

00:00:05:03 - 00:00:37:12

Thank you very much, everybody. We're resuming the issue specific hearing for, uh, where item 6.4, in relation to noise and vibration, uh, where we are going to now, ask the applicant why only six properties are referenced in requirement 14, uh, when 13 are identified within uh app 259, which is the appendix C related to uh chapter 14 of the noise related to noise and vibration of the environmental statement.

00:00:37:21 - 00:01:10:24

Uh, and it's specifically the one that relates to the, uh, the East Anglia connection node. So, uh, why why are only six properties listed when you reference 13 within the the document? Um, Russell Harris, Casey for the applicant. Uh, I'll pass over to the expert in a minute, but my understanding is that it's because they are the worst case and are used as a reference. Uh, The ones beyond six are further away and um, noise attenuation over distance would apply. But, um, that that's my layman's position.

00:01:13:05 - 00:01:47:06

Uh, David Gray for the applicant essentially. That's that's correct. So yes, the the assessment considered 13 receptor locations within the one kilometre study area. Um, the reason only six properties are listed in requirement 14 is that, as Mr. Harris said, they are the, uh, the nearest receptors. Um, if the limits are met at those nearest properties, then the levels of the properties further away would also be controlled. Yeah. Um, this is a standard approach to securing noise limits.

00:01:47:15 - 00:02:18:15

Um, also, at greater distances, it can be become more difficult to reliably measure the specific sound level from the source because it's more easily affected by other, other local noise sources, and so adding limits, specifically at more distant properties would not improve protection. Um, and could risk making the requirement so unnecessary, difficult to enforce, and unreasonable in planning terms. Um.

00:02:21:25 - 00:02:22:28

I think that's it.

00:02:23:00 - 00:02:32:16

Okay. That's fine. I understand that answer. Um, do any local authorities or county authorities wish to add anything or say anything to what they've just heard? Please.

00:02:34:23 - 00:02:49:03

And any interested parties in the room, open it up to interested parties. No indication in the room or online. So I'm going to move on to to my next, um, item with this for a second.

00:02:55:24 - 00:03:27:07

Right. Okay. This this relates to the noise and vibration management plan. Um, that's identified as DNV zero five in the outline code of construction Practice. Um, that's rep 5-139. Um, and also in relation to annex F of the outline noise and vibration band, which is rep for Dash 170. Um, how will the need for ongoing consultation and authorization be undertaken once it's once it has initially been discharged by the relevant planning authorities.

00:03:27:09 - 00:03:42:06

So. So once you've, you've discharged your your responsibilities under that. Um, uh NV oh five how is ongoing um authorisation related to noise and management going to continue?

00:03:46:12 - 00:04:22:12

Uh, David Gray for the applicants. Um, so the the detailed noise and vibration management plan will be secured through requirement for the DCO and commitment. NVR five of the Code of Construction Practice and it will set the overall framework for managing construction noise and vibration, including the approach to assessment and the mitigation, monitoring and reporting. And importantly, it must be submitted to and approved by the relevant local authorities before construction begins.

00:04:23:09 - 00:05:25:07

By requirement for um with regard specifically to change management of the management plan and the processes described in section 5.5 of the Vibration Management Plan itself, and including the process for agreement with the local planning authorities on those changes and ongoing consultation throughout the construction period will then take place through that approved framework that includes engagement with the local authorities on monitoring requirements and exceedance and reporting, as well as the ability to review and update the noise vibration management plan as works progress and if any update materially changes the agreed controls or mitigation, it will then need further approval from the relevant planning and local planning authority under requirement for the DCO, and the amount of engagement may vary from place to place um, depending on the nature of the work.

00:05:25:09 - 00:06:32:24

So it could be that short duration linear works such as pylon construction may need more limited ongoing interaction. Longer duration activities such as substations and compounds, or works particularly close to receptors, um, including pylons and even if relatively short duration, may involve more detailed monitoring, reporting and liaison. So these all these processes would be secured through the Noise and Vibration Management Plan VI requirements for through agreement with the local authorities, um for specific activities where there is potential for significant adverse effects, or where works are proposed outside of the core working hours, um, further authorization will be sought through the section 61 process that gives the local planning authorities the further opportunity to review and agree proposed methods, predicted noise and vibration levels, mitigation and monitoring for those specific activities, and they should in principle, that they will meet with each other the the management plan and the section 61 process.

00:06:32:26 - 00:06:35:01

But it's just another um.

00:06:37:20 - 00:06:41:12

Stage of enforcement like, um,

00:06:43:02 - 00:06:43:19

the.

00:06:45:21 - 00:06:46:12

Um.

00:06:51:02 - 00:07:24:06

So we've we're putting an update in the noise of vibration mining from time for deadline six. Um, to better reflect the position on noise monitoring and associated reporting. Following the comments we've received from from the local planning authorities. Um, this will absolutely secure monitoring in the Noise and Vibration management plan through agreement with the local authorities via requirement four of the DCO, rather than, as it currently states, through the section 61 process or following complaints.

00:07:24:23 - 00:07:31:00

So hopefully that provides some reassurance on that point that we, uh, we've taken away.

00:07:32:08 - 00:07:51:27

That's helpful. Um, and I look forward to seeing the submission at deadline six. Um, that gives the update. So, um, opening the question or response up to, uh, local authorities and county authorities. Does anybody want to say anything to what they've heard? It's got a hand. Well, thank.

00:07:51:29 - 00:08:25:20

You, sir. Matthew Ward, Braintree District Council. Um, as the ex was seen in our, um, submissions, we've raised quite significant concerns with the robustness of the noise assessment that's been carried out at this stage, especially at weekends. Um, and we understand, following meetings with, um, the National Grid team about the statement of common ground, that all of the noise mitigation will be deferred to the contractor. Um, and having reviewed MVO five, um, we've got some quite, uh, we don't think that addresses our concerns, obviously.

00:08:25:22 - 00:08:34:13

We'll see what it says at deadline six. But if I could invite, um, on my noise consultant to come in and let, um, articulate our concerns, please.

00:08:37:14 - 00:09:21:02

Um, Neil Fletcher for Braintree, Braintree District Council. Um, yeah. Following on from what Matthew Wilde has just said, um, we interpret the words in the code of construction practice as, um, it basically states that the main work's contractor will submit a detailed noise assessment to the local authority, but it doesn't ask for approval or agreement at that stage. Um, it then goes on to say that the main work, if the main works contractor identifies potential significant adverse effects, they will then enter into consultation with the local authority.

00:09:21:11 - 00:09:44:06

So it as we interpret it at the moment, it's only if the main work's contractor finds significant effects that they will enter into consultation. So we would we would ask that, um, when, when the noise assessment is submitted to the local authority that it should be approved and agreed by them.

00:09:48:15 - 00:09:50:00

Thank you very much, Mr. Fletcher.

00:09:53:18 - 00:10:25:15

Mr. Bray, do you want to come back on any of that at all? I mean, especially the the element with regard to, um, it needing to be approved by the somebody too and approved by the local planning authority, um, or local authority. Um, and also sort of the mechanism by which they can enforce any breach. So. So if the words like if are used, uh, it adds an element of doubt, um, as to the enforceability of the, uh, of the matter.

00:10:25:19 - 00:10:58:15

Um, so, uh, clearly there needs to be a, um, a mechanism for approval of the submitted document. And there also needs to be a clear path in relation to, to enforcement and how any enforcement would be pursued. So, you know, if the local authority gets complaints from the neighbouring occupiers. Um, then then then what? How is how is the enforcement process triggered? What what has to be done, who has to respond, etc.

00:10:58:17 - 00:11:02:18

and so on. So I need a clearer understanding of that as well, please.

00:11:03:27 - 00:11:35:00

Uh, David Gray for the applicant. Yes. On the on the, um, on the on the first point, I think it's, it's a, it's a simple point to address. Um, so the, the assessment will be undertaken by the, by the contractors and they will determine the specific mitigation measures that would then be submitted to the to the local panel authorities as part of the noise and vibration management plan, and would then be approved through the, through the um noise of vibration management plan. So, so that's.

00:11:35:02 - 00:11:40:10

The I think that's the step that's missing there. Um, um, on.

00:11:40:12 - 00:11:40:27

The.

00:11:42:21 - 00:11:54:06

On the second point. Um, that may be something to take away. Um, to put in writing if we can. Um.

00:11:54:13 - 00:12:28:14

That's fine. I'm happy for you to do that. But, um, I'm just conscious of the time we've got, um, available to us now, and and ultimately, um, we need to see something that that pretty quickly, I think, um, especially in terms of, uh, processes, if complaints are received and what happens, you know. So, uh, I think I've seen something within the submitted documentation that, um, um, that deals with that. But whether or not it goes far enough, um, I need to, to relook at it.

00:12:28:19 - 00:12:46:26

Um, but obviously there needs to be a process where the local authorities know that they can deal with complaints and what the process is and then how they can can respond. Um, I've got bronchitis on. On the line with a hand up from, uh, Babergh and Mid Suffolk.

00:12:48:00 - 00:13:25:18

Thank you sir. Bronchitis for baby district council and Mid Suffolk district Council. I made this point um, yesterday in issue three. But just more generally about compliance, monitoring, reporting and enforcement. It's something that we're in discussion with the applicant insofar as they are the developer for. Um, Branford Twins did about an agreed compliance monitoring reporting process. They have said for BTO that they need to discuss that with the Norwich Tilbury team and the Sealink team, because it will set precedent for what happens with, um, the delivery of those dsos, quite understandably.

00:13:25:20 - 00:13:58:04

But just to let you know that we are in dialogue with National Grid on this matter. It's something that the authorities feel strongly is not sufficiently covered or agreed at this stage. But what? What we haven't heard is, whilst we appreciate all the steps that are taken in the management plans to report where there is a non-compliance that needs to be agreed, that is found by the contractor or the applicant. What we haven't heard is what happens when we have a third party complaint that comes to us a lot. We are the enforcing authorities and we need to deal with those appropriately.

00:13:58:06 - 00:14:16:20

So we need to have an agreed process. And I'm trying to work on behalf of the lead authorities, for instance, with the applicant, to find a way that works with them so as not to delay the delivery of the of the project. And I think we can do that, but I don't feel that we have resolution on that for any of the projects yet. Thank you.

