

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
<b>Hearing:</b>	Q. v. A] ^ 8ãã A@ æã * AÆ Part 7
<b>Date:</b>	1 May 2025

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

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

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

## **M&M\_1MAY\_ISH1\_PT7**

Created on: 2025-05-01 14:43:14

Project Length: 01:41:10

File Name: M&M\_1MAY\_ISH1\_PT7

File Length: 01:41:10

### **FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)**

00:00:05:08 - 00:00:31:16

Thank you, everybody. It's time to resume the hearing. Uh, we're up to item six, which is scope and content of the applicants assessments. Can I just firstly say if anybody does intend to video or take photographs of the meeting, that they talk to the case team first, please. Uh, because there may be people who don't want to be photographed or, or video, so there are potential privacy issues. Okay.

00:00:33:22 - 00:01:06:16

The next item is intended to discuss and understand any matters arising from the scope and content of the applicant's assessments, including clarifications on the content and whether any further detail or information may be required at this stage. Again, I would. It's right that this is not, at this time, the forum for a detailed discussion of the effects of the proposed development. This can wait for representations, local impact reports and Consideration that any potential further issue specific hearings. And there are a number of questions that we do want to ask.

00:01:06:19 - 00:01:40:00

Following our reading of the documents and reading of relevant representations and responses to those. So given where we are with time, I would like to move on efficiently and fairly hastily, because there's plenty of opportunity examination for parties to make us aware of their further views on issues and effects, etc. arising from the application. Okay, so uh, moving on then to um, item A, which is in relation to offshore ecology.

00:01:40:10 - 00:01:43:09

And this will be led by Doctor Morgan.

00:01:46:13 - 00:01:59:27

Thank you. Um, the examining authority has noted the applicant's response to the detailed comments in the relevant representations made by Natural England and the Marine Management Organization on Offshore Ecology.

00:02:02:02 - 00:02:32:25

Unfortunately, neither organization was able to attend this hearing today, and the examination looks forward to their detailed response at deadline one. As a result, we have the benefit of their input. I only have a few questions on these topics at this stage of the examination. So the first question I've got is, um, what is the latest position regarding the without prejudice measures of equivalent environmental benefits? The NI case for the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone.

00:02:38:07 - 00:03:14:11

Heather Koski on behalf of both applicants. Um, I think you'll see in a relevant wrap, the applicants are maintaining the position that are without prejudice measures of equivalent ecological benefit known as me, which I might refer to it here just to keep it short. Um, it's not required for the transmission assets due to the small scale, long term habitat loss. As a result of that, which is 0.012% of the overall area. However, we did note the response in the rule nine letter and the request to provide a without prejudice memo document.

00:03:14:20 - 00:03:41:15

And we have engaged with Natural England. We had a meeting with them in February to discuss this, and as indicated in that rep, we will be submitting a without prejudice made case at deadline one. We have submitted a draft plan to Natural England earlier this month on the 15th of April and hopefully, depending on the resource capacity, to provide us some comments before that gets submitted at deadline one.

00:03:41:29 - 00:04:14:03

Okay. Thank you. Uh, the next question, uh, regarding the potential effects of electromagnetic fields from the proposed cables and the ripple estuary on the movements of European smelts. I note that in the response to Natural England's relevant representation RR Dash 1601. That you maintain your position that that can be screened out. Do you intend providing any further evidence to satisfy Natural England and the Environment Agency's concerns on this issue?

00:04:16:19 - 00:05:01:18

Hello, doctor Kevin Lannon. I'm a senior associate director at Texas Tech. Um, and, um, with regard to, uh, speaking on behalf of the applicant, um, with regard to that um, relevant rep response and the content of that within PDA 018. Um, we don't intend to provide any further information. We hope that the clarity that we've provided in that response, um, allows Natural England to agree with our conclusion that this EMF, uh, effects can be screened out of the mcz that assessment? Um, and I know it was briefly covered, um, yesterday about the the the death of burial below the river estuary.

