

00:00:05:03 - 00:00:17:24

Okay. Good afternoon. It's 2:00. And time for this issue. Specific hearing to resume. Um, just before we go back into the agenda, because I just check with the applicant, please, about the timetable of matters we were discussing before. Yes.

00:00:17:26 - 00:00:52:22

Um, knowing the nature of the relationship between Mr. Bedford and our sadly past colleague. Um, we think he should get to his service, if at all possible. Uh, three options allow for that. We've got some witness issues, which is why it's a little more complicated than we thought. Um, the first issue depends very much on how the examining authority and Mr. Butler views the issue. Um, it is possible, we think, but it's entirely a matter for you, and we don't press it. Uh, for the employment and skills questions and Socio-Economic to be dealt with by way of a rule 17 request.

00:00:52:24 - 00:01:29:12

We take the view that there's. And I don't mean to belittle this at all, but very little public wider interest. We've discussed the issues between us, and they are of quite a narrow campus, and we think that they might even better be addressed with a little more negotiation and, um, in by way of written submissions, that's option one. Option two, because of our constraints, is to deal with noise and socio economic today, in aviation tomorrow, because aviation was always on the agenda, which meant that people needed to be there for tomorrow in any event.

00:01:29:22 - 00:01:57:22

Uh, and option three, um, is that Mr. Bedford has kindly said that he might be able to appear virtually to deal with socio economic matters tomorrow, but, um, of course, then that's us relying on his good offices. But I think he is prepared to do that so that there are the three options. Rule 17 aviation tomorrow, virtual. Virtual. Mr.. Um. Bedford tomorrow.

00:02:00:24 - 00:02:02:26

Um, I'm quite happy.

00:02:02:28 - 00:02:03:23

To do it.

00:02:03:25 - 00:02:13:11

Uh, socioeconomics by rule 17. But I just want to hear from other interested parties first, whether or not they would have any concerns with regard to doing it via rule 17. Letter. Mrs. Pearson.

00:02:13:28 - 00:02:22:12

Rosie Pearson, pylons East Anglia don't object to do it in writing, but we'd like to disagree politely with the applicant that it's not of wider importance. For us it's very significant.

00:02:22:14 - 00:02:45:23

Oh, that's that's understood. And indeed, the applicant is entitled to what they say in Asuu. Uh, and we understand both positions. So thank you for that. Um, does anybody else have anything they want to say about socioeconomics before we confirm get no indication online or in the room. So in that case we will cover socioeconomics which is item number eight by rule 17 letter.

00:02:47:14 - 00:02:49:27

Thank thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council.

00:02:50:08 - 00:02:58:27

I'm very grateful for all parties for their cooperation in enabling us to manage something in the way That certainly is very helpful. Thank you very much.

00:03:01:21 - 00:03:38:24

Okay. Thank you. Um, so, uh, agenda item 5.3 limits deviation. Um, I just have 1 or 2 questions on this item. Um, this concern with the previous discussions over the limits of deviation, the visualizations at the extent of those limits. Um, I note that those were submitted at deadline five with blue shading indicate where the pylons and overhead lines could, in theory, move to using that. There was a deviation, um, following that exercise. Are you proposing to the applicant? Are you proposing any additions to the list in GG 34 of the code? Construction practice?

00:03:44:17 - 00:04:17:12

Laura Cargill for the applicant. Um, thank you for the question. We have reviewed the limit of the deviation visualizations that we prepared for deadline five, and we've done a back check of our findings in the sensitivity section of the landscape and visual impact assessment. And we've concluded that there would be no change to the magnitude of effect or significance of effect to any of the the viewpoints, the landscape and visual viewpoints, I should add. So to that effect, we're not proposing to make any changes to the the commitments in DG 34.

00:04:17:27 - 00:04:27:02

I would just add that that's on the sort of landscape and visual viewpoints. I have colleagues here that can speak to the residential visual amenity and heritage assessment viewpoints.

00:04:28:05 - 00:05:00:04

Um, yes, please. Yeah. Hilda, for the applicant. Yeah. We two undertook a back check and review following the production of the Lod visualizations. We do found that they did not. They reinforce the findings that we'd already reported on. And they we did not find any material changes to the effects that sit within the RBA itself. Therefore, we saw no reason to place any more avoidance restrictions, etc. on in GTA 34.

00:05:01:04 - 00:05:13:06

Thank you. Just on the air in that respect. Um, I just want to ask a quick question about the pylons to the rear of Heinz Close in Oldham, which is, um, I think around TB 55.

00:05:15:00 - 00:05:54:26

Um, and whether taking account of what you've already said, but taking, you know, with the restriction in the, in the limits of the deviation there to prevent any further movement to the east be of use, then, Hilda, for the applicant, I'll have to look at that matter in closer detail if that's alright, and I can come back to you in writing on that. Can you just confirm you said TB 55? Yes. Uh, which property did you as Heinz close. There's a there's a visualization of it. Yeah. Um, just to say we were only requested to produce, uh, two, uh, Lod visualizations in respect of VAR from from stakeholders.

00:05:54:29 - 00:06:14:09

That wasn't one of them, but we also looked at the ones that were produced for the rest of the LBA. So if that forms part of it, we'll look at that in detail. No, I appreciate that that your list effectively came from the various different councils and so on. It's just one that I've picked up and we've picked up on our site visits. Okay. So that would be useful if you could look into that for us. Thank you.

00:06:17:03 - 00:06:19:21

Um, did the council have anything to say on this matter?

00:06:20:12 - 00:06:24:10

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council.

00:06:26:00 - 00:06:56:09

We take a different view to the applicant about the, um, outputs of the new visualizations, because we think that they helpfully show in the locations where that exercise has been done, that the extent of adverse impact does differ meaningfully depending on exactly where the pylons are sited within the limits of deviation, and also depending on the ultimate height of the pylons.

00:06:56:11 - 00:07:29:05

And we think that's illustrated, um, by, um, several of those in the selected locations. Obviously, I'm not going to go through all of that now, but just by way of illustration, we would draw particular attention to the Waveney Valley and the views from the cross boundary Angles Way recreational path. Uh, in terms of the documentation, that's in rep 5196 as regards pylons RG 86 and RG 87.

00:07:29:18 - 00:08:00:08

And it's the contrast between what is its viewpoint a G two one, a little one. And it's the contrast between figure 7.12 F208HE2 brackets, little one brackets G as compared to figure 7.1 5F208H2 brackets. Little one brackets. Little G brackets.

00:08:00:18 - 00:08:30:24

Little two. Uh. Um, that will make more sense, I hope, in the transcript than it does here, but, uh, so I say it's we think it illustrates the point and it illustrates the wider concern we had as to whether actually the people doing the assessments on landscape, uh, and heritage, uh, had in fact, uh, properly allowed for, uh, the uh, the worst case in terms of where the pylons are located within the limits of deviation.

00:08:31:09 - 00:09:03:08

As regards the commitment in GG 34, in the outline CSP, we don't think that goes far enough. Uh, firstly, it doesn't address all of the sensitive locations. And I think what we'll do in our post hearing submissions. So we'll identify locations where we think there needs to be a commitment. But secondly, in any event, the way that G, G 34 works is it doesn't really provide for what you might call micro siting.

00:09:03:12 - 00:09:40:13

What it does is it has a number of slightly woolly caveats about minimized restrict in particular locations as far as reasonably practicable or if reasonably practicable and similar. And it doesn't have then any approval mechanism as to what then happens. The applicant simply says, well, that's what I'm going to do. I'll do my best. And we think that that's not good enough. There needs to be an approval mechanism. So there needs to be in the sensitive locations, a regime of micro siting for pilot locations so as to ensure that the impacts are minimized.

00:09:40:24 - 00:09:41:18

Thank you sir.

00:09:42:24 - 00:09:46:13

Thank you for that, Mr. Bedford. Um, yes, Mr. Wilder.

00:09:47:28 - 00:10:18:19

Thank you sir. Um, so, uh, Matthew Wilde, Braintree District Council, um, want to thank the applicant for updating, uh, the wireline viewpoints, uh, that we asked for. Our concern was primarily around, um, residential visual amenity and the assessment that was carried out. Um, so I'll ask our, um, landscape officer who's online to come back on this. Um, unless I did notice that the residential visual amenity was actually a later item on the agenda.

00:10:18:21 - 00:10:21:07

So I don't know if you wanted us to cover it an hour later.

00:10:21:14 - 00:10:23:15

Oh, no. He's fine. Okay.

00:10:23:25 - 00:10:28:25

Um, yeah. Bobby, please come in. Thank you. All right. Thank you.

00:10:28:27 - 00:11:06:10

Yeah. Bobby Brown, uh, landscape consultant for Braintree District Council. Um, yeah. So, as Mr. Walsh said, you know, um, thank you for, um, updating the wildlife visualizations for receptors E7, which is West Forward Farm Cottage and E8, which is Whitehead's farm. Um, we believe that the, uh, the visualizations actually, you know, that they, they exacerbate some of our concerns that we've, we've raised earlier. Um, and although they do show the lateral deviation, um, that the potential lateral deviation, they don't really show, um, potential for the pylons to kind of move along the original route.