00:14:17:05 - 00:14:47:26

Thank you very much. I think that's helpful input, because it gives you an idea of where we're trying to come from, and especially if you've had I mean, I don't know whether you know about the dialogue between Sealink and Brentford's twin stood in relation to this matter. But I definitely like to see something about, uh, the the, uh, the compliance monitoring process and the enforcement process and how that works because, um, you know, ultimately, I've, I've, I've had to secure similar things in the past.

00:14:47:28 - 00:15:15:26

So and it's not new. So I'm surprised it's it's been raised really, but and it shouldn't need to be. But I'd like to see something as soon as you can. Deadline six. If at all possible, please. Um, anybody else in the

room? Uh, wishing to say anything? So we've heard from councils, uh, both county and local. Any interested parties wanting to add anything to this element of the discussion? Got no indication in the room, so I'm going to move on. Um.

00:15:19:11 - 00:15:26:21

So the next question is, is do we have anything else that anybody wishes to raise in relation to noise and vibration? So just as a general topic,

00:15:28:16 - 00:15:42:05

no indication from councils or local authorities and no indication in the room from interested parties. So thank you very much. We're going to move on to item number seven. We'll give you a few seconds to swap around. Thank you for your time.

00:16:32:06 - 00:16:35:17

Okay. Thank you. So item seven, aviation safety.

00:16:36:29 - 00:17:10:28

Um, and we'll begin with agenda item one concerns policy matters. Um, so the first question is to the applicant. Um, and it concerns your answer to excuse, um SS 2.5. Um, and in that answer, you state that if and to the extent that the operator takes a view having regard to relevant guidance, that the aerodrome is unsafe, then it should modify its operations in one paragraph 5.5.50 such that it is safe or it cannot be achieved, that the then the unsafe aerodrome should close its unsafe operational capacity.

00:17:12:26 - 00:17:40:06

When I read that paragraph, I actually read that it states it is incumbent on operators of aerodromes to regularly review the possibility of agreeing to make reasonable changes to operational procedures, which doesn't appear to me to be quite the same. Um, and the paragraph also states that the Secretary of State should be satisfied that the proposal has been designed, where possible, to minimise adverse impacts on the operation and safety of aerodromes. Um, I'll be grateful for your views on that place.

00:17:42:01 - 00:18:29:27

Russell Harris KC for the applicant. I'm very happy to clarify the position. Um, and I should say, because it's a public forum and public. Very concerned about safety, that there can be no prospect of the grant of this order creating an unacceptable risk to public safety or human health by reason of the juxtaposition of the electricity equipment with any aviation interests. And I'll explain why that's the case. If the DCO were to be granted and its grant would give rise to unacceptable safety risk, which could not be mitigated, then the aerodrome would simply not be able to operate to the extent that the unmitigated danger existed.

00:18:29:29 - 00:19:15:23

I think there was a wrong reference. Paragraph 5.5.59 of N1 bullet point one makes it clear that for a licensed aerodrome, the CAA would simply not maintain a license. To the extent that there was an unacceptable danger or risk to human health for an unlicensed aerodrome, there's really no difference where an operator thinks that the position that's created is unacceptably dangerous.

00:19:16:00 - 00:19:57:04

It would be simply inappropriate and unlawful and contrary to the air navigation order for that operator to continue the operation insofar as it's dangerous. Now, in the circumstances of this case, sir, we've got that position accepted by. For example. I'll give you the response number. It's your questioned examining questions. Two Tibetan response 5-260, where they correctly state the position that if if underlined, there is an unacceptable danger in the way that they outlined.

00:19:57:06 - 00:20:27:23

They weren't applying the provisions that I've just outlined be unable lawfully to operate two of their seven, um, runways. And, um, that's the position. Um, they'd find it very difficult to get insurance. And ultimately the CAA retains a residual power. And as they point out correctly, article 240 or article 241 to bring a prosecution or to close airspace or to issue a warning.

00:20:27:25 - 00:20:59:00

So for those who are alleging that there is the potential for risk for human health resulting from the juxtaposition of the DCO, they ignore the fact that there are clear other mechanisms in place which mean that that risk simply cannot and would not arise because an operator is in charge of safety. If that operator is alleging unsafe, then the operation of the aerodrome cannot continue in that unsafe position.

00:20:59:02 - 00:21:37:09

And ultimately the CAA have the powers that I have outlined. And all of this is unsurprising given the importance of aviation safety generally. What that means in the in the circumstances of N1 is that the exception to the CNI presumption does not and cannot arise. That's that's the the line of thought and, um, the position that exists that Ian one is talking of, particularly in relation to unlicensed aerodromes and licensed aerodromes where the CAA takes the lead, and to unlicensed aerodromes where the operator is obliged to take the lead.

00:21:40:14 - 00:22:15:20

Okay. Thank you. Um, that I understand the point you're making, obviously. Um, paragraph 5.5 point 60, OEM one states that provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that the impacts proposed energy developments do not present risks to national security and physical safety. And when they where they do, provided that Secretary of State is satisfied that appropriate mitigation can be achieved or appropriate requirements can be attached to any development consent order to secure these mitigations, consent may be granted. I suppose my concern here is with the phrase developments do not present risks to physical safety.

00:22:15:22 - 00:22:42:15

Yes. And then we have a range of aerodromes who in their view considered appropriate mitigation can't be achieved, or is it being considered by the applicant? And within this context, I appreciate your comments that unless, unlike unlicensed aerodromes, the responsibility to ensure safe operation lies with the operator themselves to satisfy, there is no unacceptable risk to public safety as you've just outlined. Um, is this a chicken and egg situation?

00:22:44:12 - 00:23:19:05

No, sir. It's an entirely whatever the opposite of chicken and egg is. If if there is an unsafe position and if operators are declaring that in a public venue like this and it is proven to be accurate, then they would have to close. So there's no risk associated. They'd have to close to that extent. So in Tiverton, for example, there would be two runways which they say would be unsafe. We disagree and we're working on solutions to do with competition, um, uh, heights and alternatives, which I can bring you up to date with.

00:23:19:07 - 00:23:51:25

It's all mostly good news. Um, but no, it's a it's an absolute stop. Uh, on, uh, activity where the operator believes that it's unsafe. Even if the operator takes that view, um, uh, inappropriately, that's it's simply inappropriate and, uh, uh, inconceivable that an operator could declare something unsafe and then accept pilots, uh, in on that route. Pilots, too, would have to have regard to whether they thought it was safe or not.

00:23:51:27 - 00:23:59:09

And as you'll hear, pilots in the craft they come in will not land in circumstances which have been declared unsafe.

00:24:00:23 - 00:24:38:06

Okay. Thank you. In. I seen Mr. Griffiths hand up online. I'll come to you in a second. Mr. Griffiths, um, in your response to SS 2.5, you state that the operational loss of unlicensed aerodromes, which you thought about the impact of energy infrastructure, is not covered by the requirements of .5.59. And that this requirement only relates to licensed aerodromes. For a reason. Um, refer to this paragraph earlier. In that context, I note that the second bullet point of 5.5.59, which states it would cause to harm to aerodromes, training or emergency service needs,

00:24:39:27 - 00:24:45:11

doesn't apply to licensed aerodromes near the aerodromes. Um, do you have any view on that?

00:24:46:09 - 00:24:48:03

Bear with me, sir. I'm just here to go.

00:24:52:15 - 00:25:29:14

Yes. So this this, um, this is a very helpful, um, paragraph because what it identifies is what happens, um, after reasonable mitigation and operational changes, there is nonetheless the requirement for the aerodrome to close. So there are two points here. The first point is that where a licensed aerodrome has to close first bullet point. The Secretary of State is only mandated by paragraph 5.59, required, in other words, to give that specific attention.

00:25:29:22 - 00:26:06:08

There's nothing there which requires him to give specific attention. He's not mandated or she's not mandated to, um, uh, give specific attention. If an unlicensed aerodrome is unable to maintain its

operational, um, capacity. Now, that's for two reasons. The first reason is it's because there is a recognition in the document and in the area. Um, chapter, when read as a whole that licensed airports, um, tend to be more important in terms of socio economic loss or emergency services needs than unlicensed.

00:26:06:10 - 00:26:36:20

So that's why it's mandated. The second point is, it doesn't mean that if there's a loss of unlicensed capacity, it's not a material consideration. You would still be entitled to weigh it in the balance, but the way in which the document is framed requires the Secretary of State to do the exercise in relation to the first bullet point. The second bullet point relates to aerodromes apostrophe s apostrophe. So more than one aerodromes training or emergency service needs.

00:26:36:22 - 00:27:14:13

And that relates to if an aerodrome were to close completely and it had training facilities or emergency service needs which were thereby, um, compromised, and that would be a material consideration too. So, um, that's assuming that the aerodrome has closed completely. And I will say in the circumstances of this case, certainly, um, the three aerodromes which are, um, uh, asserting potential danger are not asserting publicly any of them that they would close as nothing in the documentation that say that.

00:27:14:15 - 00:27:42:00

And we have from Tiburon, for example, um, a position that they would certainly need to close. They say two of their runways, but they don't assert they would close. Um, um, no doubt we'll hear from them in due course. But that's what five, five, nine does. It's, it's it's relevant because it identifies licensed aerodromes as a specific consideration that the secretary state has to take into account. There's no such position with unlicensed aerodromes.

00:27:42:19 - 00:27:45:14

Thank you. Um, Mr. Griffiths, thank you for waiting.

00:27:51:08 - 00:27:55:10

Right. Sorry about that. I can't quite see the screen due to the bright light.

00:27:55:14 - 00:27:56:03

No problem.

00:27:56:05 - 00:28:12:15

Okay. Um, it. Listening to that, I mean, I have a fuller response that I'm intending to give later on, but the impression I get is that there's a left handed right hand situation with regard to the applicant.

00:28:14:06 - 00:28:49:23

We see, we hear the applicant saying we don't agree that there's a safety risk. But in rep 4302, table 2.2, the applicant accept there is a period in the middle where hitting the line is an inevitability. Get your teeth in and I can tell you that a light aircraft hitting a power line is going to result in fatalities. Now, how does that situation, as given by the applicant, there is a possibility that you will hit the line.

00:28:50:00 - 00:28:55:08

Sit with what we've just heard. We don't agree that there's an aviation safety risk.

00:28:58:12 - 00:29:04:04

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. I did have some questions on this matter later on, but if you wish to come back now.