00:05:01:25 - 00:05:35:06

Um, Nick said the minimum burial depth will be seven meters. And, you know, it's, you know, likely or, you know, there's there's potential for it to be, you know, much greater depth of, you know, range of 7 to 45m. The actual depth will be based on, based on detailed design, but even at the minimum burial depth of seven meters, um, as set out in the relevant response, we don't anticipate any, uh, EMF effects or if effects are generally kind of localized around, uh, kind of within a few meters of a buried cable.

00:05:35:08 - 00:05:50:15

So kind of seven plus meters would be enough to, uh, to ensure that the separation between the, the smelt in the river and the cable emitting EMS will be large enough to, to, um, to reduce EMF to kind of baseline levels, background levels effectively.

00:05:50:20 - 00:06:22:09

Okay. Thank you for that. Um. Next question. Uh, I note that Natural England has concerns on site integrity for the red throated diver and common common scoter features of the Liverpool Bay

Special Protection Area, and have suggested a full restriction on construction activities within the winter months of November to March, inclusive. Your procedural deadline A submission suggests that you've had recent discussions with Natural England on this issue.

00:06:22:16 - 00:06:24:27

Can you tell me what the latest position is, please?

00:06:27:11 - 00:06:58:15

Hello. Kier Koski, on behalf of both applicants, and yes, we have been in ongoing discussions with Natural England around the Special Protection Areas, both Liverpool Bay and the Rebel and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area. We met with them on the 20th of February and just this previous Monday on the 28th we had another meeting and undertook a site visit with them and to some of the sites that are associated with the Rebel and Alde Estuary Special Protection Area.

00:06:59:01 - 00:07:29:07

We had a meeting following that, and they have raised some additional matters for us to take away and consider, and they are going to provide us in writing some additional feedback as well. So conversations around mitigation are ongoing at this time. And the applicants do believe that mitigation can be developed to ensure that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of either of those space, and will be able to provide an update at an appropriate time once we receive the feedback from Natural England.

00:07:29:09 - 00:07:33:24

Okay, so you're actively discussing and trying to reach a resolution on that particular issue.

00:07:34:07 - 00:07:34:27

Yes, sir.

00:07:35:10 - 00:08:20:13

Okay. Thank you. It's relevant representation. RR-1414. The Marine Management Organisation has requested seasonal restrictions on unexploded ordnance clearance During the herring spawning season from the 1st of September to the 31st of October inclusive, and the cod spawning season from the 1st of January to the 30th April inclusive. Though this could potentially be refined with further modelling and clarifications, I note in your procedural deadline submission, you maintain such restrictions are not necessary, and you cite as one of the reasons your agreement to order unexploded ordnance detonation being removed from the Draft Development Consent Order and deemed Marine Licence.

00:08:20:27 - 00:08:25:23

Can you please explain why this would negate the need for the seasonal restriction?

00:08:29:11 - 00:09:07:23

Kevin and on on behalf of the applicant. And so. Seasonal restrictions have obviously been, um discussed in detail on the on the generation assets and examinations. And that was largely to do with piling operations. The main reason for for seasonal restrictions is to limit the, um, behavioral effects, um, uh, on, on, on fish during the spawning period because, um, you know, piling is generally, you

know, a fairly long term impact compared to something like, um, so, so, you know, the activity takes place over the course of, you know, hours basically.

00:09:08:11 - 00:09:44:22

Um, so clearance is quite different in terms of its behavioral effects. The main impact that comes from UX clearance has to do with injury, um, and mortality rather than disturbance. And that's because the UX clearance, it's, it's an activity or it's a noise emission that happens over a period of seconds rather than, you know, piling activity, which happens over the course of hours. Basically, it might lead to, you know, a an avoidance reaction or disturbance of spawning activity. Um, so I suppose fundamentally the um, with respect to this application, the transmission assets.

00:09:44:24 - 00:10:05:22

The only noise the actor or the main noise activities that we're talking about is UX clearance, and that, by its nature, doesn't lead to kind of significant behavioural effects. As I say, the, the and the main focus of the impact assessment is around injury and effects basically. And so

00:10:07:09 - 00:10:52:27

that's the position that the applicant had at the point of application with higher order and UX. So clearance was included as part of the assessment. Since since then we've obviously had clarity from different statutory nature conservation bodies around the inclusion of higher order detonation within DCO applications. And on the back of that, and the applicant has removed or is intending to remove high order exo clearance from the DCO application that will leave low order and UX clearance and the impact area, um, in terms of injury, um, and mortality effects for low order, um, clearance is much, much smaller than that from higher order clearance.

