty twenty six. And then they'll be advertised on the government find a tender service. So that's the sort of time scale we're looking at.

00:48:38:00 - 00:48:44:22

Okay. That's helpful. There's one final question I had. And I suppose it again goes back to that point about

00:48:47:28 - 00:49:18:29

providing net gain that responds to the effects of the project. Obviously, in Suffolk, we have impacts on grasslands and particular species. In Kent, we've had lots of reps relating to things like turtledove and other bird species. To what extent are you able to make the net gains sort of responsive to the impacts that are arising from the projects itself?

00:49:20:05 - 00:49:22:00

Luke Addison for that. So

00:49:23:25 - 00:49:31:26

while there's no requirement for us to to satisfy the trading rules as as part of the voluntary PNG for the project, It is something that we are

00:49:33:26 - 00:49:37:14

kind of using as as a shopping list for the units that we do require,

00:49:39:17 - 00:49:57:06

but but where there are better opportunities within kind of working towards the the priorities of of local nature recovery strategies or climate resilience and nature recovery environmental net gain that there would be a preference for the unit provision off-site.

00:49:58:25 - 00:50:18:19

With kind of reference to the to the acid grassland. While the unit losses for acid grassland within the project are high, the the actual habitat loss is negligible. So it's significant loss of units, but it's to do with the time lag of of that habitat being reinstated.

00:50:21:08 - 00:50:26:00

But yeah. And and so we are we are looking at the trading rules, and it's part of the tender process

00:50:27:28 - 00:50:31:02

that will be put out for the for the purchase of units off-site.

00:50:34:15 - 00:50:40:08

K. Thank you. And would either of the councils like to come in on that point? Suffolk County Council.

00:50:40:22 - 00:51:17:26

Laura Slane, Suffolk County Council. Just a a fairly short point, sir. We we raised this in relation to the acid grassland enhancement parcel in the context of the section eighty five crow duty. So this was in our rep five two zero four at page fifteen in response to question two LBIA ten of the last round of EXQ, where we said essentially that we could see no reason why acid grassland enhancement that was being proposed in discharge of the crow duty shouldn't be secured for thirty years rather than the proposed ten.

00:51:17:28 - 00:51:49:08

It's effectively the same point that we would make in the context of of BNG that where there are off-site enhancements proposed, and I appreciate not all of the details are known at this stage. The paragraph five point four point forty four of e n one sets out the general principle that where BNG is provided, provided, it should be for thirty years or the lifetime of the project if that's longer. We don't see any reason why a shorter period should be applied here to any off-site enhancements.

00:51:49:23 - 00:52:04:29

Thank you. I think that point has been well explored through comments raised in representations and responses from the applicants. I don't propose to rehearse that again at this point in time, but the point's noted. Thank you. Does East Suffolk Council have any comments?

00:52:11:17 - 00:52:18:01

Mark Westman Smith for East Suffolk Council. Not from my perspective. Can I just check with mister mayor?

00:52:20:20 - 00:52:35:12

Yeah. Thank you, sir. And James Maref, Theresa of the council. Just a a couple of small points for me. We'd obviously appreciate the sight of this the unilateral undertaking before deadline six to be able to provide you with useful comments backing out the applicant back with useful comments.

00:52:37:07 - 00:52:58:00

Just a quick point on the procurement rules that the applicant has just mentioned. Whilst we appreciate the need for these, we have some concern that if they were overly strict, they're going to reduce the pool of provincial site providers such that there might not be anybody who bids to it and and would query what would happen if that was the case.

00:53:01:24 - 00:53:20:17

And one sorry, sir? Just one final point for me. Just just also, we'd seek the commitment that the first place to look for off-site units is in East Suffolk. I appreciate the applicants referred to Suffolk repeatedly, but the scheme's impacts are going to be felt in East Suffolk. So that's where they need to be looking first and foremost.

00:53:24:00 - 00:53:40:15

Luke, how it's on for the applicant. In terms of your second point about the procurement framework, I'd have to take that one away and speak to National Grid's procurement and PNG team about that one, but I can I can respond to you on that one, James?

00:53:42:05 - 00:53:52:21

And in terms of of off-site PNG delivery in in East Suffolk, that is where we are looking. Yeah. I've just got used to referring to it as Suffolk and and Kemp.

00:53:55:01 - 00:54:08:03

And from that perspective, is there anything within the actual procurement arrangements that sort of links to East Suffolk rather than the wider Suffolk area? Or Thanet, for example?

00:54:09:09 - 00:54:10:22

I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

00:54:10:24 - 00:54:31:12

So in the procurement agreements, is there a sort of a some kind of requirement that effectively says project should be within East Suffolk or Thanet rather than in the sort of wider areas or or at least a sort of a desire to be as close to the project as as possible.