00:11:06:12 - 00:11:39:27

But in the, in the same kind of linear, um, direction. So we don't think that they necessarily show the worst case scenario. And in any case, we feel that they kind of they do, um, support or illustrate our, our concerns for those two, uh, residential receptors. Um, we, we kind of maintain the position that the towers will appear unpleasantly encroaching and inescapably dominant from both properties. And we use that wording quite carefully as they are to the criteria that are within the the applicant's own of the AA methodology.

00:11:40:02 - 00:12:17:10

Um, so, so we believe that residential and visual amenity has been breached. Um, although that's not the position of the applicant. Um, we therefore request that, um, kind of in, in relation to JG 34 of the cockpit. Uh, we request that that could be expanded to, to fix the route in proximity to those two receptors. Um, so although our VHA has been, uh, the threshold has been kind of breached, in our opinion. We do think that that would, um, that would at least reduce any further potential impacts, um, within the limits of deviation.

00:12:19:01 - 00:12:26:22

Thank you. Um, is there any other council's wish to raise any points on this matter?

00:12:30:00 - 00:12:33:25

Are you not seeing anyone? So, yes. Ardley Parish Council, please.

00:12:34:24 - 00:12:36:13

Hi. Um. I don't want to.

00:12:36:18 - 00:12:37:19

Chris Whitfield.

00:12:37:22 - 00:12:41:18

Audley parish council. Um, I don't want to repeat obviously, what I said.

00:12:41:20 - 00:12:42:15

At the open.

00:12:42:17 - 00:12:43:08

Forum hearing.

00:12:43:10 - 00:12:44:12

But it was in relation.

00:12:44:14 - 00:12:44:29

To a.

00:12:45:01 - 00:12:49:06

New visualisation which was 7.12 from the.

00:12:49:10 - 00:12:51:03

Ardley crossroads looking towards.

00:12:51:05 - 00:12:51:20

The.

00:12:51:22 - 00:12:52:08

Church.

00:12:52:15 - 00:12:53:04

Um, we.

00:12:53:06 - 00:12:53:21

Are.

00:12:53:23 - 00:12:54:21

Extremely surprised.

00:12:54:23 - 00:13:08:01

That, um, the applicant hasn't really revised their, um, assessment of that view because the visualisation certainly makes it appear as though it could be much worse. Thank you.

00:13:09:08 - 00:13:09:28

Thank you.

00:13:14:09 - 00:13:30:21

Hey, uh, would you like to respond or, um, I should say sorry just before you do, Mr. Harris. Mr. Bedford, I should have said whilst you were speaking to sir, the full list would be very useful. Thank you. Obviously, that of your concerns. Thank you.

00:13:30:28 - 00:13:50:22

That was my point. If Mr. Bedford could get us that schedule as soon as possible, we will consider it and respond. And if it could be done informally so that we can do it sooner rather than later, because these things take quite a bit of tech to deal with. Um, I think Mr. Hilder wanted to respond in relation to residential impact.

00:13:52:08 - 00:14:07:08

Ben Hilda for the applicant. Yeah, I think there's two points here. One was common between Mr. Bedford and the representatives from Braintree Council, and that was regards to the worst case scenario. We've endeavoured to

00:14:08:24 - 00:14:52:15

assess the worst case scenario, knowing full well that there are an infinite number of scenarios that could occur if you consider the the three factors of lateral, longitudinal and height. What we've done in the visualisations is to and in our assessment is to move the in, in most cases the closest pylon closest to the property affected and take therefore the worst case and the precautionary approach on that matter. But the other factor really is to bear in mind on this is that whilst we acknowledge that if you move part of the project closer to a property, it will inevitably lead to to an increase in effects.

00:14:52:17 - 00:15:19:21

It doesn't change the rating of effect and doesn't breach the threshold, particularly when you assess the effects in the round and the Landscape Institute guidance document. Lee, TN 219. In particular, stresses that effects need to be seen in the round, and there's a definition of in the round in its glossary. And that's reflected in the glossary of our RBA as well. Okay.

00:15:19:23 - 00:15:20:12

Thank you.

00:15:20:14 - 00:15:25:18

Um, was there any response or, uh, to Ardley Parish Council? Would that be in writing?

00:15:26:03 - 00:15:38:26

I think it will be in writing. And there are particular things that we need to say about that particular um, rendering as well, which, um, I think we'll share with Ardley Parish Council and yourselves.

00:15:39:07 - 00:15:43:27

Thank you. Um, Mr. McLean, I believe you had a brief point to make.

00:15:44:00 - 00:16:18:19

Yeah, with the visualization. Sorry. Charlie Meckler of Langley's estate. Um, they have produced some very kindly of from Langley's, but actually have got no backdrop to the picture, so you can't visualize it at all. Uh, it also appears to be showing the low, high pylons having I we are very confused on that. All the maps they're produced for, uh, deadline five. Some show low high pike, high low height pylons. Some show tall pylons. They've even sent a letter to me on the. I think it was the 12th of June, which is after the deadline showing low height pylons again.

00:16:18:21 - 00:16:28:12

How do we know what we're doing? They're producing visualizations for low worst case. But is that accurate visualizations? Is that not accurate? Thank you.

00:16:28:21 - 00:16:58:03

Thank you, Mr. McLellan. I believe I know the answer to some of that question, but if you could clarify it Clarify for us, please. Ben Hilde of the applicant. The visualizations adjacent to windmill House were again on a precautionary approach, prepared using the low height pylon design. Because to say that is the worst case scenario. But I'm also aware that the design has been updated and my colleague, Mr. Royston, perhaps could give us a quick update on on where that's at and where the status is.

00:16:59:21 - 00:17:10:18

Yeah. We've, um. Confirmed. Sorry. Paul written for the applicant. We have confirmed a change in, um, arrangement there. So south of the river is to standard heights in place of three low heights.

00:17:13:09 - 00:17:16:20

And north of the river remains as a shorter pylon. Is that correct?

00:17:17:15 - 00:17:19:12

Yes. That is. Thank you.

00:17:22:02 - 00:17:42:27

Okay. Thank you. Um, we'll move on then to, um, agenda item 5.4. Um, and start off with link pillars. Um. And I wondered if you could, uh, show the, um, the diagram that we requested before on the link pillars. The very long reference.

00:17:57:27 - 00:18:02:16

Thank you. And if you could just zoom into the, um, the sections, if you could at all.

00:18:09:12 - 00:18:32:18

That's great. Thank you very much. Um, it's just a question of clarification, really. Um, the drawings there appear to show defences of around 1.8m six foot. Um, whereas the answer to question LV 2.3 um stated a 1.3m high post and rail fence.

00:18:41:10 - 00:18:45:21

We'll check on that and give you the correct dimension.

00:18:47:00 - 00:19:08:27

Thank you. And obviously if the drawing needs updating, the drawing could be updated too. Um, there was also a similar clarification point about, um, in the Darcy, you said that the proposed compounds would be 4x4 metres. Um, and in LV 2.2 um stated five by five metres. So it's a similar point of clarification.

00:19:10:10 - 00:19:12:19

Russell Harris KC for the applicant. Same process.

00:19:12:21 - 00:19:13:10

Thank you.

00:19:15:14 - 00:19:34:24

Um, Essex County Council, amongst others, have suggested a requirement to ensure that detailed design is submitted and approved prior to commencement for the link pillars. Um, with receding color for the pillars and screen planting. Um, is that proposed requirement acceptable to yourselves, and if so, are you content with the wording?

00:19:35:25 - 00:19:40:26

I'm going to ask Mr., um, Mr. Kevin Robertson to deal with that, please.

00:19:41:19 - 00:19:44:06

Kevin Rowan, on behalf of the applicant, I think.

00:19:44:22 - 00:19:45:28

We'd like first of.

00:19:46:00 - 00:19:46:15

All.

00:19:46:17 - 00:19:47:02

Uh.

00:19:47:04 - 00:19:47:19

We're.

00:19:47:21 - 00:20:24:01

Aware that, uh, the authorities haven't probably seen sites of the updated Darcy that was submitted at deadline five. Uh, within the Darcy we do have we have updated with a design review, uh, coordination for design principle for link pillars, uh, which we will invite, uh, the affected local authorities, but also Denton Vale National Landscape Partnership to a design review workshop, uh, where we will run through the details, uh, in terms of layout, appearance, etc..

00:20:24:08 - 00:20:55:13

Uh, and there's a there's a mechanism there for inputs to, uh, the uh, design review process. So I think it would be interesting. It would be. Would be keen to understand their views on that. But we're equally aware that there has been a request from Colchester City Council and also from Suffolk County Council for a requirement, and we're willing to engage and work with them, uh, moving forwards and providing updates. At deadline 6 or 7.

00:20:57:01 - 00:21:05:10

Okay. Thank you. Would this design review panel be, um, or design workshop be fairly imminent? I'm just thinking of the time left in the examination.

00:21:06:02 - 00:21:12:04

I have spoke to the delivery lead and we can accommodate a workshop in October.

00:21:13:14 - 00:21:15:22

Okay, so not within the examination time?

00:21:16:26 - 00:21:17:14

No.