00:10:53:08 - 00:10:54:05

Um, and.

00:10:54:29 - 00:11:10:08

If you actually encounter higher ordnance, need to clear this higher order ordnance. Um, regardless of where the process for the license sits, is still going to be the same effect, isn't it?

00:11:12:23 - 00:11:46:15

Heather Koski, on behalf of both applicants, um, that is correct. If we do need to do a high order UX clearance, then those effects would remain. They would be subject to a separate marine license that would set outside of this process. The new guidance does provide steps that need to be followed before high order can be considered. And that would be, um, up to three attempts at low order. Before you can undertake a high order clearance.

00:11:46:27 - 00:12:20:26

So the approach we are taking is we are removing it. It won't be considered or consented as part of this application. If it is discovered that when we get to that point, that high order, it would be subject to that separate marine licence. And then those mitigations that are currently listed in the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol, which then would also apply to kind of fish and that type of thing as well for secondary measures that would need to be applied to control that noise. Emission would be in place and considered as part of that separate marine licence.

00:12:21:26 - 00:12:32:03

Yeah, I think I understand, but could I have a short note on that? Just explain that linkage between higher order explosive removal and the restrictions, if I may.

00:12:32:22 - 00:12:35:04

Yes, that we can provide that.

00:12:35:09 - 00:12:39:15

Okay. Thank you. So those are the questions I had. I'd like to open it up to.

00:12:39:17 - 00:12:40:24

Sorry. There was just one.

00:12:41:24 - 00:12:42:10

Sorry. Yes.

00:12:42:21 - 00:13:15:11

Sorry. Carrying it out on behalf of the, um. On behalf of the applicant to to compare the high order clearance impact ranges versus the low order clearance impact ranges. Um, if I can refer the examiner authority to table 3.17 of volume two, chapter three, um, which is the Fish and Shellfish Ecology chapter up 048. You can see the difference in terms of the magnitude of the effect, the amount of noise that's, that's emitted from high order, which has now been removed from the DCO and if required, will be licensed separately.

00:13:15:13 - 00:13:30:28

And then lower order, which is which is what is in and the um the DCO at the moment or what the applicant is, is applying for. And that demonstrates really the scale of effect and the fact that lower order clearance is a much, much smaller and more discreet effect.

00:13:31:06 - 00:13:35:01

Okay, I still think I'll benefit from a short note, if I may.

00:13:35:27 - 00:13:49:27

Um, yes. And I would just say the new guidance that's been issued by the statutory bodies that has come out does have, um, the recommended mitigations in place or that they do recommend if high order is required.

00:13:50:14 - 00:14:00:06

Okay. Thank you. So if I open it up to apps then. So if we do the room first, I think Miss Fawzi would like to speak.

00:14:13:05 - 00:14:39:20

Thank you. Uh, Ross Forsey from the Squires Gate residents group. I was asked by a member of our group who can't be here today to ask a question on her behalf about this, um, area. Apologies in

advance if the things that have just been said have answered this, but I'm not clear that they have. So the Question is it relates to the sand dunes?

00:14:41:08 - 00:14:41:23

Um.

00:14:43:27 - 00:14:46:20

Yeah. And it's about the sand lizards.

00:14:47:04 - 00:14:49:06

Yes. Let me just stop you there, Miss Fawzi.

00:14:49:08 - 00:14:49:24

Yes.

00:14:49:26 - 00:14:53:10

That actually relates to a different part of the agenda.

00:14:53:12 - 00:14:55:00

Oh, okay. Apologies.

00:14:55:12 - 00:14:57:09

If we come back to you at that time.

00:14:57:11 - 00:14:58:24

Okay. When would that be?

00:15:00:06 - 00:15:01:27

Which agenda item is that?

00:15:07:22 - 00:15:10:18

Take into account. Yes. Yeah.

00:15:10:24 - 00:15:17:21

As you've got the microphone now, perhaps it's best if you make your point now. Oh okay. And then. Yes. And then perhaps we can get a response to it at this stage.