00:29:04:18 - 00:29:51:22

No, um. I will get the experts to deal with that later. Russell Harris case for the applicant. Sorry. Um, just dealing with your question, which was to do with risk to public safety. Um, with respect to the question that just being asked, it doesn't address that issue. And, and we know from Tiverton that they agree with the approach that we've adopted, which is there can be no risk of that. There can be no risk of that, because there would be those in the system that would either have to do it themselves or the CAA, with its reserve capacity, um, could close the airspace or, um, give a warning or eventually, um, serve a prosecution under the um, under the air navigation order.

00:29:51:24 - 00:30:16:03

So I don't think would respect the misinterpretation of what is said. Um, by our air witness is relevant to that question. So I'll come back to it in the context of the negotiations that are helpfully going on now, also with Tiverton, which is a new thing since we met last and the British Gliding Club Association. Association. Sorry.

00:30:16:09 - 00:30:22:20

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. Do you still have your hand up, or is that, um, you've not taken it down from before?

00:30:23:29 - 00:30:57:12

Sorry. Let me just get these looking straight into the sun, trying to click these. Yeah. Things. I didn't address the question of public safety because. What do you mean by public safety? Now, Tibetan is a gliding club. It is a club flying club, in effect, that's operated by members for members. But it also has an element of, um, how can I put it as sort of commercial operations. For example, we have virgin balloons based there now.

00:30:57:14 - 00:31:38:23

Virgin balloons go flying as often as they can, and they're always carrying members of the public. So in terms of a risk to public safety. Are we talking about. Well, if it's a club member, it doesn't count. They can kill themselves if they want to, but if it is a member of the paying public. That's a different kettle of fish. And if that is the decision, or that is the view that these members of the public who are having flights from Tiverton are being put at risk because of the proximity of the pylons to those two runways, and is acknowledged by the applicant as representing a safety hazard, then how on earth can they comply with involved?

00:31:41:15 - 00:31:43:24

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. Mr. Harris.

00:31:44:22 - 00:31:45:08

Um.

00:31:50:17 - 00:32:34:16

I think Russell Harris. KC. I think we need to be careful, particularly when talking about safety. Um, the applicant is clear that there is no safety risk or that there can be a modification. Um, use of runways is one type of modification. Um, that can bring about an entirely safe position. So we aren't saying anything is unsafe. The question that was posed to us was in the event that there was an unsafe position, would there be a risk to human health? And the answer to that is no, because the relevant authorities and the operator will see to it that there is not a risk to health.

00:32:34:27 - 00:32:46:28

Um, that doesn't mean that we accept the, um, allegations of unsafe areas. Um, in fact, that's a completely separate question, which we're going to turn to shortly.

00:32:48:18 - 00:33:20:22

Thank you. Um, I'm just going to move on with a few questions of my own now, Mr. Griffiths, but I will come back to you afterwards. Thank you. Um, your answer to, um. Excuse SS 2.6. You state that there are many aerodromes which operate safely on a daily basis with electricity infrastructure nearby. Um, could you provide any examples of aerodromes of a similar type of scale? Traffic types? Usage? It's, um, what they were talking about and proximity to existing overhead lines at similar heights.

00:33:21:19 - 00:33:33:07

Russell Harris KC for the applicant, um, we we have done at the last deadline and I'll pass over to um Louise Brace to summarize that evidence and to signpost you to it.

00:33:33:09 - 00:33:42:18

Thank you. Yes, I did I did know the kind of you mentioned Thurrock, Peterborough, CIPs and BAC speed and so on. Um, I guess I was looking for a bit more detail about them rather than just the names, and.

00:33:42:20 - 00:33:43:05

That's what we're going.

00:33:43:07 - 00:33:44:05

To give. Thank you.

00:33:55:18 - 00:34:27:25

Neil Jamieson for the applicant. I'll, I'll be able to answer that question. Um, so, in the case of Thurrock, um, that is an aerodrome that was impacted by this project. So it has been assessed. Um, we've reached an agreement on where the line will go in relation to the runway there. Um, they have been operating already for many years successfully with, uh, an albeit um, uh, lower height line in a very similar position to the one that is proposed here.

00:34:28:03 - 00:35:01:05

Um, so on that basis in our, in our view, that makes it a good, a good example. Um, in the case of Peterborough Sibson. Uh, they've also been in existence for decades. Uh, they've had a 440 kilovolt line, um, in close proximity, about half a mile from the eastern edge of their aerodrome. Um, they were formerly licensed. Um, and so the, the runways and the obstacle limitation services and so on were in place with that line in existence.

00:35:01:19 - 00:35:42:21

And so they also provide a good example of where, um, flying training takes place. There is a parachute drop zone at that site. So it's an example of a mixed, a mixed economy general aviation airfield, uh, with a, with a power line very similar to the one that's proposed here in existence. Uh, Elstree Aerodrome in north London, um, is much busier than any of the 21 aerodromes that have been considered on this line. Uh, 60 to 70,000 movements a year. Um, has, uh, lines running to the north and the west of it, um, uh, including one that runs perpendicular to the takeoff path from the western runway.

00:35:43:01 - 00:36:17:03

Um, again, licensed aerodrome. Uh, so the 168 obstacle limitation services apply. Um, back speed. Um, it was included here as an extreme example of coexistence with a line in that a full 40 kilovolt line runs right across the the end of the runway. When I say across the runway, it runs over the top of the end of the runway. Um, it's a microlight site. Flying training takes place there. They have made operational changes, I think, in that they don't, uh, approach under the line, for instance.

00:36:17:05 - 00:36:46:11

But, uh, I believe that there are sometimes takeoffs that take place under it. Um, they sign it suitably, uh, the brief pilots on the way in and so on. But the fact is that they coexist with a line within the boundary of their aerodrome quite successfully. So there are there are several places around the country that have survived for a long time. Sometimes it's quite extreme situations with regard to to interaction with the lines.

00:36:46:17 - 00:37:06:21

Thank you for that. Um, I think it would be helpful that that was useful. I think it would be helpful to me if possible. Um, if I could, if we could get some more information on those. On those aerodromes and similar in writing, potentially with diagrams or something similar. So you can see the distance and the proximity and the height of the lines in those individual cases, for instance.

00:37:06:23 - 00:37:17:27

Yes, that does exist. Um, absolutely. Submitted, including I think the aerial photographs are the most impressive way to understand it, but we do diagrams and aerial photographs.

00:37:18:00 - 00:37:18:15

Okay.

00:37:18:17 - 00:37:44:06

Thank you. And just to add, um, those areas that, uh, were described as either licensed now or previously licensed when the line was in place means that the CAA itself has satisfied itself of the safety of the airline because, as we know from Eon one and the paragraph we just looked at, if it's not satisfied, it will revoke or modify the license. Um.

00:37:45:06 - 00:38:20:11

Thank you. Um, you further state in, uh, SS 2.6 that you acknowledge that the proximity of the obstacle in this case could potentially limit pilot options. Again, dependent on multiple variables contributing to the likelihood that the obstacle could not be safely avoided, and consideration of appropriate mitigations such as pre-flight risk avoidance or via normal in-flight operational practice. In your view, are the mitigation options provided reasonable, achievable? And would they restrict the operational or economic existence of any of the aerodromes along the project route?

00:38:27:09 - 00:39:00:03

At Russell Harris KC I'm going to pass back to Neil. But before I do, I would like him to explain to you his experience both as a pilot and as a person who does this sort of, um, analysis, uh, aeronautic analysis, um, by reference to um, cap 168 and Other measures just so you're able to understand the weight, which you should give his evidence in that respect, should you agree with it.

00:39:01:08 - 00:39:37:11

Thank you, Niels Jason, for the applicant. Um, so just for the for the benefit of people in the room. I'm a chartered mechanical engineer. Um, I've got, uh, 35 years of general aviation experience. I've been flying small aircraft and large ones for the greater part of my life. Um, learned when I was 14. I've flown and and, uh, I still do fly, uh, light aircraft on a regular basis. Um, I have a helicopter license. I have an air transport pilot's license for fixed wing aircraft. Um, I've previously been a glider pilot, including, um, uh, as a as a tug pilot.

00:39:37:13 - 00:40:09:28

So towing gliders as well. Um, and I've done many other roles around general aviation aerodromes, uh, including uh, providing air traffic services at the lowest level, Aerodrome flight information service level. Um, I work in this context for a consultancy, Alan Stratford and Associates, and, uh, we are specialists in general aviation projects, amongst others, and particularly those where uh, uh development has impact on general aviation.

00:40:10:00 - 00:40:48:04

And we, uh, we are keen and I am keen on trying to help general aviation coexist with development. And in the context of this project, that has been my goal and remains my goal, is I would like to find a way, if it's possible, for general aviation, which I am still a part of every day, to try and coexist if possible with this project. And that is my focus and that is what I'm trying to help National Grid to do is to understand general aviation and, uh, where possible, to make changes to its design, if that's necessary.

00:40:48:26 - 00:41:19:07

Um, and that is the question is where is it necessary and why do we think that? Um, and, and our previous submissions, I think, um, illustrate, uh, how we've come to the conclusions that we have. Um, in this project, there are 21 aerodromes that were identified as being within scope and may potentially be affected. Of those two, uh, were no longer operational and confirmed to be, uh, have no plans to become operational again.

00:41:19:15 - 00:41:54:10

Um, we've got obviously uh, flying Station Wattisham, which we'll come to as a separate matter. Um, we had a model aircraft flying site and several of the general aviation, uh, aerodromes, too. Um, I'd like to make it clear that we have reached agreement with the vast majority of aerodromes on this line and the three that remain in discussion. We are making progress with. So the vast majority of aerodrome operators and the pilots that operate from those aerodromes are in broad agreement.

00:41:54:12 - 00:42:08:22

They may not be delighted with the fact that they have a new obstacle in their environment, and I do understand that. But nevertheless, they have. They have found our assessment to be agreeable, and I think the remaining discussion should be seen in that light.

00:42:10:24 - 00:42:34:12

Thank you. Um, I'd like you said obviously we'll come on to the individual drones in a little while. So just to have, um, one final question in this section, which, um, your answer to SAS 2.6, um, which refers to the involvement of, um, Alan Stratford and Associates previously, um, in the formulation of your proposals and aviation safety risk.