00:21:18:03 - 00:21:28:10

Okay. Um, so in the meantime, would, uh, I suppose I'd restate my question. about what the requirement would be acceptable to yourselves.

00:21:29:01 - 00:21:30:12

I'd have to take it away.

00:21:31:15 - 00:21:34:02

Okay. Thank you, Russ and.

00:21:34:08 - 00:21:51:12

Casey, for the applicant. I think the issue is individual siting, which largely depends on electricity requirements as opposed to anything else. Because of the nature of the cable and the nature of the job that it has to do. But we'll come back to you with an answer directly to your question.

00:21:51:14 - 00:21:52:14

Okay. Thank you.

00:21:55:24 - 00:21:58:13

Um, I have a drink hand up online.

00:22:01:06 - 00:22:42:20

Thank you. Sir, I'm ordering Essex County Council just to flag that. This does relate to an extent to one of the matters from yesterday, which was requirement 12 and the design of permanent buildings, which does already have a requirement for permanent buildings, which would include link pillars. I think depending on how one defines buildings and to be in general accordance with the design approach for site specific infrastructure. Um, and if you will have seen from our uh, representations in in response to the second round of questions, LV 2.4 um, that's where the where the council thought that the design of the link pillars is submitted and approved.

00:22:42:22 - 00:22:53:24

So it may be the requirement 12 goes part of the way towards that. Or is it is a home for, for for kind of dealing with that issue. Thank you.

00:22:54:01 - 00:22:57:07

Thank you. Understood. Um and Bron Curtis please.

00:22:59:01 - 00:23:02:28

Thank you sir. Bron Curtis for baber district council and Mid Suffolk district council. Um.

00:23:03:00 - 00:23:04:10

Apologies sir.

00:23:04:12 - 00:23:09:14

Have you finished with item 5.3 and the decision making approval process?

00:23:10:28 - 00:23:11:20

Um, yes, I have.

00:23:12:03 - 00:23:15:28

Sorry. Okay. It wasn't clear where you had concluded on that. Thank you.

00:23:17:00 - 00:23:21:19

Okay. Thank you. Was there anything you wish to raise? Or you can put it in writing if you prefer.

00:23:25:13 - 00:23:27:11

We'll put it in writing. Thank you.

00:23:27:13 - 00:23:28:19

Okay. Thank you.

00:23:30:24 - 00:23:32:21

Um, I'll just revert to the applicant on the.

00:23:32:29 - 00:23:33:14

Sorry.

00:23:33:17 - 00:23:34:17

Oh, sorry. Mr. Bedford.

00:23:34:27 - 00:24:10:17

Bedford, Suffolk county council. So I was going to echo the points that have been made by Miss Dring. And obviously in our answer to LV 2.5, 2.4 in rep 5271. Uh, we've set out, I think, the requirement that we wish to see, uh, included. Um, and, um, I don't think that we're seeking to control the siting of where the link pillar is, but that where it's operationally required, there is then control of the above ground appearance of that link building.

00:24:13:03 - 00:24:13:26

Thank you.

00:24:14:18 - 00:24:15:25

Mr. Casey. That's a.

00:24:15:27 - 00:24:16:12

Helpful.

00:24:16:14 - 00:24:20:17

Helpful clarification. Thank you. And we'll aid, um, consideration on this side. Thank you.

00:24:20:19 - 00:24:25:07

Thank you very much. Anything else on link pillars? Miss Pearson?

00:24:26:01 - 00:24:43:00

Um, yeah. A quick point to enable the applicant to respond by the next deadline. Would it be possible to include the Dead and fail society in any design review? Um, and, um, again, comes back to our good design practice. Is the independent. Is the panel independent for this design review? I know it's only a small component, but thank you.

00:24:43:25 - 00:24:45:13

Thank you for that, Mr. Harris.

00:24:45:15 - 00:24:52:07

We'll we'll come back to that. I think the answer to it is in the Darcy, but, um, uh, we'll we'll deal with that in writing.

00:24:52:09 - 00:24:54:02

Thank you. Thank you.

00:24:57:23 - 00:24:59:27

Okay, so we'll move on to dark skies.

00:25:01:13 - 00:25:30:19

Um, there's just a quick question about, um, your response to, um, LV 2.1 about the, uh, dark skies designation. Could I ask, uh, could we ask for completeness that the, um, visual based baseline VRA C8 him at 229 and the assessment study at 235 be updated to include reference to that designation.

00:25:32:20 - 00:25:33:17

Harris for the applicant.

00:25:33:19 - 00:25:34:26

Yes. Thank you.

00:25:36:23 - 00:26:16:26

Um, it's noted that in local level policy that dark skies are a component of tranquility. That this in turn, is a special quality of the Denton Vale Natural landscape, where minimal light intrusion is noted as a contributing factor to that tranquility. Across various documentation is reference to lighting in the hours of darkness, for example for the treacherous crossings or proposed gentlest crossings, which is described as both unlikely to be perceptible and an exceptional and infrequent occurrence, but also as having direct effects. Um, if you could confirm which areas of the natural landscape are likely to have those direct effects from nighttime construction, lighting, and how frequent they may be.

00:26:16:28 - 00:26:19:23

Russell. Harris. case. Miss Cargill will deal with that.

00:26:22:07 - 00:26:41:17

Laura Cargill for the applicant. And we have considered the effects of lighting during construction as part of the sort of overall construction activities. Um, so that's both in in relation to landscape character areas and visual receptor areas. And so that's set out in our chapter. Um, sorry. Could you repeat the first part of your question?

00:26:41:25 - 00:26:56:01

Yes. It was um, it was basically because there's almost seems to be, um, uh, a clash there between some of your comments saying and likely to be perceptible and an exceptional, infrequent occurrence in terms of not unlighted, but also that they would have a direct effect.

00:26:58:19 - 00:27:21:05

Laura Cargill for the applicant. Um, I would need to go back and check our assessment, but I think we do identify significant effects within a certain distance of the project. Um, and that would that takes into account all in construction activities, including lighting. Um, but with regard to sort of throwing the Thornton Street, which is around about two kilometres. Um, from the project, the effects of lighting and other construction activities would be barely perceptible.

00:27:21:26 - 00:27:50:01

I think it would be if you could clarify, perhaps in writing. Um, not necessarily on Thornton Street, but also across the whole national landscape. Um, because, as I said at the start, it's a the dark sky is a

component of tranquillity, which is a special quality of the national landscape. So if you could clarify, um, within the areas of the dead and Vale where that direct effect may occur, um, how frequent there would be and potentially, if there is any mitigation proposed.

00:27:51:24 - 00:27:53:27

Laura Cargill for the applicant. Yes. Happy to do that.

00:27:53:29 - 00:28:00:20

Thank you. Thank you very much. Um, does anyone else wish to raise anything on dark skies? Uh, Miss Pearson.

00:28:01:24 - 00:28:32:05

Rose Pearson, East Anglia. Um, I'd like to refer to the planning, national planning guidance, um, that, uh, in a development in or near a protected area, like a national landscape or intrinsically dark landscape, then it's appropriate to set conditions at the planning stage. So we would argue that the entire route, almost the entire route is dark, it's rural, it's an inherently dark area, not just the national landscape. Um, so there needs to be efforts to reduce light spill none beyond the site boundary. Minimize minimize outward light.

00:28:32:07 - 00:28:46:02

We'd like to request that, as with the Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant, when they had their DCF relocation, they had a lighting design strategy built into the DCO, which had to be approved by all the local authorities before any work commenced. So we'd like to request one of those.

00:28:47:17 - 00:28:48:09

Thank you.

00:28:49:02 - 00:28:51:09

We'll take that one away as well. Thank you. Russell Harris.

00:28:51:11 - 00:28:56:25

Casey, thank you very much. Thank you, Miss Pearson. Um, anyone else have any comments on Dark Skies?

00:29:00:29 - 00:29:46:07

Okay. Thank you. So we'll move on to cumulative. Um, in your response to, um, excuse two, Gen 2.3, um, you described Significant magnification as an effect that is significantly greater. Stroke. Larger stroke magnified than those reported as a result of the project in isolation and the use of significant magnification. Considers where further significant effects are likely cumulatively. Considering that in the context of cumulative landscape and visual effects, is there a threshold for landscape and visual effects above which significant magnification is identified? Could you provide any specific examples that illustrate significantly greater, larger, and magnified in that context?

00:29:47:14 - 00:29:57:03

Um, I'll ask Miss Cargill first to have a crack at that. Um, I suspect it's one that we will have to come back to you in writing, but, um. Let's see.

00:29:57:12 - 00:29:57:29

Thank you.

00:29:58:01 - 00:30:01:09

Laura Cargill, for the applicant. Um, yeah, just to confirm, we will come back in writing on that.

00:30:01:11 - 00:30:04:01

Thank you. I know it was a fairly complex question.

00:30:08:27 - 00:30:34:09

Um, your response to Q two. Um. Ah. The appendix E included a series of drawings illustrating the location and geographical extent of the community of landscape and visual effects. Um, they were particularly helpful. Um, and we wondered if it would be possible to put together a similar package of drawings for significant non cumulative landscape and visual effects.