00:15:17:23 - 00:15:51:07

Okay. Um, the question was, um, relating to the lizards in the sand dunes. Given that they are a shy creature who is camouflaged in the colours of the dunes and the nature reserve, and that they dig camouflaged burrows in the sand up to a metre deep where they lay their precious eggs. How can the applicant fail? To crush the lizards the burrows in their eggs. With the huge increase of manpower and HGV vehicles that they will introduce to the sand lizards.

00:15:51:15 - 00:15:54:11

Delicate habitat. Thank you.

00:15:54:13 - 00:16:02:23

Thank you, Miss Fauzi. I'll just check any other comments on this agenda item in the room. Yes, Mr. Morgan. Um, yes.

00:16:02:25 - 00:16:22:29

Um, Phil Morgan. Newton, Clifton parish council. Um, just to re-emphasize that point, they were released back into the final dunes about five years ago, based on support from the local council to do so. They're incredibly rare creatures and endangered species and protected as well. So thank you for the opportunity.

00:16:23:01 - 00:16:34:01

Okay. Thank you for that. I can't say when. Oh yes, I can see one hand online. So I'll just go to that person before asking if you'd like to respond. Uh, so there's someone on line Rd.

00:16:34:29 - 00:16:43:03

Uh, David Dunlop from the Wildlife Trust. I was just wondering if I should comment now or wait until we get to the onshore ecology, but.

00:16:43:27 - 00:16:47:11

Um, just relate to this specific point. Is that not.

00:16:47:13 - 00:16:49:07

Part of what I was going to say? Does.

00:16:50:06 - 00:16:52:17

Um, yes. If you make it quickly, then please.

00:16:52:26 - 00:17:27:02

Uh, just to say that, uh, we hope to discuss it further with the applicant, but we are concerned that our most recent data shows a particular concentration of hibernating, uh, sand lizards by the track that is proposed to be used for vehicular access. And we're not clear whether the amount of vibration would actually risk breaking them up and cause a degree of damage to the population. Uh, so all I can do at the minute is express concern, because we don't know enough to do more than that.

00:17:27:13 - 00:17:33:08

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dunlop. I can go to you, Mr. Den, to see if you'd like to respond to those comments.

00:17:35:09 - 00:17:42:03

It's done on behalf of the applicant. We don't have the team here to talk about this because it's an onshore ecology.

00:17:42:12 - 00:17:43:15

Right? Can you, can you.



00:17:43:17 - 00:17:47:21

So very happy to remember these points and we'll pick them up. Okay.

00:17:48:07 - 00:18:06:20

Yes. If you could pick them up then when we get to that in the agenda that would be good. Okay. I can't see any more comments on on offshore ecology. So I'm moving on now to six B which is traffic and transportation. So I'll just give you a second to organize yourselves.

00:18:31:06 - 00:19:03:10

So as with all these topics, I don't intend to get into the detail. Um, raising the relevant representations. Um, I'm aware from the applicants procedural deadline, a submission of the ongoing meetings that they're having with both the local highway authority, Lancashire County Council, who's here today, and the highway authority for the strategic road network, National Highways, with the aim of resolving them. And I look forward to seeing the progress being made at deadline one, with the evidence in the initial statements of Common Ground.

00:19:05:11 - 00:19:05:26

Series.

00:19:05:28 - 00:19:41:08

The examination I do have or however, have some questions relating to the assumptions made in the modelling of traffic and transportation effects. The proposed development, because obviously everything else flows from them. So firstly, I note from app Dash 108 that you don't intend selecting a port for offshore works. Prior to any consent being given. As a result, you scoped out the effects of additional vehicle movements arising from offshore works based on a qualitative qualitative assessment.

00:19:42:02 - 00:19:46:05

Um, can you tell us which ports are under consideration for the offshore works?

00:19:48:27 - 00:20:07:00

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. At this stage, we have not engaged with supply chain to be able to confirm which ports are currently under consideration. The Traffic and Transport Study area is focused on the strategic road network, which obviously would then connect up to any potential locations where, um, those deliveries might come from.

00:20:07:15 - 00:20:10:08

Okay, so you can't even share with us a short list.

00:20:11:26 - 00:20:13:05

Okay. Understood.