00:54:31:14 - 00:54:34:20

There is. Yes. Yeah. Luke Hudson, Feb yeah. There is a

00:54:36:13 - 00:54:45:04

a preference for for projects that are as close to the scheme as possible. And there's also several other steps in the tender process that we'd we'd like them to tick off.

00:54:45:16 - 00:54:52:20

In the pre hearing notes, are you able to provide examples of those clauses so we can see what's being required?

00:54:56:27 - 00:54:59:12

I'm going to pass over to Mr. Pearson.

00:55:00:27 - 00:55:30:29

Adrian Pearson for the applicant. The procurement is being established to cover the whole of National Grid electricity transmission's geography. When we tend to specific lots through that procurement, so for the East Suffolk PNG requirement, we will specify the procurement to add additional weight to schemes within East Suffolk. It's not yet designed yet, so it may be restriction in the first instance to only qualifying schemes within East Suffolk.

00:55:31:03 - 00:55:49:06

We obviously need to ensure we can deliver the BNG commitment. So if no suitable schemes were in East Suffolk, it would broaden out to Suffolk maybe more generally. But in the first instance, the requirement will be driven and certainly weighted to schemes as close to the proposed project as possible.

00:55:54:20 - 00:55:56:29

Do you know when those rules are going to be defined?

00:55:58:25 - 00:56:41:11

Adrian Pearson for the applicant. So those will be defined as we launch the tender for the project. So as we've mentioned by my colleague earlier, we are already engaging with potential schemes and encouraging the organizations that are bringing those schemes forward to register onto the dynamic framework. So we are aware that we believe there will be suitable qualifying schemes in the East Suffolk geography, but we have to let that process follow through as we specify the procurement at the right time. We will include in those rules that for the East Suffolk PNG will be the requirement and certainly the Thanet and East Kent area for the equivalent for the Kent BNG procurement.

00:56:44:19 - 00:57:00:22

I suppose just from my perspective at the moment, I don't have anything that hinges that down at all. Verbal statement from yourself, obviously, I appreciate that. But there's nothing formalized within the application material that I'm aware of, unless you correct me. Adrian Pearson, for

00:57:00:24 - 00:57:09:08

the applicant, we can take that point away and look as to what we can commit to in writing, subject, of course, to we must be able to deliver the BNG.

00:57:09:10 - 00:57:10:18

I do appreciate that.

00:57:10:20 - 00:57:11:05

But we can take

00:57:11:07 - 00:57:12:09

that away and consider it. Thank you.

00:57:12:11 - 00:57:14:26

Yeah, if you would. Thank you. And for deadline six?

00:57:14:28 - 00:57:16:28

Yes, for deadline six.

00:57:17:00 - 00:57:17:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:57:20:00 - 00:57:24:00

And did Thanet District Council have any questions or comments?

00:57:30:24 - 00:57:37:04

Helen Johnson, Thanet District Council. We've got nothing to add more at this point, and we look forward to the submission at deadline six. Thank you.

00:57:38:03 - 00:57:41:02

Thank you. Right.

00:57:42:27 - 00:57:45:26

Are there any further comments on biodiversity net gain?

00:57:49:02 - 00:57:57:06

If not, I want to thank everyone for their time on the ecology session today, and I'll pass back to my colleague to deal with any other business.

00:58:01:16 - 00:58:11:18

Thank you. So Item fourteen on the agenda was any other business. We have been informed by the case team that Marianne Fellows wishes to raise a point of any other business. So if you'd like to speak now.

00:58:19:03 - 00:58:51:24

Thank you, madam. Ladies and gentlemen, Marianne Fellows, Olga resident. Really appreciate your time over the last few days to examine these important matters. As you know, e n two one point five point three says the principle of sustainable development will also ensure that energy infrastructure is deployed in areas where the local environment has the capacity to enable these developments. And then it goes on to to explain and restore nature.

00:58:53:05 - 00:59:23:06

As you've noted, there are significant challenges to mitigate the various potential harms that may be caused should you be minded to recommend this application. As the needs case really underpins everything we do in terms saying of whether harms can be mitigated against the benefit. It's really key to this examination that we look at that specifically, especially as this rolls to various nationals

00:59:23:11 - 00:59:28:10

Can I pause just you there? This feels like it should be a written submission. It doesn't feel

00:59:28:12 - 00:59:48:00

like question, madam. It's a question, madam. Urgent question about the timetable over the next few weeks. So If you could quickly my question is I I wanted to give you a bit of context very succinctly, hopefully. But so my question is, will a needs case

00:59:49:15 - 01:00:12:11

will an issue specific hearing please be scheduled urgently to examine the needs case in the light of new information and evidence that has come forward? So we have not examined that, and all of the harms that we're looking to can only go through if there is an underpinning needs case.