00:30:35:20 - 00:30:40:11

Russell Harris Casey for the applicant, did you have a timeline in mind at all to do the time really.

00:30:40:13 - 00:30:44:11

Of course. Well we only have the two deadlines left. Anyway um I.

00:30:44:13 - 00:30:46:21

Think I was going for the later of the two. Yes.

00:30:46:23 - 00:30:48:23

I thought you might be. Yes. Um.

00:30:51:07 - 00:30:55:25

I think yes. In this instance, yes, I think that's deadline set will be fine.

00:30:55:27 - 00:31:00:08

Well, we'll do all that we can. Thank you. To get it as quickly as we can and as extensive as we can.

00:31:00:10 - 00:31:01:03

Thank you.

00:31:02:21 - 00:31:32:08

Uh, and then finally, on this matter, um, it's Q2 again. Asked about sequential impacts On users of the public right of way network, and in response to identified users of the SCSI and NCN, route 50 is likely to experience significant cumulative effects. Can you confirm what proportion of those routes would be subject to significant cumulative effects, and if any mitigation would be appropriate for those routes?

00:31:34:11 - 00:31:44:11

Laura Cargill for the applicants. Um, again, I think we will take that one away. We don't have specifics or distances over which the significant cumulative effects would be experienced at the moment, but that is something that we could look at.

00:31:44:13 - 00:31:50:20

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, does anyone else wish to raise any comments on cumulative impacts?

00:31:59:02 - 00:32:07:27

Okay. Thank you very much. We'll just move on to the, uh, to the RVI then. Um, and I just have one question on that. Um.

00:32:09:24 - 00:32:11:06

I'll just let you swap over.

00:32:13:06 - 00:32:13:26

Thank you.

00:32:16:15 - 00:32:52:18

Um, thank you for the response to the rule 17 letter at deadline five a concerning the cottages opposite Flood and Hall Cottages. Um, your response mentions, uh, provides a justification, um, for the 200m, um, distance. Um. That's understood. But the visuals still show a fairly high, um, significant impact to high hopes, which is, um, noted as being 208m from the proposed development. But still true because the the are that um, are there likely to be many other properties of a similar nature.

00:32:55:17 - 00:32:56:02

And Hilda.

00:32:56:04 - 00:32:56:19

For.

00:32:56:21 - 00:32:57:06

The.

00:32:57:08 - 00:32:57:23

Applicant, uh.

00:32:58:09 - 00:32:59:27

I couldn't categorically.

00:32:59:29 - 00:33:01:14

Say that they're what number.

00:33:01:16 - 00:33:38:11

There would be or not. But what I would say is that in undertaking the work that we did, both desk based and field based. We took in consideration properties around the margin of that 200 meter zone. We also took into account guidance to the landscape Ministry guidance, which specifically said about overhead lines that 150m was the the limit from which the threshold could be breached. Um, so my, uh, answer would be that it's very unlikely there would be other properties like that.

00:33:38:13 - 00:33:54:29

That's not to say, though, that there and again, written in our work, that there may be properties upon which there'd be a high magnitude of effect occurring in, in that zone, that the thing that is unlikely is that that would break, that those would break the threshold.

00:33:56:18 - 00:34:15:24

Understand? Thank you. Um, and the measurements for the 200m cut off, if you like. Is that taken from the curtilage of the affected properties, then Hilda for the applicant. Yes. We're very acutely aware that it's gardens, driveways, suchlike which are equally important to receptors in this regard. So it's taken from the edge of the curtilage. Okay. Thank you.

00:34:19:02 - 00:34:31:12

Um, I'll just move on now to a veteran trees. Um, I understand from yesterday's, um, issue specific hearing that the number of veteran trees now being affected has been reduced. Um, could you explain that to us, please?

00:34:33:00 - 00:34:49:07

So, Harris Casey, for the applicant, I think Mark Watson can explain it. Yes. Um, there were 115, I think, along the route. Um, the last we reported were four, and now we're down to one. But, um, Mr. Watson would be able to tell you better.

00:34:51:03 - 00:35:05:12

Yeah. Mark Watson for the applicant. Um. That's correct. We're now we're now down to one tree that's potentially affected still or currently marked as removed. Um, the other three, we may be able through the design process to retain those trees.

00:35:08:27 - 00:35:16:11

Could you give me an example of how how is that? Is that microsite in or is that something else? It's just more detailed design or.

00:35:17:03 - 00:35:50:24

Mark Watson for the applicant. Some of it's been an element of micro sighting in 1 or 2 positions, or we've been able to do some more modeling in terms of the trees, canopy and potential future growth rates and determine that against, um, some ground management. So we can look to retain the tree underneath the pylons or close to the pylons. Um, there's also been some of them have gone through the detailed design change request process.

00:35:51:05 - 00:36:12:19

Um, I think two of them were associated with the mod, um, position. And so they were reviewed as a request of the lot. And design change has resulted in has been able to retain the trees rather than remove them because there has been a limited light realignment in those areas.

00:36:12:23 - 00:36:23:21

Thank you. Would it be? You may well have be doing this anyway, but would it be possible to submit some information on those specific trees and and how they will now be not affected?

00:36:25:21 - 00:36:30:08

Russell Harris KC for the applicant that does exist, I'm looking at it and we can submit it. Yes.

00:36:30:10 - 00:36:31:15

Okay. Thank you.

00:36:33:07 - 00:36:56:06

Okay. And I just have one more landscape question. Um, and this may well be something that I've missed. So if I have, then apologies. But is there any more detail, um, such as cross sections for the various proposed, um, permanent spoil bund hatches or hatch? Um, there's a there's a plan, I believe rep for one one. Oh. Um,

00:36:58:06 - 00:37:22:29

um, so that shows a proposed permanent spoil band. That example is actually R-cnn. Um, but they some of them appear fairly substantial and especially the one at the R-cnn. So as I said, I may well have missed this information, but if there's more information, the size, mass, slope angles, if they're going to be planted or landscaped and so on, if that would be available, that'd be useful.

00:37:25:00 - 00:37:32:09

Sorry, Rebecca. Great tricks to the applicant. Um, there is no detail at the moment. There are no cross sections there indicative only.

00:37:32:11 - 00:37:47:27

It's dependent on detailed design and what the actual volume is, um, needed in terms of cut and fill on site. And they will be developed during the detailed design. They are referenced on the limp figures. I can't remember which appendix is, but I can we can put that in writing appendix D thank you.

00:37:48:24 - 00:38:04:06

So so is there any controls over how they might look that um, the R-cnn example, for instance, I know it's fairly close to Bounds Farmhouse, which we've discussed before. Listed building and so on. So the actual look of that might be quite important.

00:38:05:00 - 00:38:08:05

Yeah. Rebecca, great tricks for the applicant. We can take that away and come back to you on that.

00:38:08:07 - 00:38:09:09

Okay. Thank you.

00:38:11:18 - 00:38:18:01

Um, before we move on. Are there any other landscape and visual, um, issues that anyone wishes to raise?

00:38:23:03 - 00:38:25:18

Seeing any hands. Miss Mason?

00:38:26:17 - 00:38:27:28

Sorry. Just one.

00:38:28:00 - 00:38:28:15

Query.

00:38:28:17 - 00:38:29:02

Just me, if you might.

00:38:29:04 - 00:38:29:19

Sorry. Sorry.

00:38:29:21 - 00:38:30:27

I'm so sorry. No problem.

00:38:31:00 - 00:38:58:04

Um, just one query that just occurred to me. There's. There's a cottage called Glebe Cottage on the Little Bromley Road right by the railway line. And I believe the pylon. Probably 6 or 7. I think I've forgotten the lettering. Um, I think the pylons will be going very, very close to it and I've never heard it mentioned, so I'm just wondering if we could know more about?

00:38:58:07 - 00:39:04:01

Of course. Do you know if it's, um. It's a list of building. No, it doesn't ring a bell to me. No, it's a railway.

00:39:04:03 - 00:39:04:18

Cottage.

00:39:04:20 - 00:39:07:19

Building, so it might be something that's been considered within the air.

00:39:08:11 - 00:39:13:00

Um, it just occurred to me that I've never heard it mentioned. Thank you very much.

00:39:13:02 - 00:39:16:12

Thank you. Um, if that could be looked into.

00:39:17:18 - 00:39:19:10

The house for the applicant will do.

00:39:19:12 - 00:39:24:04

Thank you very much. So it's been held of the applicant. It is included. Glebe cottages.

00:39:24:06 - 00:39:25:03

There's two. There's three.

00:39:25:05 - 00:39:41:01

Properties there. Actually. One, two and three. They're all included in the RBA already. And, uh, yeah, but if there's particular questions on them then. Yeah answer that. But they are in the RBA already if you want to have a look. Okay. Thank you very much.

00:39:42:27 - 00:39:46:09

And there's a hand in the audience if we could get a microphone please.

00:39:58:15 - 00:40:00:17

Jenny Mitcham for the Langley's estate.

00:40:00:23 - 00:40:01:15

I just wanted the.

00:40:01:17 - 00:40:05:27

Definition of a veteran tree, because I know there's two trees that prevent. Well, we'll.