00:20:14:27 - 00:20:35:14

Um. Moving on. It's essential that all routes that would potentially be impacted by the proposed development are included in the assessment. So at this stage, I was going to ask both Lancashire and

National Highways. Whether they're content with the study area and that it contains all the links you'd expect it to contain to class. Mr. Stevens.

00:20:36:18 - 00:20:37:15

Neil Stevens.

00:20:37:17 - 00:20:48:20

Lancashire County Council I'm relatively happy with the extent that has been considered, but I do have concerns with the quality of that information and obviously I can come on to that.

00:20:48:24 - 00:20:50:13

That's one of my next questions actually.

00:20:50:15 - 00:21:26:03

So with regards to the quality, um, I have significant concerns with that being presented as a try to overcome that. What I've done, I've looked through all that information and I've presented back in March my thoughts on all the junctions at 65. And just for your information, I've got issue with 62 of the 65 junctions and of the 101 links considered, I've got issues with 15 of those. I don't unless you want me to go into details what those issues are, but it's based upon, uh, ten criteria for the junctions.

00:21:26:06 - 00:21:48:03

So all that information has been shared. Yes, I am aware that the applicant is going through that list. They have collected some new data, um, with regard to pedestrian cyclist questions, because that's a huge missing quantum of information that is necessary when regard is had to the urban and the rural environment where this development will have an impact.

00:21:49:12 - 00:21:55:08

Okay. Thank you. Miss Goodall, I wonder if you could leave your question to the end after I ask my questions.

00:21:56:04 - 00:22:02:14

That's fine. It's not a question. Um. There's not. Uh, Blackpool Council is the local highway authority. Oh, sorry.

00:22:02:16 - 00:22:03:04

Uh, apologies.

00:22:03:06 - 00:22:13:20

Blackpool Council would like to be included in matters of traffic and transport. And we welcome as the local highway authority, and we welcome the discussions that are about to be engaged with the applicant.

00:22:13:22 - 00:22:20:16

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Yes, because of course, Blackpool is a unitary authority and is the highway authority for the Blackpool area.

00:22:20:22 - 00:22:21:21

Thank you very much, sir.

00:22:21:29 - 00:22:22:18

Okay.

00:22:23:14 - 00:22:28:23

Um, this time, did you want to comment on what Mr. Stevens has just said?

00:22:30:07 - 00:22:48:25

I'm Hillary Williamson on behalf of the applicants, just to state that the applicants have spoken with Blackpool Council and we, um, we welcome the engagement and the opportunity to talk on, on, on highway matters and that will proceed in due course. I'll pass to my colleague Andy Andrew Ross to provide a response to Mr. Stevens points.

00:22:53:14 - 00:22:56:13

Thank you sir. Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicants.

00:22:57:00 - 00:22:57:15

Um.

00:22:59:17 - 00:23:29:10

So yes, we we have met with Lancashire on a couple of occasions post submission, and I think there is a, um, a mutual will there to work together to, to resolve some of the concerns and clarifications that Mr. Stevens has raised. So I can confirm that if I could just very briefly go through the basis of the accesses, just to contextualize as some of the.

00:23:29:26 - 00:23:32:04

Probably a bit too much detail for this meeting.

00:23:32:06 - 00:23:37:20

Not not accessing detail, but in high level how we've approached the access design.

00:23:37:22 - 00:23:40:12

Again, I don't think that's necessary for this meeting.

00:23:40:18 - 00:23:48:24

Okay. The key the key point I would like to make, um, uh, it's around,

00:23:50:12 - 00:24:32:02

uh, satisfying the principle of the access is. And given Stevens and the the Highway Authority's assurances at this stage that they can be delivered within the envelope. We we we we've set out and I'm confident we can do that. And we are looking at, uh, traffic management measures to try and reduce the extent of hedgerow that's going to be removed, for example. Uncle. How? However, it's a balance and we do not want to be transgressing into matters of detailed design and technical approval.

00:24:32:08 - 00:25:00:26

Understand? And there are provisions in the DCO requirement ten, which secures the finalized. Um. Uh, outlook. Sorry. The finalized, uh, Hamp, um, highways access management plan. Um, and it also sets out the process for technical approval in there. So it's drawing that balance at this stage.