00:42:36:04 - 00:42:59:00

Uh, the s appendix 15.2 Review of Aviation Impact um update at deadline four states that it draws upon the findings of the technical impact assessments conducted by Alan Stratford and Associates. But you previously stated that the design had altered since their involvement, and so it would not be useful to provide those assessments to us.

00:43:00:21 - 00:43:12:04

I understand that position. If that isn't feasible, as you say it is. Is there any way we could receive confirmation from ASA that they agree with appendix 15.2?

00:43:13:14 - 00:43:17:07

Um, well, I think there may be a misunderstanding here, because this is Asa.

00:43:18:13 - 00:43:24:16

That's okay. Right. I wasn't aware of that. Yeah. Okay. Um, yes.

00:43:24:28 - 00:43:30:25

It was Jeremy from the applicant. So Asa is Alan Stratford and Associates, and and I work for ASA, to be clear.

00:43:30:27 - 00:43:33:19

Okay. Thank you. That is useful. Thank you.

00:43:36:06 - 00:43:42:08

Okay, before we move on, then I'll just open it up and we have, um. Um, Bartleby on the line, please.

00:43:44:18 - 00:44:15:02

Thank you, sir. And Bartleby, on behalf of the General Aviation Awareness Council. Um, for today, I just wanted to make one point, which is that two other people have been closely involved with assessing the risks and issues at Debenham and at the other outstanding airfields that Mr.. That have just been mentioned, but other risk assessment specialists have also been involved.

00:44:15:04 - 00:44:46:06

So Doctor Meadows undertook a very thorough, detailed report in respect of him, and he identifies that there are risks which are not have not been identified by ASA. And of course, prior to that, um, the CAA airfield's advisory team was closely involved with all of the sites that have just been mentioned. And in fact, they brokered many of the resolutions at those sites.

00:44:46:08 - 00:44:55:10

But they highlighted quite clearly that the issues at Tiburon and Priory Farm remained of great concern to them. Thank you.

00:44:56:04 - 00:44:57:11

Thank you, Miss Busby.

00:44:59:20 - 00:45:06:11

Um, and, um, there's supposed to be sand still up. Um, you should respond, Mr. Harris.

00:45:06:28 - 00:45:38:17

Um, yes. We will signpost in our written responses where we have dealt with Mr. Edo's, um, positions and also the concerns of the cat. Um, there is another meeting, I think, with Tiverton on Monday who are now engaging, um, proactively with the proposals, as are the British Gliding Association. And I think there'll be a joint meeting again on Monday, which we can bring you up to date with. Um, uh, shortly when we deal with individual, uh, airlines.

00:45:38:19 - 00:46:05:29

Um, I also ought to say that the Mod are here, EOD there on the screen. Yes. And I can bring you up to date with the position in relation to that, which will involve me telling you that subject to the DCO, including a requirement which meets their concerns, that they will withdraw their objection. But I thought you ought to be aware of that.

00:46:06:01 - 00:46:21:10

Okay. Thank you. We'll yeah, we'll move on to Washington shortly. Um, just before we do, um, we have Tony Griffiths hand up online. Um, Mr. Griffiths, um, we will be talking about Tiburon after Wattisham, but if there's any other general points you wish to raise now.

00:46:22:08 - 00:46:59:22

Yeah. Um. Making progress? Well, no they're not. They are meeting. The BGA are getting involved to discuss purely competition finishes. But the obstacle a 200 foot high electrified wall within the fatal zone of runways two six and three three, unless it is moved outside or buried under grounded, is certainly not going to see us making progress.

00:47:01:14 - 00:47:40:22

Mr. Jamison says the assessment is agreeable. The assessment is flawed. The CAA told him it was flawed before he produced it. Yet he still went ahead and produced it. He claims that heritage will be able to maneuver to avoid hitting the pylons. Yet the CAA specifically says to make that assumption is wrong. You should not consider that. So why, given that we have this if safe landing area, which is three kilometers from the end of the runway.

00:47:41:22 - 00:48:18:13

Why do they choose to ignore that guidance and put the pylons straight across the middle of it? So there are as as things stand, quite frankly, there is no way that the SSG is going to be signed by Tibetan, because the only way we can make their safe is to close those runways. If the pylons are built. And closing those runways means an adverse impact upon us. And when you then go to N-1, which requires collaborative development, I can give you the timeline.

00:48:18:15 - 00:48:53:04

But it was don't want to spend time now. Put it in the published one. Collaboration has been virtually zero. Tibetan was first mentioned in April 2022 when the form the report and I can't remember its name. Um, something like. Uh, no, I can't think. But it was now app three, five, six or something like that. I mentioned two airfields as needing work or needing special investigation.

00:48:53:24 - 00:49:25:00

Yet they claim that they consulted all airfields. Then why aren't they in the report? Ah, well, we didn't know it was in that report. But the reference to Chippenham in April 2022, the first meeting that we had was not until the summer of 2023, 15 months later, by which time the route had been decided. Hey, we're not going to change the route. You'll have to stop your operations in order to make it safe.

00:49:25:07 - 00:49:49:06

I'm sorry, but that is the position that we are in. There has been very little meaningful Consultation, as we have kept repeating, but this continues to get ignored. And if these pillars are built, then we will have to close simply, as you have mentioned, on the grounds of safety. So there you go.

00:49:50:07 - 00:49:53:00

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. Um. Miss Pearson.

00:49:54:15 - 00:50:30:04

Rosie Pearson, East Anglia. Um, I'm concerned that the interpretation by the applicant of anyone making a mockery of the planning system in the eyes of the public, you cannot have assuming there is an acceptance that is a risk to human life or human safety. It's set out very clearly in, in 14.2.15. Then unacceptable risk to or interference with human health and public safety. Um is an exemption to the CFP priority. So this whole chicken and egg situation that you mentioned, you can't have a business coming in and telling businesses they have to close to make it safe to human life.

00:50:30:06 - 00:50:48:22

It's just it's circular and it goes against the NPF Agent of Change rule, which is all about unreasonable restrictions. It's highly unreasonable to make a business close its runways or to close altogether. So I wholly disagree with the approach taken with Cyrus, and I think it's not reasonable to suggest that. And I don't think it would stand up in a court of law. Okay.

00:50:48:28 - 00:51:07:05

Thank you for that. Um, I just point out that I don't know if you but we there is one of the questions, recent questions where we raised the agent of change, um, process. So I don't we won't go back into that today because that's already been in writing. But, um, if there's anything you wanted to respond to Mr. Harris on what you've just heard. I was.

00:51:07:15 - 00:51:25:28

Uh, Russell Harris KC for the applicant. I was just going to refer to that answer and direct you to it. And the way in which the agent has changed, as applicable to aerodromes and new critical national infrastructure is set out in the N1, which takes into account the agent of change in those particular circumstances.

00:51:26:22 - 00:51:45:20

Okay. Thank you. Um, we'll now move on to, individual aerodromes. So we'll begin with Wattisham Station. Um, thank you for the latest statement of common ground between the parties. Um, and, uh, following on from your your comments earlier, Mr. Harrison, give me an update on the on the latest requirement. Yes.

00:51:45:23 - 00:52:19:19

Um, well, first of all, I'm very grateful to the Ministry of Defence EOD, who've been, um, positive and have taken the advice in N1 fully into account. Um, I'm pleased to say that we're in almost total agreement. Um, I say almost only because the wording of the requirement has not been formally placed before them to agree just yet, but it's been a model of, um, uh, engagement and negotiation and coexistence. Wattisham is recognised to be an important defence establishment.

00:52:20:09 - 00:52:52:29

Um, mod I Dio is speaking on their behalf. It has two roles. The first I'm not going to go into in any great detail. It's an intelligence equipment role. And the second is it is itself an aerodrome for Apache helicopters, also an important defence issue. So they have been advised by proper agents who understand aviation safety, but also the area of intelligence equipment and the potential for interference with pylons.

00:52:53:07 - 00:53:47:08

And we accept and accepted from the outset, as you remember from issue two, I think that interference with that important establishment might constitute an unacceptable interference with defence, which would display the presumption in favour of critical national infrastructure to that extent. And for that purpose, if that had occurred, the presumption would be, um, set aside, saving exceptional circumstances, etc. would be set aside. Fortunately, um, a very positive working relationship has taken place such that it's led to a technical solution within the limits of deviation, such that the um, activities of the aerodrome and the uh, intelligence equipment can coexist without any unacceptable interference with defence.

00:53:48:02 - 00:54:11:03

And, um, I think they're on the line, but they can confirm I'm going to speak for themselves, but they can confirm that they are content conditionally to remove their objections subject to the provisions of the order. We've got, um, Mr. Walker here who can speak to the detail of that, should you wish. Or maybe you should speak to the model, direct that we leave it to you.

00:54:11:06 - 00:54:15:19

Thank you. Um, yes. Mr. Wilson, um, if I could have your update, please.

00:54:19:25 - 00:54:50:14

Good afternoon, John Wilson for the Ministry of Defence. Uh, yes. We've been working closely with the applicant, and the applicant has accepted and agreed the need for provisions to make to maintain Mod safeguarding requirements, and we are currently in dialogue with them to finalise the wording of relevant requirements and provisions so that can be included in the DCO. And we will then in due course, update our statutory safeguarding position. Just to clarify, the intelligence equipment that Mr.

00:54:50:16 - 00:55:14:13

Harris is referring to is actually an aviation navigational aid transmitter equipment, rather than sensing or surveillance type equipment. It is all aviation related. And yes, we have been able to identify, um, technical measures to ensure that structures will not impact upon the effective operation of both the navigational aids and the aerodrome.

00:55:16:24 - 00:55:23:09

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. That's useful. Um, so the, um, is there more than one requirement.

00:55:23:11 - 00:55:28:28

Two requirements in terms of drafting. Would you just bear with me a second,

00:55:30:22 - 00:55:31:07

Sarah?

00:55:35:28 - 00:55:59:19

Said, concentrating the applicant so we can deal with the requirements in the the definitions and in the order itself? Um, I can't remember if it's 1 or 2 or it's a combination within a single, but we can confirm that we have sent the we have sent the wording over to the, uh, the Dio for, for a prior approval and then will incorporate it in the version that goes into d6 in d6.

00:55:59:21 - 00:56:01:06

That's good. Okay. Thank you.