00:40:05:29 - 00:40:06:14

Protect my.

00:40:06:16 - 00:40:13:29

House that are still circled on plans. So how old is a veteran tree? I'm sorry. How old does a tree have to be before it's veteran?

00:40:15:10 - 00:40:18:27

Thank you. Um, I'm looking to the applicant.

00:40:19:09 - 00:40:29:25

It's a it's not just an age. It's a functional, uh, and, um, it's, uh, characteristics as well, for which I'm going to turn to the arboriculture list. Mr. Mark Watson.

00:40:30:21 - 00:41:03:27

Hi there. Mark Watson for the applicant. Um, the definition that we'd use is the one set out in the NPF guidance. Um, the current guidance, which is a size and condition, makes reference to um in terms of veteran trees per se. I think the our industry has around about eight different definitions of veteran trees. Um, and it's the different nuances are put into it, but we have applied quite a stringent and robust methodology in terms of surveying and what features and characteristics we're looking at.

00:41:03:29 - 00:41:13:09

And to answer lady's question, we're there is no age category placed on on either ancient or veteran trees.

00:41:14:16 - 00:41:23:28

Thank you. And is there within within the literature somewhere that you've submitted? Is there detail on your your definition of a veteran tree, the one you've chosen out of those eight that you've mentioned?

00:41:24:29 - 00:41:37:07

I've got some for the applicant. We've got the broad cultural impact assessment where we talk about veteran trees. We go back to the scoping document. I'm afraid I can't remember off the top of my head what the reference. Now, of.

00:41:37:09 - 00:41:37:25

Course.

00:41:38:03 - 00:41:45:13

Um, but in there it says the sort of methodology that we're looking to apply. Um, and then on I think it's, uh,

00:41:46:29 - 00:41:57:29

I think it's appendix B of rep 3032, which is the Ancient Woodland and Veterinary Strategy document. There's also information in there.

00:41:58:17 - 00:42:09:22

Thank you for that. Okay, okay, okay. I'm not seeing any more. Hands up. So, um, we will now proceed to item six and I'll pass to

00:42:11:16 - 00:42:12:13

Mr. Butler.

00:42:14:11 - 00:42:17:18

Thank you. Right. So item.

00:42:17:20 - 00:42:19:16

Six is noise and vibration.

00:42:20:05 - 00:42:23:10

And item yes.

00:42:24:01 - 00:42:26:28

I'll pause for a second whilst you're all swapping around.

00:43:22:17 - 00:43:30:22

Russell Harris KC for the applicant. Thank you very much for waiting. While they're getting ready, I will introduce David Gray and Giles High.

00:44:10:18 - 00:44:13:18

You could just give me an indication when you're comfortable and ready.

00:44:15:10 - 00:44:20:09

I know it takes a little while just to set your things up and get. Make sure you get the right things on the screen and stuff. So.

00:44:22:09 - 00:44:59:07

Okay. Yes. Thank you sir. Perfect. All right. So noise and vibration is item six on the agenda. And we wanted to start at 6.1 with an update concerning the primary access route 30, which was Bently Road, and the magnitude of impact on noise sensitive receptors, both in terms of noise and vibration and also mitigations proposed. However, we've noted that you've responded at second written questions, which is rep 5211. Question DCO 2.8 uh, that you've responded to our question in relation to this matter.

00:44:59:09 - 00:45:41:21

Um, on Noise of Vibration, we've especially noted that, um, the same principles of noise mitigation, um, for noise of construction traffic will apply to all 16 properties as per Jasmine Cottage, uh, with the exception that jasmine cottage where standard measures were found not to be feasible. Um, standard

mitigation measures may be feasible at some of the other or all of the other receptors. Um, you were clear where the standard mitigation measures are feasible and efficacious, um, at avoiding significant, uh, efficacious, I should say, uh, at avoiding, uh, significant adverse effects at receptors.

00:45:41:23 - 00:46:22:13

Uh, and this would negate the need for bespoke noise mitigation strategies at those specific receptors, but rather otherwise bespoke specific strategies would be developed at those receptors. You also highlighted that there's a potential to utilize the No Falls and Five Estuaries Hall Road off of the Bentley Road, thus reducing the number of properties that could potentially be affected. Before asking relevant local authorities to speak on the matter, can the applicant provide any further information about the potential use of the North Hall's and five Estuaries Hall Road off of the Bentley Road? And when it would become clear that that may be an option?

00:46:25:10 - 00:46:42:21

One of our witnesses, Russell Harris Casey for the applicant, one of our witnesses, you remember, was taken ill. Um, it's this witness. So we will put that in writing for from you, um, and give you a further update. But everything else that you said was entirely accurate. Okay. Thank you for that. Um.

00:46:46:24 - 00:46:54:24

Do the local authorities have anything they want to say with regard to the applicant's response to second written questions? Um,

00:46:56:17 - 00:47:01:12

Tending District Council have got their hand up online. Mr. Jha Jasmine.

00:47:02:29 - 00:47:04:15

Um, yeah. Thank you.

00:47:04:17 - 00:47:07:11

Jacob, for tendering district council. So we've.

00:47:07:13 - 00:47:14:23

We've also noticed the applicants response and specifically the mentioning of bespoke strategies that will be developed.

00:47:14:25 - 00:47:51:18

At other receptors, um, along Bentley road. So tDCS view um is an in response to that is that it's not a good or robust practice um to, to defer um, what we consider to be known necessary and material mitigation to, to a later stage in this context to both consent discharge of requirements. Um, we don't think it's appropriate, especially where the impacts of affected properties and residents are already well understood, as set out in in National Grid's evidence.

00:47:51:20 - 00:48:31:06

So the as, as we see the the system is deliberately front loaded. Um, so in simple terms, um, we, we feel that it's, you know, not known impacts or if the decision makers should, should know what the impacts are and, and how they will be controlled through, through effective mitigation. Um, before granting the DCO, um, so at this very late stage, we, we don't even know what mitigation measures are proposed along Bentley roads.

00:48:31:19 - 00:49:03:10

Um, and particularly those 16 properties that will experience a significant adverse effects without mitigation. So and also we don't know the specifics of the mitigation. We don't know how reliable it will be. We don't even know if it will be enforceable, especially in the context of North Hills and five estuaries. Um, I mean, it's late in the day. We're approaching deadline six. Um, and National Grid is known about these issues for at least five years.

00:49:03:12 - 00:50:00:09

Um, and perhaps, perhaps from the moment when they settled on, on this location for their East Anglia connection node. Um, so, so for Tendring, we feel that it's definitely not unreasonable to expect precise details of mitigation along along Bentley Road. And moreover, um, if mitigation is is vague, which it is at the moment in the Bentley Road context, um, or if it's deferred or uncertain, um, it creates significant doubt not only for local residents, but also about where the mitigation proposed will will be efficient and effective in that context, with two, maybe even three other intercepts, um, happening in that location and using the same access road or same area for construction traffic.

00:50:00:23 - 00:50:12:04

So, so to conclude, um, DCS, in response to the applicant's response to that question, um, at, you.

00:50:12:06 - 00:50:12:21

Know.

00:50:13:07 - 00:50:45:13

At the last deadline. Um, we we feel that the national grid should already know the scale of noise and vibration impact, including from all Norwich Tilbury related, uh, construction traffic along the primary access route 30. They should know precisely the number of affected dwellings. And indeed they do know. They do know that. And they should also know at this stage precisely what mitigation is needed in that area.

00:50:45:25 - 00:51:18:10

Um, and if if National Grid don't know or don't understand the scale of impact along Bentley Road and what mitigation is needed, uh, then then that in itself raises very, very difficult and concerning questions and is in a difficult situation because then they go into something somewhat blind and and without fully understanding the impacts of, of turning Bentley Road into the busiest primary access route of the, of the entire project.

00:51:18:25 - 00:51:20:06

Um, so.

00:51:20:11 - 00:51:20:26

All.

00:51:20:28 - 00:51:50:03

Of all of these matters raises a clear red flag for for tendering because National Grid knows the impacts. They know the affected properties. Um, and they know mitigation will be required because they their own evidence show that um, so TDC um, think it's not reasonable to defer. Known critical mitigation to discharge to the discharge of requirement stage for all of that to become known. Thank you.

00:51:50:05 - 00:52:13:05

Thank you, Mr. Gentleman. Um, I think your position is quite clear. I'm assuming that you're going to follow that deadline. Six in any event. Um, so there's no need for you to respond to that. But, um, we'll look forward to some thinking writing from you at deadline six as well. Um, does any other local or county authority wish to say anything with regard to PA 30?

00:52:15:19 - 00:52:58:15

Mr. Harris, do you want to respond to Mr. Jarman's comments at all? Uh, we'll do it in writing. But of course, the thing is, if the five estuaries North fall primary mitigation takes place, then the detailed mitigation will all have been done in vain. So far, we know the flows. We know precisely what mitigation is needed in order to reach the targets, and we know that they are achievable by usual methods and proprietary proprietary screens, etc. that's all set out already. In my submission, it's not unusual, particularly where you've got this either or position at this stage for the absolute detail of that to be dealt with safely by the local authorities in due course, I'm sure he'll be astute to ensure that.