00:25:00:28 - 00:25:36:25

Okay. Thank you for that. I just want to get back to higher level principles of the assessment. And the next area I just wanted to talk about was the the viability of the routes for construction. That's been assumed in that assessment. Um, so I know Lancashire County Council raised in its relevant representation the um the applicant's environmental impact assessment, AP 108 was potentially flawed with regards to some of the roads with stated were incorrect.

00:25:37:15 - 00:26:13:25

Leinster Network were unable to accommodate two way HGV movements, and that bridges and other structures um may not be able to accommodate the size and weight of HGVs proposed. And I've noted that in your response, the applicant's response that you've accepted a procedural deadline a that the local road geometry is constrained on what you've termed last leg routes and they still need and that you still need to demonstrate to Lancashire County Council that there that traffic movements on these routes can be safely managed.

00:26:14:00 - 00:26:46:12

So this is quite a key issue because obviously it goes to the the accuracy of the assessment, um, that you've, you've made. And then that obviously leads to effects and impacts. So, um, how do you propose collecting the accurate data required to inform your discussions with Lancashire, noting that your the initial data on routes, the routes you based your work on was initially collected using Google, Google and 1 to 50 50,000 scale maps.

00:26:47:14 - 00:26:54:10

So how do you intend collecting more accurate data to inform your discussions with Lancashire?

00:26:57:24 - 00:27:01:27

And over what timescales do you intend carrying out that work?

00:27:05:24 - 00:27:40:28

Uh, through Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Uh, these these matters have been raised by Lancashire County Council and as referred to by Mr. Stevens. We are in the process of preparing, um, clarifications, um, to to confirm and to to answer his his questions through our expert working group engagement. Um, in relation to the collation of the baseline and the validity of the access rules chosen, we are confident that we can demonstrate to at Lancashire County Council that that is that, um, that there is no issue with what we are proposing.

00:27:41:12 - 00:28:07:23

Um, and that will either be via um measures are included within the construction traffic management plan or demonstrating that the engineering solutions are available there or engineered solutions are there. Um, on the matter of collation of baseline, that's a matter of proportionality. Um, in terms of

how that that assessment is undertaken, um, and the approach that we have taken is robust and defended within the traffic and transport chapter, um, methodology.

00:28:08:15 - 00:28:18:05

So can I just clarify that you don't intend to actually do onsite measurements or collect further information about weight limits on structures and that sort of data.

00:28:20:23 - 00:28:59:01

Sorry, Philip Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, we we believe we have sufficient data to do that. Um, most of that information which has been mentioned is already within the application or within the construction traffic management plan. Um, there is a matter of collecting it if there is a need for for additional data to be collected in the post consent phase. When it comes to the detailed design of or the discharge of the construction traffic management plans, or the detailed design associated with the highway Access management plans, but at this stage, we do not believe that we need to acquire additional data in order to validate the assessment that's already been undertaken.

00:28:59:28 - 00:29:06:11

So when do you think you'll be in a position to actually, uh, confirm the viability of those last leg routes?

00:29:09:29 - 00:29:31:03

That Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, as I referred to. We are engaged with with Lancashire County Council. I'm wary of stating deadlines because we haven't actually confirmed these with Lancashire County Council, but the intention is to provide all of the clarifications by deadline one, so that we might be able to submit the progress or potentially closure of those matters by deadline. Two.

00:29:32:06 - 00:29:32:24

Okay.

00:29:33:02 - 00:29:45:24

Sorry to keep pressing on that, but it's quite an important point because until the actual assessment data is correct, the effects impacts can't be relied on. That's a very important point.

00:29:45:27 - 00:30:13:20

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, I do want to stress that the assessment is correct. We believe that we have a collated and appropriate baseline proportional to the process of impact assessment, and that these are matters of clarification. Um, in terms of what Mr. Ross clarified. Um, drawing a balance between providing assurance to the to the to the local highway authority, but not straying into matters of detailed design.

00:30:14:29 - 00:30:20:27

Okay, I understand it is a balance. So go to Mr. Stevens who would like to comment on that, please?