00:56:01:08 - 00:56:13:09

I think the answer is I think, uh, Russell Harris. Casey. Uh, I think the answer is we don't know at this present stage, but whatever the requirement or requirements are, they will deal with the two aspects.

00:56:14:21 - 00:56:27:20

Thank you. And do the requirements. I don't need the full details. I noticed you AOC mentioned the limits of aviation before. Um, did they involve any reduction in the pylon height?

00:56:35:21 - 00:56:37:16

Yeah. Paul reached him for the applicant.

00:56:37:18 - 00:56:38:04

I don't know.

00:56:38:06 - 00:56:38:21

The.

00:56:38:23 - 00:56:39:21

Exact details, but.

00:56:39:23 - 00:56:57:25

I'm aware through adjustments in the limits of deviation. And, um, I think a concession about the Earth wire at the very top not being of concern. The the pilot heights have been reduced slightly, but within the limits of deviation. Um, so it's not a change in pylon type.

00:56:58:19 - 00:57:01:00

I see. Thank you, Mr. Reese. Uh, Mr. Wilson.

00:57:04:02 - 00:57:33:04

John Wilson for the Ministry of Defense. Just to clarify, we're talking about six provisions at the moment. We've confirmed with the applicant that five of those will be implemented as requirements. The sixth actually relates specifically to Removing or limiting the vertical limited deviation to a specific section of the proposed development route. And at the moment, we're reviewing that with the applicant to decide the best way of that being implemented in the DCO.

00:57:34:21 - 00:57:38:00

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Okay.

00:57:39:25 - 00:58:02:26

Thank you for that. I don't think I don't have any more questions on Wattisham, so move on. Thank you. We'll move on now to Ted Burnham. Um, and thank you for the confirmation. I already have a meeting planned on next Monday. Um, does that involve the, um, British Gliding Club as well? Is it yourselves and Chippenham?

00:58:04:19 - 00:58:10:28

Okay. Thank you. Um, is there anything else you wish to raise about that meeting at this stage or.

00:58:12:03 - 00:58:35:21

Um, well, there are two ways of, uh, Russell and Casey. There are two ways of dealing with this. The one is to deal with all of the merits now for each of the remaining aerodromes. Although I should say something about Chase farm, definitely, or they are all the subject of ongoing meetings, including Raid and Wings, which is also this week.

00:58:37:08 - 00:58:38:09

To be TBA.

00:58:38:16 - 00:59:08:17

All right. I understand it's to be arranged, but is agreed it should take place. Um, to bring you up to date. Um, at the next stage with the negotiations that have taken place, um, and our response to any remaining concerns. Um, so that's the first way of dealing with it. The second way of dealing with it is to ask Mr. Jameson to summarize broadly what the remaining issues are and his prospects of, uh, getting a solution to those. I'm in your hands.

00:59:08:19 - 00:59:10:27

Really? But I should bring you up to date with Chase farm.

00:59:11:05 - 00:59:52:03

Yes. No, that'd be useful. I think my, um. We don't need to go really discuss the merits and so on, and we don't need to go back into those areas. And they're also covered in writing. I understand the various points of view. I think it would be useful. As you said, there's various um, aerodromes listed on the agenda. So I also had, um, obviously right of wings the meeting you had on the 15th of June. So any update from that, uh, would be useful. And you're meeting with Priory Farm on the 12th of June. Um, so, yeah, just a general update on where you are and the remaining, um, outstanding disagreements between you and the various airfields would be useful.

00:59:52:05 - 00:59:56:14

And, yes, Miss Harris had an update on Chase farm. Would be useful as well. Thank you. Brilliant.

00:59:56:16 - 01:00:33:03

Um, Russell. Harris. Casey, let's start with, uh, Chase farm. From the very outset, um, uh, National Grid representatives, uh, made it clear that with the runway in the existing position that it was, uh, because of its relationship with cap 168, and the advice in that that it could not operate safely and would therefore need to curtail its operational capacity. The Chase farm employed at our expense a independent consultant who confirmed that position.

01:00:33:17 - 01:01:04:04

Um, there was then an assessment of whether there could be, um, mitigation by changing of operation practices. Uh, an orientation of the runway was set up. Uh, a model was run and it was shown to be safe. And the independent consultant confirmed that, uh, National Grid has agreed in principle to facilitate that and other works on the site, including making payment for that.

01:01:04:06 - 01:01:36:08

The agents in respect of of Chase farm have been chased, uh, twice weekly, at least with a view to understanding whether that offer will be taken up and we are still waiting and will inform you. But if, if, if the Chase farm operation ceases, it will be a commercial decision, not one that's necessary for safety. In the event that the reoriented runway, um is available and and is capable of being taken up.

01:01:37:21 - 01:01:38:10

Thank you.

01:01:39:15 - 01:01:40:21

Don't say anything about that.

01:01:43:26 - 01:01:47:20

Yes. If I could have the the updates now on the other airfields, please.

01:01:47:22 - 01:02:07:12

I'm going to turn to, uh, Louise Brace, who's engaging with the negotiations to identify, um, what the next stage is for each of the remaining three. That's Priory Farm, Debenham, and, um, the wings. Um, and then, um, perhaps we'll do it one at a time. Priory farm first, please.

01:02:09:02 - 01:02:09:17

Yep.

01:02:09:19 - 01:02:43:15

Louise, brace for the applicant. Um. Priory Farm. So you refer to the meeting that we held with them on the 12th of June. Um, it was a productive meeting. Um, we haven't had the opportunity to speak with them since last summer. Um, a key development was, um, that the operator has re plotted their aerodromes, circuit patterns. Um, and there are some differences between various published routes that they have at the moment. So, um, we've undertaken an additional impact assessment relating to the newly plotted 500 foot circuit, which now no longer overlies the overhead line.

01:02:43:19 - 01:03:06:12

Um, but it is in close lateral proximity. Um, so that assessment has been shared with the operator. Um, we've provided an initial view in terms of, um, what that means and mitigation, um, related to it as well. Um, and we're looking to have another meeting with them to discuss that further. Um, so that we can get their perspective on mitigation.

01:03:08:07 - 01:03:18:16

Thank you. Are you, um, are you confident that a signed statement of common ground will be, um, possible with, uh, Priory Farm within the timeline of the examination?

01:03:19:25 - 01:03:42:01

Um, Louise, brace for the applicant. Um, I think we're confident that that, um, the discussions are progressing productively. We're hoping that there's going to be matters agreed within the statement of common ground. More so than than currently. Um, and and that we're we'll be able to sign a statement of common ground whether or not it's got all matters agreed in it. Um, is is for consideration.

01:03:42:07 - 01:03:43:21

Okay. Understood. Thank you.

01:03:43:27 - 01:03:52:12

Can I ask Mister Jameson to explain the, um, aeronautic assessment, uh, in terms of Priory Farm, please?

01:03:53:23 - 01:04:28:28

Certainly. Neil Jamieson for the applicant. Um, so as, as mentioned, um, we we've not had engagement with Priory Farm directly since last summer, and, and we really welcomed the meeting, uh, on the 12th of June, which was extremely useful. One of the main learning points for us that came out of that was that the previously provided circuit map had changed, something that we were unaware of until that meeting.

Um, we take that very seriously. We within two days, had redone an impact assessment based on the new information provided to us.

01:04:29:07 - 01:04:59:22

Um, it gave me some concerns and, uh, some relief in, in in other parts. The, the re plotted circuit does not overfly or does not appear to overfly the line anymore. However, it is um, laterally closer to it than the previous A map. And that's the the the matter that we need to discuss further, uh, what priorities uh, operators view is of that.

01:04:59:24 - 01:05:27:29

Um, I have some ideas for mitigation, um, for that, um, and we have offered that as an idea. Um, and that's, that's a matter that we need to discuss still is what their view is of that, um, and how that will fit in with their current operations. But we feel that there are solutions possible. Um, whether that be through operational changes or anything else. So we remain hopeful. As far as Priory Farm is concerned.

01:05:28:01 - 01:05:28:16

Thank you.

01:05:28:19 - 01:05:39:27

Casey, for the applicant, could you please explain to the, um, examining authority the the 1000ft circuit as well as the 500ft circuit? And what of what relevance is that?

01:05:40:19 - 01:06:12:12

Uh, so, yes, Neil Jamieson for the applicant. So there are two published circuits. At Priory Farm, there's a low level circuit which is flown at 500ft, roughly 150m above the ground. And there's a wider, larger circuit which climbs to a higher height of 1000ft above the ground. Um, and, uh, both circuits are in use at pilot's discretion in general. The 500 foot circuit, because it's shorter and it's just slightly more demanding to fly as well.

01:06:12:14 - 01:06:46:05

We are told by the operator at Priory Farm that that's generally limited to people who are more experienced, and the thousand foot circuit is either used by people who need a little bit more time to think or are learning to fly, for instance. So. So both circuits could be used. And one potential mitigation to be discussed is that maybe the 500 foot circuit is, is no longer in operation in the future. And everything just uses 1000 foot circuit, which is a situation that exists at many other aerodromes. So, um, there would be no officially published 500 foot circuit.

01:06:46:07 - 01:06:55:23

As I say, I emphasize this again. This is all under discussion. Uh, we we look forward to to, uh, Priory Farm's view on all of that.

01:06:56:21 - 01:07:01:29

Understood. Thank you. Um, and the, um, latest update regarding Ride on Wings, please.

01:07:05:09 - 01:07:41:18

For the applicant. Um, so further to our meeting, our last meeting with them back in April. We had a meeting on the 15th of June. Um, which provided some necessary clarity around their operator's existing and proposed operations and the related concerns. Um, further information is still sought on some of those activities. Um, the operator remains focused on the location of the cable ceiling and compound. Um, and we were able to discuss their existing aerobatic flying practice that operates from the aerodrome, um, and relates to their concerns.

01:07:41:27 - 01:08:17:11

Um, so what we've requested is further clarification regarding the details of their, um, aerobatic box that they use so that we can understand its relation to the proximity of the overhead line and the cable ceiling and compound. Um, and also to understand how their proposed relatively Localized move from the proposed location would provide effective mitigation. So we're still looking for for that further clarity. Um, the operator also described how they they've foregone opportunities to diversify the aerodromes operations because of the prospect of the runway's closure.