00:52:58:17 - 00:53:18:19

That's right. Okay. That's understood. Thank you very much. I didn't open the floor to anybody else on responding or making comments on public access, route number 30 and the noise and vibration impacts as a result of the proposed development. Does anybody either in the room or online, um, that I haven't already asked, wish to say anything?

00:53:20:22 - 00:53:31:01

I get no indication in the room and there's no indication online. So I'm going to move on to item 6.2, which is related to the East Anglia Connection Node substation. Um.

00:53:40:22 - 00:54:11:24

Right. This is just a query, but it seems quite coincidental that all of the cumulative noise limits for the National Grid East Anglia collection node are the five estuaries and no falls nationally significant infrastructure projects at all 11 receptors um shown in table eight. Sorry a 14.3.1, which is the cumulative noise assessment, are all rated at 35dB later.

00:54:12:09 - 00:54:38:22

Um, purpose of putting this matter on the agenda was just really give you notice to double check those figures and make sure the cumulative figures are actually correct. Can you confirm that you've you've actually had a look at that and that they are creating the table? Yes. Um, and it would also be just briefly helpful if you could give us a brief layman's layman's explanation of how you've how you've done that and come to the conclusions you have. Yes. Russell Howard's case for the applicant, David Gray.

00:54:42:04 - 00:54:43:17

David Gray for the applicant.

00:54:43:20 - 00:54:46:14

Good afternoon. Good to see you again. Um, yeah.

00:54:46:16 - 00:54:47:06

The values are.

00:54:47:08 - 00:54:51:08

Correct. So that those are the cumulative limits are.

00:54:51:10 - 00:54:51:25

Set at.

00:54:51:27 - 00:54:53:16

35 overall.

00:54:53:18 - 00:55:32:11

And then individual limits that add up to 35 have been assigned to each of the three substations based on their proximity to the to the to the to the names of sectors. Right. So so the limits add up to 35. Right. The noise level of the substations won't of each individual substation won't be above those values. And therefore the cumulative level won't be above 35. Right. Okay. So you you have re looked at the calculations that you've done initially in the the assessment and you've confirmed each one of those has come back again at 35

00:55:34:03 - 00:55:54:10

till we have. And then they do. Right? Okay. Perfectly. Thank you very much. Um, does anybody else want to say anything on what they've heard with regard to the cumulative, uh, noise? Um, consistently being at 35 decibel A or TR uh, at noise sensitive receptors

00:55:55:28 - 00:56:37:04

in no indication that's, that's open to interested parties as well as local authorities. Again, no no indication. Thank you for the clarification on that. I'm going to move on to my, uh, my next question then, um, which relates to potential mitigation options that are shown in table A, 14.3.7 indicative mitigation options, um,

in relation to transformers and shunt reactors. Uh, you've indicated that plant selection would have an indicative reduction of achievable decibels of ten decibels screening would have a five decibels effect and acoustic enclosures would have a 20dB effect.

00:56:37:14 - 00:57:23:04

Whilst in terms of the cooling system, plant selection and manufacture attenuation, um would also have an indicative reduction of an achievable decibel level of 14. Um. So in theory you have the potential mitigation options in relation to transformers and shunt reactors. Um, and a mitigation related to the cooling system that would have an indicative reduction of an achievable decibel level of 35 and 14, respectively. Um, I've noted in the code of construction planet code, code of construction practice, which is rep 53139 uh, including in relation to appendix F, which is the outline Noise and vibration management plan, which is rep four 170.

00:57:23:11 - 00:58:05:05

Um, it sets out the outline framework for the management of noise and vibration and where feasible at this stage, the proposed development of the site specific measures and construction methodologies required to help avoid or reduce potential effects of the project on the environment during construction. Noted those. However, can the applicant, um, be clear in how these documents will secure the necessary mitigation options and the levels of noise reduction, which are listed as potential or indicative, and how local authorities can be certain that they will adequately protect the relevant noise sensitive receptors, um, and how that will be secured and delivered to their satisfaction.

00:58:05:07 - 00:58:14:14

So that's the satisfaction of the local authorities. I'll leave that to the applicant. Sorry, it's a bit of a long winded question, but Mr. Gray will give an answer.

00:58:16:23 - 00:58:17:26

David Gray for the.

00:58:17:28 - 00:58:30:23

Applicant on the first point, the the values in table A .3.7, and they don't necessarily add arithmetically.

00:58:30:25 - 00:58:31:10

Right.

00:58:31:12 - 00:59:02:23

Um, for the purpose of the assessment of the mitigated, the mitigated scenario, we've only assumed the enclosures as a standard enclosure and the cooling attenuation. There's been no additional screening or plant selection. The reason for that is plant selection. Um, there are National Grid's specification limits for noise from transformers. That's what the assessment is. Based on that higher specification level.

00:59:02:25 - 00:59:25:21

Transformers won't be noisier than that because there's processes through procurement to to to ensure that they're not higher than the specification level. Um, now there's scope for that to be lower obviously, but they won't be higher. And it's the scope is up to ten DB, but it's more the procurement process rather than mitigation in terms of.

00:59:29:02 - 01:00:02:09

But rather. Rather than saying it can definitely be ten TB, it can be up to ten DB depending on the procurement process. So the assessment only assumes the 20 DB from the enclosures, which is a standard enclosure. There's no no contentious issues there. And 14 DB from the cooling. And again standard measures with the worst case noise level from the transformer. So therefore it's a sort of worst mitigated scenario and invincible right. It should it should be certainly no worse but potentially better.

01:00:02:21 - 01:00:35:08

Um, to to answer the specific question. Um, so the mitigation options set out in table A, 14.37 of uh documents that uh, 259 adequately secured by commitment envy 21. The CFSP commitment of 21 requires that the proposed new substations will include any required noise mitigation measures by design, and ensure that significant adverse effects are avoided and adverse effects are mitigated and minimized.

01:00:35:14 - 01:00:44:04

And this identifies plant selection siting screening enclosures as potential mitigation options, which are consistent with those listed in the table.

01:00:46:22 - 01:01:20:11

In order to ensure that the relevant local planning authority is consulted on the mitigation measures which are to be employed for the substation. Commitment NV 21 will be updated at deadline six to include a clear mechanism for securing agreement with the local authority. Specifically, NV 21 will be updated to state that an operational Noise report will be prepared by the applicant at detailed design stage, setting out the final substation plant, noise levels, site layout and design, and the specific mitigation measures that will be Proposed.

01:01:21:02 - 01:01:47:05

The report will be submitted to the relevant local authorities, in this case Thurrock Council and to for Tilbury North Substation and Tendring District Council for the ECN council, so it would cover both substations and it would be submitted to those before for approval before construction. And we will carry out post commissioning noise compliance measurements to demonstrate to local authorities that the noise limits are not exceeded.

01:01:47:28 - 01:02:16:04

Okay. Thank you. That's that's helpful. Clarification at the end. Um, quite a lot of what you said was what I was anticipating you would say about being in the code of construction practice, etcetera, and so on. Um, but the the helpful bit about adding something called deadline six. Um, I look forward to seeing that when it comes in. Um, do any, uh, councils either tendering or Thurrock if they're present, uh, wish to respond at all or comment on what they've just heard?

01:02:20:04 - 01:02:23:03

In no indication. So I've got somebody in the room.

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

Sorry, sorry. Andy Higham, Essex County Council, just on behalf of Tendring. Uh, Jacobs had to, uh, just drop off and he'll respond to that in writing.

01:02:31:04 - 01:02:48:04

Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much. Um, I hadn't spotted that Mr. Jarman had actually gone, so thank you for letting us know. Um. All right. Okay. Does anybody else in the room wish to say anything with regard to, um, this.

01:02:50:18 - 01:02:57:14

Specific matter? Uh, regarding the the potential mitigation options and how they would be secured.

01:02:59:17 - 01:03:32:27

No indication in the room and there's no indication online. So in that case, I'm going to move on to my next item, which is I apologize for this. It's a little bit more technical and a little bit more detail, so it might be a bit dry I'm afraid. So. Um, I wanted to briefly touch on requirement 14. Um, in relation to noise and vibration here, as opposed to in yesterday's DCO hearing. Um, and um, this is specifically related to um operation operational noise of the East Anglia connection node.

01:03:33:08 - 01:04:03:26

Um, can the applicant explain, um, what DB layer TR actually represents? Um, now bear in mind we've got laypeople in the audience. Uh, I know it's a la stands for audible level. I know R stands for reference and I know TR stands for time reference. Um, but this is how the wording within the requirement is, is actually formed.

01:04:03:28 - 01:04:41:00

It refers specifically to db la dash comma tr. Um, but what is ah are you proposing it to be for example LA 90 which is background. Are you proposing it to be Lake, which is an energy level? Um, or is it going to be something else? Um, what is the time reference? The tr um, is it five minutes? Ten minutes? Is it 30 minutes? Is it an hour? Is it six hours? Is it 12 hours? Is it a day? Um, what what time? Measurement are we measuring this this noise effect across, um, and bearing in mind.