00:30:22:09 - 00:30:55:14

Yes. I'm quite surprised at the response in some ways. Um, from my own assessment, there are errors in what's been submitted. I'd be very shocked and surprised if some of these principles are agreed. Posed any concerns? These are matters of principle. And from my perspective, representing the local highway authority, I need certainty that all that is on the table can be delivered. Otherwise, I've got a network that's potentially unsafe and I cannot compromise safety.

00:30:56:05 - 00:31:01:22

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevens. Did you want to respond to that before I move on?

00:31:09:13 - 00:31:28:25

Thank you, sir. I just wanted to provide a bit of a bit of context on the routes and the accessibility, if you like. So, um, the, um, the application does benefit from good links to motorways A and B roads. Um, so,

00:31:30:19 - 00:32:07:03

um, we approximate so the study area is about 155km of the 133km sits on motorway A or B roads. We mentioned the um last leg routes being approximately seven 17km. Um, we which are in the region between five and a half and six metres wide. So, uh, we feel they will still accept HGV traffic.

00:32:08:14 - 00:32:42:24

The real pinch point we estimate to be around five kilometres. So there's we feel that there's a management solution there to address it. And the outline construction traffic management plan. If I can just give the reference up uh 211 as secured by requirement nine, um sets out um measures for managing traffic.

00:32:43:16 - 00:33:07:26

Um, uh, Mr. Williamson already mentioned earlier that we're we're looking at how we confirm those measures are we're in discussion with El-Sisi, and we feel that that is the I was going to say road map there. It's hard not to not to introduce puns when you're talking about transport, but, um, we feel that's the roadmap for addressing this matter.

00:33:07:29 - 00:33:19:23

Okay. Thank you. I'm aware people have got hands up in the audience. Um, I think general principle is I'd go through the questions and then go to them. But I think on this particular issue I'll go to the people in the audience.

00:33:21:09 - 00:33:24:11

I think they probably got comments that relative to this.

00:33:27:27 - 00:33:28:18

Thank you.

00:33:28:20 - 00:33:29:10

I'm sorry.

00:33:30:02 - 00:33:48:27

My name is Jennifer Frost. I'm a local resident. I just want a point of clarification on that specific discussion. As I understand that you do not have the data to be able to make an assessment. You collected data from Google and you have no intention of collecting any further data.

00:33:50:05 - 00:33:50:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:33:51:02 - 00:33:54:06

Thank you. Yes, yes you may.

00:33:55:27 - 00:34:29:13

Thank you, David Barlow. Uh, I live on, uh, Lower Lane opposite the Morecambe Bay, uh, the Morecambe substation. Station. So just a quick point on the last leg routes, which obviously includes the line I live on. So that's lower Lane. And the applicant has stated that they are going to use light commercial vehicles and cars for the project. No heavy machinery vehicles will be used. However, a seven and a half tonne wagon can be driven on a driving licence that's not classed as a HGV.

00:34:29:19 - 00:35:01:00

And I can assure everybody here you would not get on lower lane to HGV vehicles being able to pass each other. So I live on Lower Lane, I drive uh exits onto Lower Lane, uh Lower Lane. 90% of Lower Lane has no footpaths. It's it's used by pedestrians and cyclists. There are no footpaths. And a big majority of Lower Lane is single track. You can't get two vehicles past each other.

00:35:01:08 - 00:35:31:19

So I would like to put it to the examining authority. If they could take Lois Lane totally up. Totally out of bounds. Um, there's going to be grave consequences with the amount of traffic. And on top of that, we now have the 80 acre, uh, solar farm that's enveloping the substations. And they have put in their plans that they want to use Lower Lane as the access route to an 80 acre project.

00:35:31:21 - 00:35:37:27

So that's on top of the applicant's project. Lower line has got to be made out of bounds.

00:35:37:29 - 00:35:38:17

Okay.

00:35:39:02 - 00:35:47:26

Thank you. And if I could just quickly go to Doctor Hahn online, if you're going to make a point on on this particular point.

00:35:48:02 - 00:35:48:23

Yeah, it is.

00:35:48:25 - 00:35:49:10

Because.

00:35:49:18 - 00:35:50:03

Yeah.