01:08:17:24 - 01:08:58:15

Um, so what we were able to do was to better understand that that, um, uh, apparently involves, um, training, um, a potential training facility and or a gliding club at the site. But we were able to clarify that, um, they're not proposing parachuting activities, which we did understand was was a previously proposed activity. Um, without that diversification, we understand their perspective is that their business would not be be viable. So we're just seeking to get further information from them around the exact nature and the scale and the timing of the operations and the proposals, the opportunities that they are deciding not to pursue.

01:08:59:01 - 01:09:25:18

Um, so. Yes. And then finally the meeting focused on construction impacts and mitigation around that. It was, um, positive discussion there where we agreed to explore the potential to move the proposed cable route towards the end, the eastern end of the runway, and so that there may be the possibility of continued aviation operations during construction and further other related mitigations as well.

01:09:29:05 - 01:09:37:11

Thank you. Okay. Thank you for that summary. Um, are there any other meetings in the diary with Raider wings or.

01:09:38:23 - 01:09:44:14

None yet until we've received that, that further information so that we can inform our impact assessments and the mitigation recommendations.

01:09:44:16 - 01:09:58:01

Okay. Thank you. And that's being regularly chased. And so yes. Thank you. Okay. So that just leaves, um, Bonham. Um, and I understand you have a meeting on Monday. If you could update us on that one, please. Thank you.

01:10:00:09 - 01:10:40:22

Louise Bass for the applicant. Um, so as has been, um, within our representations previously submitted, we have been attempting to engage meaningfully with the operator to understand, um, their perspective in relation to the operations. Um, sorry, the proposed project. Um, but that has been frustrated, um, to an extent by the operator's, um, rejection of meeting proposals that we've made previously on the grounds of, um, perceived withholding of information. But we are pleased to update that yesterday they did agree to attend, um, an invitation that we sent to them for a trilateral meeting with the BGA, the British Learning Association.

01:10:41:00 - 01:11:11:22

Um, and this follows work that we've been doing with the BGA bilaterally, um, in, in recent weeks and months. Um, which is focused on consideration of gliding specific operational parameters. Um, and understanding how, um, how they relate to our impact assessments and mitigation options. So, um, with the BGA, um, our last meeting was back on the 18th of June. Um, when we, um, we talked in a lot of detail about the operational parameters. And my colleague, Mr.

01:11:11:24 - 01:11:44:20

Jamieson could probably explain better than I can. Um, but essentially, um, we did agree with them to do some modelling work based on some of their, um, defined parameters. And that's what we'd like to be discussing with the operator from TBM airfield. Um, when we meet on Monday. Um, it includes, um, it's in relation to sort of approaches predominantly and, and considers the competition finishing aspect of their operations as well. Um, so that's, I think, what Mr.

01:11:44:22 - 01:11:46:07

Griffiths may be referring to.

01:11:47:27 - 01:11:48:19

Thank you.

01:11:50:19 - 01:11:59:00

Um, Mr. Griffiths. Um, did you have anything you wish to respond to about your, um, your meeting coming up on Monday?

01:12:00:24 - 01:12:03:07

Um, yeah. Uh,

01:12:05:06 - 01:12:42:22

the meeting, as far as I'm concerned, the meeting coming up on Monday is really to do with this competition finishes element. Um, to put it in some sort of perspective, modern competition gliders are

extremely efficient flying machines. And if they are returning from the West, uh, with a view to landing on this particular runway, then they will cross the pylon line at about 100ft above ground level, but the pylon is 200ft above ground level.

01:12:42:28 - 01:13:15:08

And so that restricts the situation in terms of those of using it for competitions now. Initially when this all came out, the BGA basically said, well, if the pylons are built, you can't use Chippenham for national competitions, which of course has a financial impact upon us. They are coming round, as I understand from what Louise Bryce has said, they're coming round to thinking, well, maybe we could modify those rules.

01:13:15:10 - 01:13:45:14

And my understanding is that is the purpose of the meeting on Monday. The competition rules are within the remit of the BGA, not within the remit of Norfolk Gliding Club. As with the rules issued by the CAA, we have to work within those rules. We don't and cannot work within the rules as put forward by Alan Stratford and Associates, which are contrary to the rules put forward by the CAA.

01:13:46:04 - 01:14:32:24

And that is where the biggest problem is The CIA have stated, as I mentioned earlier, that the airfield impact assessment carried out by Alan Stratford associations is flawed. Mythology. Methodology. Sorry Mr. Meadows. In his assessment, risk assessment of the whole situation confirmed that the applicant themselves have admitted that there are circumstances when, in the event of some sort of failure of the, uh, of the takeoff, be it engine failure or power failure or whatever, there is a likelihood of hitting the cables.

01:14:33:24 - 01:14:56:06

I have witnessed that twice in my 53 years of flying. It's not a pretty sight, and it usually involves fatalities. Therefore, once the cables are proposed to be where they are, we cannot accept that there is no adverse effect on the operations of Tibetan. And that's it.

01:14:57:04 - 01:15:17:12

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. It's understood. Thank you. Um, lately we had lots of written evidence as well about, um, Tibetan, um, and some of the comments that Mr. Griffiths has made. There have been in writing and you've responded in writing. So we don't necessarily need to go back into all those issues. But is there anything you wish to respond to on that matter?

01:15:18:06 - 01:15:24:05

Mr. Harris? Casey, for the applicant, I just asked Mr. Jameson very briefly to give his view on that, please.

01:15:24:26 - 01:16:08:03

Thank you, Mr. Jameson, for the applicant. Um, I welcome Mr. Griffiths. Um, summary, uh, as he gave, uh, um, where the the outstanding issues for discussion still lie there of no surprise to us and and we would like to talk more uh, and and particularly specifically about the numbers involved in terms of

clearance, heights and distances and that sort of thing. As mentioned, we have been dealing with that separately at British Gliding Association level, and we have provided the BGA with extra information, which is Tibetan specific, in order to gather their view of what we're doing to try and progress matters as rapidly as we can.

01:16:08:05 - 01:16:40:28

I'm, I'm really pleased that Mr. Griffiths is coming to the meeting on Monday, and I hope that we can we can share that further information with him and and maybe reach an agreement on some matters, if not all. And and maybe even despite his his early statement regarding a statement of common ground. But I hope that we might be able to get to a stage where we can at least agree some matters. I would like to see them carry on operating. We believe it is not inevitable that they need to stop. There is a safe outcome possible here, as there has been agreed with many of the other airfields on this line.

01:16:41:03 - 01:16:47:04

Um hmm is no different there, in our view. And and we look forward to further discussions on that line.

01:16:47:22 - 01:17:18:04

Thank you. Um, a previous, um, specific hearing. And, um, in one of our written questions, we, um, uh, stressed the importance of, uh, collaboration and so on and meetings. So it's it's good to hear that the, the, the meetings with the various airfields are taking place and progressing. So I just we'd just urge you to carry on and redouble efforts to, um, achieve as much a common ground as you can with these airfields.

01:17:18:06 - 01:17:29:17

Thank you. Um, before we move on, is there any other comments anyone wishes to raise on aviation? Uh, sir, if we give a microphone to the lady, please. Thank you.

01:17:34:11 - 01:17:37:17

If you could just bear with us. A microphone is on its way. Thank you.

01:17:43:06 - 01:17:58:05

Sorry, I didn't understand. Louise kind of said that there was a possibility at reading wings that they might move the cable ceiling and move further eastward. It would be safer. Was that what Louise kind of said?

01:17:58:15 - 01:18:03:01

I don't wish to put words in your mouth, but I don't believe that's what Ms.. Brace said. But if you'd like to confirm.

01:18:03:03 - 01:18:09:18

What I didn't hear quite what what she said about was decided on June the 15th.

01:18:10:01 - 01:18:24:09

For the applicant. Um, so I was referring to the cable route itself, um, underground. And whether or not the routing of that can be slightly altered within the limits of deviation to the benefit of ongoing operations at the aerodrome.

01:18:24:16 - 01:18:26:28

That be to the east or to the west.

01:18:27:05 - 01:18:31:27

Uh, the the operator is suggesting that it would be beneficial to move it to the east.

01:18:31:29 - 01:19:00:13

To the east? Yes. Well, I agree, because they've just suddenly in 2025 produced it was to the east and then suddenly in the 2025 route is being moved to the west. You know, further west. So it's quite it's quite relevant because suddenly the 2024 route was to the east and now suddenly it's gone. The cable route to the west.

01:19:01:04 - 01:19:01:24

Thank you.

01:19:03:12 - 01:19:09:03

I agree. I agree with. It would be safer and better if it went to the East.

01:19:09:05 - 01:19:13:28

Thank you very much. That's understood. Is there anything you wish to clarify just on that matter, or.

01:19:14:00 - 01:19:19:28

I think there's a misunderstanding between the cable sealing end and the line. We'll clarify it in writing.

01:19:20:00 - 01:19:24:27

Thank you very much. Thank you. Um, so, any other anyone else wishes to raise anything?

01:19:29:27 - 01:19:45:01

Thank you. So, um, thank you for all those comments. Um, that's the end of item seven. Item eight is now being dealt with via rule 17 letter as discussed. So we now move to item nine. Any other matters? And Mrs. Hunt.

01:19:47:23 - 01:19:50:17

Thank you. Um, because we've we've removed.

01:19:50:19 - 01:19:51:04

Item.

01:19:51:06 - 01:20:16:01

Eight from the agenda, and, and we've got through some items quicker than expected. Um, it's just gone. It's 5:05. Um, we can fit in the remaining agenda items today. Um, if we continue a little later than usual. And I just want to check with the parties that they're agreeable to, that it should be no more than a half an hour. 5:30 ish.

01:20:18:27 - 01:20:22:24

Russell. Harris. Katie, for the applicant. We think you should press ahead.

01:20:25:13 - 01:20:27:19

Hands up if anyone objects to that.

01:20:30:03 - 01:20:33:04

Oh, okay. Well, we'll plow on. Thank you.

01:20:36:06 - 01:20:46:19

So, as you'll know, this is the last of the hearings. In the examination. There are a few matters that the examining authority would like to raise as we move towards final deadlines.

01:20:50:01 - 01:20:57:21

Which means there's a hand up, but I can't say it. Is there a hand up online? I move on. Emma dring.