01:04:41:15 - 01:05:17:15

Um, British Standard for 142 2014 plus a one 2019 has been referenced elsewhere within the document. Um, is TR nighttime or is TR daytime? Um, you know, they're all reasonable questions to try and get certainty into the noise measurement background so that we know what it's being measured against. Um, because ultimately, um, if you're saying 33dB is the noise level against this this this thing.

01:05:17:24 - 01:05:48:28

Am I measuring it over five minutes in any day? Time period. For example? Um, I'm sure I could find somewhere within five minute period where I'm not breaching that noise level, so. So it needs a bit more certainty, I think what I'm getting at. So if you could explain what R is, uh, in relation to what I've just said, what TR is in relation to time and also, um, what BS 4142 standard you're setting it against whether it's TR night time or day time. I'd be grateful if you could explain that please.

01:05:50:27 - 01:06:25:04

David, great for the applicant. I will try not to be too dry. Um, I will I will not give you a mark out of ten of your accuracy, but I will explain what they all mean. Right? And people can judge for themselves how accurate you are. Um, so so put simply DB like, sorry, I'll get it right. DB LRT is the noise rating level of an industrial noise source, as defined by pretty standard form for two methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.

01:06:25:16 - 01:06:40:23

It is the standard metric used in the assessment of operational noise of an industrial or commercial nature, including substations. It essentially describes the noise from the source being assessed. The DB

01:06:42:12 - 01:07:15:04

DB means decibels or sound, L means level as in sound level, and the suffix is after the L. Describe the specifics of the level the L being described. In this instance, the suffixes are AR, tr. Different suffixes mean different things, and it's how q stations talk to each other in our dry way. So A means the sound level is a weighted. It's not audible, it's an A weighting.

01:07:15:06 - 01:07:54:21

And that essentially represents how humans hear sound. So sound occurs at a whole range of frequencies. Most of them we can't hear. We hear a certain range of frequencies. And a weighting corresponds to to to what? To what? To what we hear. Um, r means that it's a rating level. So that means the specific sound level of the source. So the the actual level, if you measured it with a sound level meter, um, at the, at the receptor location, with any adjustment added for the character of the sound, such as tonality, impulsivity or intermittency, which can increase its susceptibility.

01:07:55:20 - 01:08:29:08

Therefore, the penalties mean that the sound level of the sources with such characteristics need to be lower compared to sources that don't, and therefore providing additional protection against against sources that contain those characteristics. They need to be lower proportionate size. Penalties for substations. The main adjustment is in relation to tonality because electrical plant can produce tonal sounds. So the standard practice is a worst case is to include a six decibel penalty.

01:08:30:01 - 01:08:54:00

So if, for example, you had a 20 decibel specific sound level. So that's just the sound level of the of the substation. At a certain distance you would add six decibels to that, and then the rating level would then

be 26. And that's just the level from that's the rating level. Just as the substation in isolation of everything else.

01:08:57:21 - 01:09:06:07

TR means the time period over which the level is assessed. So it's the rating time period.

01:09:11:24 - 01:09:51:16

Means the time period over which the level is assessed. BS 4142 normally uses a one hour assessment period in daytime, during daytime, and a 15 minute assessment period at night. The shorter assessment period at night is in order to capture, as you suggested, the worst case periods from sources where the sound level may vary over time. For example, if there's a factory that has various plant that kicks in intermittently over over the course of an hour, a generator might go on or something else might kick in through a process for that, for that particular for that particular site.

01:09:51:18 - 01:10:23:22

So the night time period, look at the worst case 15 minutes of a process cycle essentially. And because it's more sensitive during that times um for substations however The. The sound is generally steady, so there's no stopping and starting. So the level would effectively be the same over whatever measurement period you assessed it over. So 15 minutes is in principle the same as one hour. Three years. Yeah a decade.

01:10:24:07 - 01:10:24:26

Um,

01:10:26:12 - 01:10:27:18

so in this case.

01:10:30:08 - 01:10:55:12

We assess it's a slightly different tact, but we in this case the assessment has been based on the night time period. So we we look at the night time background sound levels rather than day time because it's quieter. And given that the rating level is the same during the day and night. The lower background therefore means the, um, the assessment is worst case at night.

01:10:57:27 - 01:11:01:09

Um, I think I think that's all right.

01:11:01:11 - 01:11:07:09

Okay. I, I mean, I, I follow all that. I understand all of that. Um,

01:11:09:02 - 01:11:27:21

I'm going to go on to my next question, and then I'll bring in the local authorities after that. Um, because I think the local authorities will all understand that as well. Um, interested parties are also bring you in if you've got any questions about that in a minute. But, uh, my next question then is, um.

01:11:29:24 - 01:11:42:08

Why is the requirement, um, which is requirement 14? Is schedule three um been set? Uh, as they have given mitigation levels indicated? Um.

01:11:44:21 - 01:12:05:28

That's double check with mitigation would be achieved, would achieve a better level than double a 90 at night time. So so for example, um, the monitoring location which is S one three um for Um, bounce farm, for example. Um.

01:12:08:04 - 01:12:50:00

The measurement has been actually calculated because it's been that that location monitoring locations was actually at my Hills Farm or Mayfield's farm. Sorry. Um, so you've obviously calculated, um, the level at Bounce Farm at some point. Um, but that's shown as 24 DB um, at LA 90. Um, because it's, it's related to monitoring location S1 three. And yet the DB noise rating level set within the condition is 34 DB la tr um, which is ten decibels difference, which is quite significant.

01:12:50:14 - 01:13:22:01

Um, bearing in mind three DB is just about perceptible in terms of noise difference. Um, but then logarithmically over that um, sounds doubles effectively. Um, so. So why? Why is it set at about a bounce film, for example, which is a listed property which we visited on our, uh, accompanied site inspections? Um, that has single glazed sash windows on the front elevation facing directly onto the ECN.

01:13:22:09 - 01:13:58:01

Why is 34dB LRT are acceptable when the background noise level LA 90? Um, so DBL 90 is set at 24 or shown at 24. Um, and you could make similar discussions with regard to, to all of these, um, properties that are listed because properties south of Hunger Downs, for example, Mayfield's farm and Bradley Hall, a set of 33dB little uh Waterhouse Farm and 69 hunger down lane is set at 31 DB.

01:13:58:16 - 01:14:15:20

Um la Little, um, can can you take me through the logic of where how you got to those specific figures as set out in the requirement when bearing in mind the background level? Uh, at night time is 24. Uh, DB la 90.

01:14:17:20 - 01:14:50:03

Certainly. Uh, David Gray for the applicant. So the 35 DB limits has been set for the East Anglia connection node because the existing nighttime background sound level is, is low. So in that situation and the noise rating level is also low. So in that situation, uh, BHS form for two recognizes that we should not look only at the comparison of the background level to the rating level.

01:14:50:25 - 01:15:37:12

But we should also consider as part of the context whether the sound rating level is low in absolute terms, irrespective of what the background is. So we've therefore compared the substation noise level against

other guidance, including British Standard 8233 and World Health Organisation guidance and guidance from the Association of Noise Consultants, and that guidance indicates that an external level of 35 DBA noise rating level is low and would provide appropriate internal noise levels, including at night, even with open windows, and would therefore be below the point at which adverse effects would occur.

01:15:37:20 - 01:16:20:04

So in policy terms, that means that 35 DBA represents the lowest observed adverse effect level. Um, it's actually you could argue that 40 World Health Organisation would say 40dB. So 35 DB is lower than that. Um, this level therefore ensures that policy requirements are met. Um policy does not require that the DCO secure limits below that where no adverse effect is expected, but also say that the 35 DB limit is actually above and beyond policy requirements, because the policy requirements are to avoid significant adverse effects and mitigate and minimize adverse effects.

01:16:20:14 - 01:16:30:02

So at setting the limit relative to the low is essentially below the adverse effect level, right.

01:16:30:27 - 01:17:01:22

Okay. I'd like to see something in writing from you explaining that as you've just done if you could. So I can actually have a clear understanding. Um, I mean, we'll have the transcript anyway. Um, but I'd like to see something in writing if possible, but that actually sets out exactly how you've explained it, the different sets of guidance. Um, what PS 4142 says in terms of 35dB threshold, what the Who guidance says and what the the the other guidance.

01:17:01:24 - 01:17:22:19

You refer to the Institute of Noise Consultants guidance. If you could do that, I'd be really grateful. Um, does anybody else have anything they want to say with regard to, um, the specific noise levels set out within requirement? Full team. I've got a lady in the audience. Can we get a mic? She's in the front row.

01:17:39:10 - 01:18:20:01

Um, Jane Marshall, a local resident interested party. Can I just ask a couple of questions, please? Regarding, um, the 35 DB. Um, first of all, how many times were these areas monitored? What time of the year? Night time. I know you said, but would it have been, um, in the spring? In the summer when there were leaves on the trees with it during the autumn or winter? And also, were they taking the time when the wind direction was, um, um, prevailing? So it really, really needs to be taken from north, south, east and west.

01:18:22:14 - 01:18:52:21

Does the applicant want to respond? I mean, firstly, can I just clarify, are you talking about because requirement 14 is related to the noise threshold levels for noise emanating from the the um East Anglian collection node. As a result once it's developed and built. So it's a, it's a threshold thing that's monitored against at that point in time. Or are you asking about the noise assessments that were undertaken to inform the report that was submitted with the application.