01:00:12:13 - 01:00:28:26

We understand. Need was investigated and examined during issue specific hearing one and through written questions. It's not that we've not examined it, and we have we are considering everything that we've been given in writing and everything that we've heard orally. There won't be any more issue specific hearings.

01:00:29:01 - 01:00:29:16

Okay. Have

01:00:29:18 - 01:00:31:06

you got any other points that you'd like to raise?

01:00:32:07 - 01:00:45:23

It's just that it's so crucial, and it underpins everything else that we've been talking about since that. Because if you can't demonstrate need, then you can't demonstrate that the potential harms that are being caused aren't justified.

01:00:46:05 - 01:00:48:21

Yeah. We we understand the examining authority.

01:00:48:23 - 01:00:50:02

Alright. I trust you. And

01:00:50:12 - 01:00:50:27

Thank you.

01:00:50:29 - 01:00:53:18

I put everything in your capable hands. Thank you.

01:00:53:20 - 01:00:57:06

Thank you. I know there's a hand up in Suffolk. We can go to there, please.

01:00:59:01 - 01:01:31:27

Yes. Charlotte Fox on behalf of Benel and Stamfield Parish Council. I'd just like to say thank you very much for your thorough examination and also especially for being so inclusive of people like Benel and Stamfield Parish Council. My question is, can you tell me whether there's any real prospect for meaningful examination of the Suffolk County Council route proposals for the northern access route to access the converter station site.

01:01:32:02 - 01:02:03:08

Seeing as we're so close to the end of the examination, what worries me is that the converter station sits wholly in the village of Stenfield, and the access route runs through the village of Benel. So we are being subjected to an awful lot of adverse impacts, and we already feel overwhelmed, as you know, by our cumulative impact burden, and we already feel are already experiencing unacceptable interference with our mental health and well-being.

01:02:03:13 - 01:02:46:17

But it feels to me as if we're in a state of stalemate because National Grid aren't recognizing cumulative impact or health and well-being impacts. And I I would hope that National Grid will be attempting to reduce our adverse impacts. And if we look at the mitigation hierarchy, southern the Suffolk County Council's northern route proposals actually avoid a lot of our impacts. For instance, the bridge over the River Fromas, transportation over the Benel railway bridge, and the traffic disruption in Saks London, that could all be avoided.

01:02:46:22 - 01:03:02:03

Yeah. We I mean, we have heard your concerns, and, obviously, we had a session on cumulative, and we understand the impacts on health and health and well-being. We have seen the Suffolk County Council submission. We've seen the applicant's response, and this is still being under under consideration at the moment.

01:03:02:05 - 01:03:09:23

Yes. So that's fantastic. My my question is, can it be properly examined this close to the end of the VCO examinations?

01:03:10:07 - 01:03:12:29

Do the best we can in the time we have left.

01:03:13:01 - 01:03:13:16

That's all

01:03:13:18 - 01:03:14:03

I that's all I

01:03:14:05 - 01:03:14:22

can thank you.

01:03:14:24 - 01:03:15:11

Thank you.

01:03:15:13 - 01:03:22:03

Was there another hand in Suffolk? And so there were two people in Suffolk who might speak? Nope. Just one. Okay.

01:03:22:22 - 01:03:24:05

Is there anybody up here.

01:03:24:26 - 01:03:30:07

Thank you. Is there anybody else who has any points of any other business?

01:03:32:23 - 01:03:33:22

Yes?

01:03:34:14 - 01:04:05:20

James Buckley on behalf of the African. I picked up a theme in the floor open here in the other day, which I thought was worth just reiterating now, but we will put in writing of this compulsory acquisition of the hover port. The former hover port including access to it, and I've got plot numbers here, which I won't repeat, is required for the permanent access to the mud flats for both construction and maintenance. This does not constitute acquisition or exclusive possession and will not materially impact other users. I just want to put out that because it's a misconception that we are buying the hoverboard.

01:04:05:22 - 01:04:14:00

The other thing is we are not importing any aggregate onto the hoverboard. So just two points I wanted to make clear, and we'll put that in writing as well.

01:04:14:12 - 01:04:19:18

Thank you. I appreciate that. Are there any other points anyone would like to wish make before we close the hearing?

01:04:22:09 - 01:04:53:15

Okay. So can I remind you all that the timetable for the examination requires that parties provide any post hearing submissions on or before deadline six, which is Monday, the thirteenth of April? I'll also remind you that a recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspector's website as soon as practicable after this hearing. Before we close, I just want to thank everyone for their time and assistance during the course of this hearing. We will consider all your responses very carefully. The time is now twelve forty nine, and this issue specific hearing for the proposed C Link project is now closed.