01:20:58:07 - 01:21:22:21

Sorry. Yes, I'm a dring Essex County Council. I did have my hand up and then you moved on. Um, no. Just to say I. I have to leave. Um, so I can't stay, but I think there there are officers from Essex who are in attendance online who will be able to to deal with that. So I'm afraid I have to go, but obviously that shouldn't hold up anybody else from completing the agenda. But thank you.

01:21:23:29 - 01:21:27:06

That's absolutely fine. Thank you, thank you.

01:21:30:05 - 01:21:56:26

So the examining authority, we've issued a few rule 17 letters, um, Which, uh, requests for further information in the past month or so. And an additional deadline deadline survey was inserted into the examination timetable. And that was further to the change requests and our rule 13 letter, which is examination library reference PD 022.

01:21:58:12 - 01:22:32:19

Um, so the additional deadline that was just last week. It was Wednesday the 17th of June. Um, responses to those submissions are expected at deadline six and as our written responses to deadline five. However, I just wanted to give participants here today the opportunity to raise any matters regarding those deadline

five A submissions. It's just really so responses can be expedited. So firstly our rule 17 letter dated the 1st of June.

01:22:32:21 - 01:23:02:21

And that's reference PD zero two for that requested responses from category one and category two affected persons there, as listed in the Book of reference as to whether they objected to the compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of their land and the reasons for that objection. And we touched upon this yesterday as well, and we did receive a good number of responses which have now been published.

01:23:02:23 - 01:23:32:27

And they're in the examination library at rep five, a 005. And then we subsequently issued another rule 17 letter, which this time just to the applicant. And that's PD 028 that was issued just last week on the 18th of June. And we requested the applicant's response at deadline six. And this was discussed briefly yesterday at the compulsory acquisition hearing. three.

01:23:33:11 - 01:23:44:23

Um, since then, the examining authority have seen an email from the applicant raising some queries regarding that. So I just wanted the applicant to briefly summarize what they're seeking. Please.

01:23:47:25 - 01:23:50:26

Madam. Thank you. Have a sergeant for the applicant.

01:23:50:28 - 01:23:51:14

Um.

01:23:51:27 - 01:24:27:19

Madam, it's really just. And this was something that we discussed with Mr. Stone and your colleague yesterday. Um, it's really just that our understanding, which we, um, sort of support, is that what is necessary for the TSA's benefit is that, um, our response be a sort of free standing, independent document so that our response is in one place and doesn't sort of just cross refer back and hyperlink back to previous responses to save a paper trail that I don't think the essay has the resources, understandably, to undertake at this stage.

01:24:27:27 - 01:25:07:04

Um, because the request is that we sort of synthesize previous submissions and respond, you know, properly and adequately to all of the responses that have come in, and that will inevitably just take some time to make sure that we've done it thoroughly so that we have, you know, our our position in a single document for the SSAs benefit. So we've begun work on that already. We began analyzing the responses as soon as they came into us, and we anticipate that there will be a number of responses that we can deal with quite swiftly and, and sort of address those rapidly and probably by deadline six, but we don't.

01:25:07:06 - 01:25:32:26

Um, having begun an initial review of the documents, anticipate that it's practicable for us to do a proper job in terms of saving the SSAs. Time for all of the responses by deadline. Six. And so it's for that reason that we've requested that we essentially do as much as we can by deadline six, but that the remainder of the exercise will probably have to follow a deadline seven if that's possible.

01:25:34:16 - 01:25:41:04

Yeah, we have only just seen the email, so don't have a full response, but I'll just pass to Mr. Stone. Thank you.

01:25:41:28 - 01:26:12:18

Thank you very much. Uh, conscious that the, uh, email isn't in the examination library so others may not necessarily know the full detail of what you've requested. I think just addressing some of the points in that, in terms of cross-referencing to existing documents, statements of common ground and things of that nature, like actual application documents, we don't necessarily have a problem with that. What we didn't want was a sort of a paper chase.

01:26:12:24 - 01:26:27:26

Two other responses that have been made previously. So cross-referencing to our application documents, that's fine. Don't they don't have an issue with that. But it's more to try and avoid this, uh, paper trail of previous responses and trying to have something.

01:26:30:02 - 01:27:02:24

As a total document, you've also made reference to the fact of limitations within Excel and in terms of the amount of wording and things of that nature. Again, the way that we would suggest that you get around out was the way we did that was by adding extra lines into the Excel sheet and then just using the additional cells below the the cell that you're responding to, so that you can use more than one cell for a response to one individual, you just add an extra line.

01:27:02:26 - 01:27:37:28

Sorry for the technicality of it, but that can overcome the word count issue in the Excel spreadsheet in terms of the more substantive issue in terms of your timeline issue. I think we're in the difficulty as well with that timeline, because if we wait till deadline seven, that's the last substantive deadline. And that will constrain the opportunity for other people to comment on the responses that you may make.

01:27:38:08 - 01:28:10:02

And we are in a situation, obviously, where we're talking about compulsory acquisition and temporary possession and addressing the individual concerns and objections of those parties. So we would ask you to use your best endeavours to get as much done by deadline, sixth as you can. Obviously, it's an ongoing document, and it may well be that you need to supplement that or add further to that at deadline seven, but we would ask that you use your best endeavours to get as much done for deadline six as possible.

01:28:10:04 - 01:28:55:08

Submit that to us at that deadline, whatever is there, because that enables us to work on that. And then if you need to make further additions to that at the next deadline, then we will have to accept that. But we would suggest do as best you can. We're all against hard deadlines here, and obviously with the lack of deadlines that are enable other people to make comments on those comments, then we want to leave the situation as open and as fair to all parties as possible, and particularly given that this matter relates to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession.

01:28:55:11 - 01:29:27:17

We also don't want to be in a position where we are running out of deadlines and have to issue more detailed rules. 17 letters where we ask for substantive issues at a late stage in the examination. I don't think that helps anybody. So the earlier that we can get back into that, then that would be helpful. So I would suggest that the other issue that you raise is that you've identified that there's a number of.

01:29:30:09 - 01:30:02:02

Similar responses, and therefore have suggested a thematic response may be appropriate in some instances. I think once you've adopted that in terms of responses to IPS responses that slightly different from CAA and individual objections, and therefore we would encourage you not to go down a thematic response, but look at the individual responses, what we asked for from those.

01:30:02:04 - 01:30:02:19

Um.

01:30:04:20 - 01:30:41:08

Category one. Category two persons was their detailed, uh, concerned about where CA and TB had got to. If there are issues there which aren't related to CNP matters And they relate to wider issues, then you don't need to address those because that's not what we're there for. We're simply dealing with the NP issues. But if there's a bit of similarity in approach, then it may be that you use a similar form of wording in the next in each of the approaches.

01:30:41:10 - 01:31:01:08

But I don't think what we would want you to do is extract from that a series of issues and sort of try and address those as themed issues, because we want to contain your response to each of the parties so that we have a track system in response to each of the parties.

01:31:01:27 - 01:31:02:12

And.

01:31:02:14 - 01:31:53:10

Have a slot for the applicant. Thank you sir. I think the concern and as I said, um, we're still, I think, in the process of reading what people have sent in, but, um, I my understanding is that there are there are simply the factual positions that there are points that many people just raise, you know, the same point. So it was really I think we felt and if the suggestion is not helpful, then we won't do it. But I think we felt that instead of, you know, for ten people in a row, essentially copying and pasting the same answer to the

same point, because it's been raised by ten people, for example, that it may be easier if we had a section at the start which just set out those answers, and then in the responses to the individual apps, we would be focusing purely then in that in those boxes on where, you know, individual negotiations and actually extremely specific points.

01:31:53:12 - 01:31:56:09

But we're entirely in your hands as to what you want to see from us.

01:31:56:11 - 01:32:05:14

Obviously, whilst I hear the comment you make and I've got some sympathy with that, I think I go back to the point that what we're trying to do is get a

01:32:07:08 - 01:32:23:17

a summarised response to each individual's concerns, and therefore if they have raised a concern, we want to address to them. So I would still say And if it comes down to cutting and pasting a comment, then you do that for each person.

01:32:25:05 - 01:32:26:16

That's very helpful, sir. Thank you.

01:32:26:18 - 01:32:27:10

Thank you.

01:32:28:10 - 01:32:28:25

Mrs..

01:32:29:04 - 01:32:29:28

Thank you.

01:32:31:16 - 01:33:04:09

So moving on to the other rule 17 letter that we've published recently. That's PD 027. That was dated the 5th of June. Um, that that asked the applicant for a few matters. The first one was a response to comments made on historic environment matters that were made at issue specific hearing to um by interested parties. Um, they, they, they were missing from from the deadline after the hearing.

01:33:04:28 - 01:33:40:13

Um, and the second one was the assessment of some additional properties in the residential visual amenity assessment. And that was discussed earlier in item 5.4 of the agenda today. And the third item in that letter was for comments on the um, recently published government guidance on um biodiversity net gain for nationally significant infrastructure projects. So we do have the applicant's response to those points now in the examination library at rep five a 003.

01:33:40:15 - 01:33:57:12

They've only just been published, but it's just whether any interested parties here today, if they've seen them, if they do wish to raise any comments, now's your opportunity to do so. And, um, the benefit of raising them now is that you can get a response to those at deadline six.

01:34:03:13 - 01:34:04:29

Norfolk County Council.

01:34:08:17 - 01:34:09:22

Um, thank you madam.

01:34:09:24 - 01:34:27:23

This was actually, um, not a response to your question, but just to say that I also have another professional commitment. So I'm afraid I have to drop off and my officer also has to leave. So there won't be anyone remaining from Norfolk County Council, um, who can speak to the rest of the agenda item. I trust that doesn't cause any issues.

01:34:29:11 - 01:34:33:28

But that's fine. There won't be anything else after this for the local authorities. Thank you.

01:34:34:00 - 01:34:35:10

Brilliant. Thank you so much.

01:34:37:18 - 01:34:42:19

So anybody in the room or online wish to make any comments on the deadline? Five responses.

01:34:43:09 - 01:35:12:16

Madam, all I was going to say. Michael Baptist. I think I'm afraid we will be responding at deadline six to anything that has been arisen simply because of the, as it were, the process and the amount of documents to deal with. So I'm afraid we're not in a position to give you an off the cuff response now, even though it might have been helpful. So I'm afraid it will be deadline six. When we do that, we will try. If we identify anything we can raise informally with the applicant in the ongoing meetings, we will try to do so informally with them, but there's nothing that we can tell you at the moment.