01:18:53:09 - 01:19:30:04

Both really because we at the moment we can only base it on what we know. But considering that we've got a very flat landscape as well. I think that, um, you know, as I said before, depending upon the time of year in which the, you know, the, um, monitoring equipment was set out. Um, and, um, the prevailing wind, it will make a massive difference. We live, um, probably a mile away from the proposed ECN and at certain certain times of the year when it's pretty windy, we can hear the, um, the humming from the from there already.

01:19:30:06 - 01:19:30:21

Thank you.

01:19:30:23 - 01:19:49:26

I understand where you're coming from, Mr. Bray. Um, I mean, the answer that you will probably give is it was all set out in the appendix attached to the noise chapter of the environmental statement. But do you do you want to give any specific pointers in terms of, uh, answering, uh, Mrs. Marshall's question?

01:19:50:13 - 01:20:03:07

Yes, certainly. David Gray for the for the applicant. And so the survey was undertaken, um, over eight days in February 2025. Um, the

01:20:04:22 - 01:20:12:28

it I understand the question. It's like it's a slight moot point because when we're talking about low background levels,

01:20:14:24 - 01:20:15:09

I don't.

01:20:16:26 - 01:20:52:10

What is important is the noise level from the substation rather than what the background sound level is. So you could you could do extensive monitoring over long periods for the background sound level. And the answer would still be 35 is an appropriate limit in that case because it's a low background. So the argument would be you would survey to try and you wouldn't say, I'm not saying you would survey to get a higher background sound before, but we've accepted it's a low background sound level, so.

01:20:52:16 - 01:21:31:20

So irrespective of whether that changed over the course of the year marginally which, which can happen, you know, when leaves on trees and things like that. Um, it wouldn't change that 35dB. Is that the, the correct limit in terms of policy and the lowest level? Um, well, in terms of the assessment, um, the modelling of the substation noise and that assumes downwind propagation in all direction as a worst case, as part of the um, the ISO 9613, it, it assumes downwind propagation in the calculations in all directions.

01:21:31:22 - 01:21:32:27

It's a worst case.

01:21:37:27 - 01:22:13:16

Uh, I don't know if that helped you, Mrs. Marshall. Um, but, I mean, essentially the answer to your question is, is that, um, there's a report submitted with the original submission pack. Um, I can't give you the application reference. Our examination life reference off the top of my head. Um, but it's an appendix to chapter 14, uh, which specifically talks about the noise impacts as a result of the East Anglia connection. I think it's appendix C. Uh, and that sets out how they've undertaken the noise assessment, and it explains the the process.

01:22:13:18 - 01:22:48:06

They've gone through, the equipment they've used. Um, and, and also, um, then goes on to say what the background noise levels were when they were recorded. Um, what the baseline is, what, uh, what factors they've taken into account. Um, if if you haven't already read that document, you might have done. I don't know. Um, I'd suggest maybe it'll be worth sort of ten minutes of your time having a quick look at it. It's not that long. Um, but it is a little bit technical, so, um, I don't know if it will really help you, but, um.

01:22:48:08 - 01:23:20:19

But that's where the answers to your questions primarily will lie. Um, in terms of Mr. Bray's response, um, what I would say is 24 DB like 90 or whatever it is. Um, 34 DB la 90 is, is is exceptionally low. Um, and that's primarily because of the rural area it's located in. Um, I'd like to see the evidence that says 35 is acceptable in that instance.

01:23:20:26 - 01:23:33:00

Um, because I, I don't feel I've read that so far. Um, and that's where my concern is. Uh, I've got another hand at the front. Uh, it's hardly parish council, is it?

01:23:33:13 - 01:24:07:03

If I could just. Thank you very much, Carolyn Mason Parish Council, just to add to the query, if there's an having limited understanding of what you're talking about. But if I live near there as well. But if I was at Browns Farm or Mayfield or hunker down, I really want the background sound to remain as it is now, and wondering what the mitigating mitigation would be to enable those people to live similar lives, because he's mentioned commercial industrialization.

01:24:07:05 - 01:24:41:03

That again, the mitigation is highlighted in the appendix I've just referenced. Um, but it's it's perspective mitigation, which was why I asked the question I did about how can we be certain what you're, you're going to actually be using? Because if you calculate it all and add it all up, assuming you can just add one figure to the next, which is what I did. And, and then I've been told it's not how it works. Um, then you, you would get to a point where, um, the plant itself would be potentially 35dB lower, um, because of the mitigation that they're installing.

01:24:41:15 - 01:25:12:15

Um, but but ultimately, um, that's as. As Mr. Bray has responded. That's not how the maths works. Um, so so hopefully they're going to come back with this to us at deadline six and actually set out a bit clearer to us to explain how they've got to where they've got to. Uh, do understand your point about wanting the background noise level to remain as it is, as we all would? Um, but I want to understand why, if they can't do that, why they're saying 35 DBA would be an acceptable alternative.

01:25:13:02 - 01:25:38:20

Um, and I need to be certain about that, as would you want us to be. So. Um, and if that's because that's what the the British Standard says, if that's what the Who guidance says, the World Health Organisation guidance says, or if that's what the, the, the guidance from uh, the acoustic consultants guidance sets to them. Uh, then I want to see that evidence. So thank you. Yes.

01:25:38:22 - 01:26:09:13

Also oddly Whitfield Audley Parish Council. Um, this is just sort of like a common sense type of question and maybe more of an observation. But to be honest, I haven't got a clue what you're talking about because simply because, um, we only relate to sound in relation to what it sounds like. Yeah. We have no idea of the nature of the sound. We've no idea of the frequency, the pitch.

01:26:09:25 - 01:26:42:19

Um, it's impossible for us to to imagine what you're. What what this these figures actually mean. What we do know is that, um, Ardley has a number of active quarries, and sometimes you can hear a quarry to the east. Sometimes you can't hear it at all. Sometimes you can hear it to the north. Sometimes it's extremely annoying. Um, sometimes it isn't. Um, we can even hear the, um, naval battery, range, which is I think is about 1520 miles away.

01:26:42:21 - 01:27:14:07

Quite clearly, sometimes, and sometimes we can't hear it at all. So we need some sort of, um, from a residence point of view, we need to have some sort of idea of what we're talking about in terms of the nature of the noise and, and the likelihood of that becoming different. According as Jane said, according to wind direction and so on. Um, so it's all very well putting down all of this technical information, but if it's supposed to help us, it doesn't.

01:27:14:24 - 01:27:18:08

I understand your point. Um, you know, um.

01:27:21:23 - 01:28:03:00

I think if you can provide a more layman's explanation as to the noise levels, that would be grateful. Um, I mean, as I say, I've, I've had quite a lot of experience with noise, um, applications, uh, throughout my lifetime as a as a planning officer. Um, and, um, I understand I understand quite a lot of it, but it is it is still a bit of a minefield. But I do need to be certain with regard to, um, how you're justifying the the figures that you've given us in the, um, in the requirement against the background noise level of 24.

01:28:03:12 - 01:28:13:24

Um, to get a clearer understanding. Um, does anybody else want to raise anything on this specific issue? I think it might have heated itself out that, um,

01:28:15:15 - 01:28:21:05

Mr. Harris or Mr. Bray, do you want to come back on anything that you've heard or comes from? Um, Russell Harris QC.

01:28:21:07 - 01:28:23:14

I think Mr. Hain would, um.

01:28:23:23 - 01:28:24:20

Something to say.

01:28:26:11 - 01:28:27:24

Charles Hine for the applicant.

01:28:27:26 - 01:28:59:29

Um, in answer to your question. Sorry, in answer your question, um, with the rating level of 35, We we do have low frequency sound emanating from the transformers. Um, but the mitigation should be designed to, um, to specifically address the low frequency sound. Um, and with a rating level of, of 35, which is what we're seeking as the cumulative level.

01:29:00:12 - 01:29:33:17

Um, that equates to a, a specific sound level of approximately 30, um, 30dB on its own equates to what the, the standard for acoustic, um, suitability of spaces would give to a meditation space. Um, and when you're looking at, uh, designing libraries Museu then um 40dB would be the, the lower level for, for those spaces.

01:29:33:21 - 01:30:09:27

So it is quiet. Um, but that's not to say you won't hear it, but, um, on most occasions, it just forms part of the the ambient sound that's already there. You shouldn't notice it. Um, perhaps it might be better to have the conversation directly with Ridley as opposed to in the public forum. Um, if if what you're trying to do is to give them some assurance. Um, but, um, but most certainly, um, as I say, if you could, um, provide me with the extra information that I was seeking, I'd be really grateful.

01:30:09:29 - 01:30:14:00

Thank you. Um, I'm assuming there's nothing else, Mr. Harris?

01:30:14:19 - 01:30:15:04

Correct.

01:30:15:12 - 01:30:25:09

Anything else? In that case, we're going to take a 15 minute break. Uh, it's 3:30. We'll be back at, uh, 3:45.

01:30:27:08 - 01:30:28:05

Rejoined.