01:35:14:15 - 01:35:17:13

Okay. That's fine. Any other comments?

01:35:20:04 - 01:35:23:05

Nope. Don't see any. Hands up. Thank you.

01:35:27:09 - 01:35:57:19

The other item I once raised was relating to other other consents, licenses, legal agreements. And then we'll come on. Statements of common ground. Um, other consents and licenses was on yesterday's issue specific hearing three agenda for the DCO but short of time. So we just moved it today. So it was really just for the applicant to provide a brief update, um, with regard to the other consents and licenses which are required in order to undertake the proposed development.

01:35:57:21 - 01:36:00:03

We'll come on to legal agreements next.

01:36:02:16 - 01:36:22:08

Um, Christian Tracey, the applicant, um, I believe we gave an update. Um, you may have just said there's a deadline five. We were given an update at deadline six, but deadline seven will be the sort of full and final update. I don't think anything. I was just checking behind me. I don't think there's anything else to say in that regard. No there isn't, ma'am.

01:36:22:10 - 01:36:25:29

There's no change that's worth raising at the moment. Okay.

01:36:30:06 - 01:36:38:15

So moving on to legal agreements. Um, second written question. Jen 2.2. Um, so

01:36:40:06 - 01:37:14:21

the applicant's response at appendix A of their response to second written questions. Rep 5211. Um, it's my understanding that the drafting of legal agreements are ongoing in relation to, firstly, the, um, the section 85 Countryside Rights of Way Act duty in respect of the Dedham Vale National Landscape. Another one in relation to offsite tree planting. And again, that was discussed earlier. Biodiversity net gain and joint police force is funding.

01:37:14:23 - 01:37:47:12

So they're the the four. Um and I also understand their ongoing discussions outside of the examination relating to community funds, PPA funding for local authorities, um developers forum meetings and uh highway section 7278 highway agreements. Um, is that correct? And could you provide a brief update on the progress of those agreements and anticipated timescales for their conclusions, please?

01:37:48:11 - 01:38:05:00

Um, Chris Andres, for the applicant. I think that is correct. I'm. I didn't hear if you said the, um, additional, um, what we call the blue pencil 106 that we talked about yesterday, was that included? If it if it was, I apologize if it wasn't that that needs to be on the list as well.

01:38:06:03 - 01:38:13:29

Yeah. That should be now that that's come about since I wrote my script. And that wasn't yesterday. That was this morning. I know it seems like it. Yes.

01:38:15:08 - 01:38:53:15

Indeed. Yeah. So there's that as well. There's that as well. Yeah. Um, so so we've, we've, um, we're going to give a full update on the progress of those at deadline six. I also hope we'll actually be submitting, um, a number of those at deadline six. It could be that they are submitted as final, but not yet signed, because we have to go through a governance process with the applicant. Um, the signed ones will be at deadline seven. There are ongoing discussions as you as you reference, we've received from, um, the authorities a in particular with the um, some of the measures we discussed today and yesterday in relation to landscape, visual and other compensation type matters.

01:38:53:18 - 01:39:17:11

Um, their, their version of, of, of of what they'd like to see in the 1 in 6 which we received, I believe it was this week. Um, I think it was Monday. Um, so we're going through that as well to determine where our our drafting is compared to theirs. And we'll there's some meetings and discussions ongoing. I might just turn to a colleague to see if there's anything else to add on on that front at the moment.

01:39:21:07 - 01:39:33:06

No, I don't think so. I think yeah, the the summary is, um, is accurate and you would have seen the unsigned version of the following purposes. Agreement submitted at the last deadline.

01:39:37:25 - 01:39:44:02

So I don't think there's anything else we can say at the moment in relation, unless you wanted sort of no details.

01:39:44:07 - 01:39:59:23

Just wanted some assurances really, and particularly in response to the biodiversity net gain because the there was some outstanding questions regarding that and that, um, you stated it would be submitted by deadline seven, if not earlier. So just when there was an update on that.

01:40:00:01 - 01:40:30:18

So, so, uh, Christian is the applicant on the on the being. So the applicant proposes a unilateral undertaking and there's a, um, I can talk to that very quickly. Um, the reason why I say you're not undertaking is because unlike some of the other agreements where they're bilateral, they're with a single party, or maybe in some cases two parties, um, something like being is across all authorities and there's 13. So the just the logistics of having bilateral and the governance process is some still, um, signed and sealed.

01:40:30:20 - 01:41:06:03

You know, it would take several weeks to get a number of counterparts. So it's quite a typical process in these things to have these things delivered by unilateral undertaking. It's still under section one and six, still as enforceable as it would be in a bilateral um, because these are straightforward single um applicant obligations that don't require reciprocal covenants from the other authorities. So when we submit, um, the

either the final draft or the signed one at deadline six, as I mentioned earlier, um, what I propose is we, we also accompany it with a sort of short report explaining the approach and what's in it.

01:41:06:08 - 01:41:18:03

Um, we thought that would be quite helpful. Um, as for the its contents, I think that's already been discussed in the in the issue specific hearings, unless you wanted any particular detail of what that one includes currently.

01:41:20:28 - 01:41:23:25

No, I think I think we're okay with that.

01:41:26:03 - 01:41:31:14

It's just really that we would just want to know that there's firm progress being made on the matter.

01:41:34:10 - 01:41:35:01

So.

01:41:39:16 - 01:42:09:16

Just following on from that, we did request the statements of common ground to be updated to reflect agreement or not on the need for section 106 agreements. And that follows from the, um, the local authorities in response to our written questions, to provide further justification for their requests for certain legal agreements, and we wanted that reflected within the statements of common ground.

01:42:09:21 - 01:42:17:09

Um, and just when will that be submitted to deadline? Six as well, for each local authority.

01:42:19:13 - 01:42:51:21

Um, Chris. Jason. Applicant so broad um, update on common grounds. Um, so I think we're tallying so far. 11 um, signed and delivered. Um, and they came through. Um, last deadline and before. Um, there are a number of additional to, um, we, we anticipate will be also submitted as signed and final deadline six. Um, I'll flag three because I think they're really important. There's the Environment Agency, Natural England and historic England. Um, so there's the high expectation that we do.

01:42:51:23 - 01:43:25:15

There are others as well, but I won't get list them now. Um, I think at deadline for you. You asked for us and we supplied a sort of tracker of of the same common grounds. That tracker will be updated at deadline six. Uh, to the extent obviously it will show those that are signed and any that are to follow at deadline seven will be identified. Um, um, we feel confident that the applicant that is, um, that those state common grounds with uh, statutory stakeholders, local authorities, etc.

01:43:25:17 - 01:44:03:10

are on course. They are on track for being, um, signed and agreed by deadline six and seven. That doesn't mean say everything will be agreed. It means the document will be agreed. And within the document it will set out the items that are not agreed to. Just to be clear, particularly for members of the audience. Um, there may be a few that just don't reach that stage, but they are. There will be primarily with the third party commercial parties and their elements. Um, to give you a flavour, there are some elements. For instance, there may be some commercial financial measures that are still being discussed, which are matters between the applicant and that entity, and they are linked with the commercial agreements.

01:44:03:12 - 01:44:25:21

And it is not unusual for a third party to say, I don't want to sign the statement of common ground until we've got the legal agreement signed on our commercial private business. So there may be, um, there may be some in that category means we won't deliver a statement on the ground and they'll come off the list, but we'll update that fully at both deadline six and seven.

01:44:28:16 - 01:44:40:02

Okay. And and the issue about, um, the legal agreements with, with the local authorities and the ones that they've asked for, will they be included in the next version?

01:44:40:04 - 01:44:50:09

Christian. Jason, applicant, I do apologize. You specifically asked for that, and I didn't answer that one. Yes. We will also identify where we've agreed that legal agreements will be included.

01:44:51:12 - 01:44:52:15

Okay. Thank you.

01:45:03:23 - 01:45:11:05

Before I move on. Is there anything from the local authorities or any interested parties present related to what I've just gone through?

01:45:13:12 - 01:45:15:24

Nope. Okay.

01:45:20:08 - 01:45:48:17

So as I previously set out at the start of today, we've only been discussing a small number of environmental issues related to the project or really to make efficient use of the time available. And this again, this doesn't mean we're not continuing to examine other matters. But bearing this in mind, before we close the hearing, can I check if there are any other matters that anyone else wants to raise that cannot be made in writing?

01:45:55:15 - 01:45:56:00

Okay.

01:45:57:26 - 01:46:02:14

If there is, that can be done at deadline six, which is Tuesday the 7th of July.

01:46:04:23 - 01:46:37:08

Got a number of action points noted from today's hearing. Um, won't go through them in detail as usual, but they will be published on the project page of the website early next week. And if there are no other items relevant to this hearing, can I remind all parties that any post hearing documents, including summaries of oral submissions and responses to submissions that have been made today, should be on or before deadline six Tuesday 7th of July.

01:46:38:05 - 01:47:09:26

Recording of the hearing will be put on the project web page as soon as possible. That's together with other recordings from this week and believes some of them are on there already. And this is the final hearing in the examination. There are 6.5 weeks left. Um, and it will take place in writing only from now on. Deadline seven. The next one after deadline six. Obviously it's 21st of July. That is an important one.

01:47:09:28 - 01:47:38:21

And that's when we expect, amongst other things, a range of final documents, and that includes relevant updates to environmental statements, the final book of reference, relevant control documents and signed statements of common ground and deadline eight is the final. Final deadline is on 4th of August, and at that deadline, we only expect closing statements from both the applicant and interested parties if they wish.

01:47:40:08 - 01:47:51:01

And these these are expected to succinctly summarize matters raised during the examination that have not been resolved to their satisfaction.

01:47:54:03 - 01:48:26:22

So before we close, I and the rest of the Examining Authority panel would like to thank all participants for their time and assistance today, and for all previous hearings that have taken place since February. Your answers to our questions and other comments have been very useful in the wider examination and will inform our forthcoming recommendation to the Secretary of State. And I'd also like to thank all the people that work behind the scenes, and they include the case team at the Planning Inspectorate and CVS.

01:48:26:24 - 01:48:43:15

And they're the they're the audiovisual company. They ensure that these events run smoothly. The time is now. 533 and this issue specific hearing four and the Norwich two Tilbury project is now closed. Thank you.