00:35:50:07 - 00:36:21:02

I mentioned earlier that I contacted the applicants through the helpline and via email regarding traffic movements. Um, it took them over six weeks to respond and to point me to the relevant information. And they did it on the last day to register an interest in this process and make a written submission. They keep saying all the information has been available to us, but I do think they have a responsibility to help individuals to navigate thousands of pages of documents, to make sense of them and find what we need. I actually attended one of the events during the consultation.

00:36:21:04 - 00:36:56:02

It was at the farmer's Market in Saint Anne's, and those present were actually unable to answer my questions. They weren't engineers and they weren't involved in the planning process. They just simply leafed through the brochure, which had already been sent out to residents. Anyway, in January, they referred me to 439 page document of tables and diagrams regarding traffic movements. They're proposing to use Blackpool Road North, which is where I live, as access for HGVs. As I read it over a period of three and a half years, with around 100 a day for four of those months.

00:36:56:11 - 00:37:35:04

Now that's an increase, as I estimate it to about one every five minutes, six days a week, from early in the morning until the evening. Now, their information indicates that this is a 1,740% increase in HGV traffic. I actually think it's much greater than that. Um, I've lived on this road for more than 20 years and you hardly see any HGVs. It's a quiet road that doesn't lead anywhere other than people's homes. So unless they're including the bin lorry on Friday and perhaps the number 11 bus which uses part of the road a few times each day, I'm not entirely sure where they got that data from further than that.

00:37:35:06 - 00:38:06:12

My question is, why are they actually proposing to use a quiet residential road which actually has people parking on both sides? And often you can only access, you know, you can't have two way traffic. Uh, for all of these HGV movements in the first place. The cable corridor actually runs through the airport land up to Queensway. Can't some of this traffic access the corridor directly from Queensway onto the airport land instead. If the work is scheduled appropriately, there's also an industrial estate between kiln House Lane and the airport.

00:38:06:15 - 00:38:18:00

One of the roads on the estate actually actually ends just a few metres from the playing fields themselves. Has there been any consideration to doing this? Instead, do these access?

00:38:18:12 - 00:38:23:26

Can I just check? Check. Have you actually put a lot of this information in your relevant representation?

00:38:24:02 - 00:38:45:29

No, because as I say, I didn't receive the information from them in the to refer to this document until the 27th of January just before 4:00. So in my submission, I just simply had to say that I was waiting



for this information. I'm very happy to put it into writing, but I think I just wanted to mention at the moment, because it's part of the process that's led them to this proposal.

00:38:46:01 - 00:38:57:17

Yes, it sounds like you've got quite a few points there that we probably won't be able to cover everything that you've raised in this forum, so can I suggest that you submit a written representation at deadline one. Yeah.

00:38:57:19 - 00:39:06:24

Is it possible for them to answer the brief question as to why they whether they've actually considered other routes in coming up with using this residential road?

00:39:10:15 - 00:39:23:17

Are you in a position to give a quick answers to the three people that make representations? I'd like to keep you brief, because I want to crack on with my line of questioning if I can.

00:39:24:29 - 00:39:46:04

Ian Mackay on behalf of the applicants. I just want to give a categoric answer to the gentleman who's the resident of Lower Lane. The Morcom project is correct in the sense that the operational access there will be used by light goods vehicles, but just to provide further clarity, that is cars vans for by for pickup trucks that is not lorries.

00:39:48:11 - 00:39:51:12

Okay. Thank you. And the other points raised.

00:39:56:05 - 00:40:30:00

Williamson on behalf of the applicants. And with respect to the gentleman that was asking those questions online, I think we would appreciate to have those in in writing just to confirm that accesses to our landfall were considered holistically, and access via Queensway would require us to take heavy goods vehicles immediately adjacent to Blackpool Airport runway. We've mentioned how we are in discussion with those, and we have a commitment to not be interrupting of operational activities at Blackpool Airport. Um, and so yeah, whilst it was considered as an option, it ultimately was discounted for the for that reason.

00:40:30:16 - 00:40:33:10

Okay. The remaining points I think we'll have to cover in writing.

00:40:33:12 - 00:40:49:12

Okay. Thank you. Did you hear that, Doctor Qihan. There was a bit of a partial answer to your points. Yes, I strongly recommend you. You submit a written representation, a deadline one, and then you'll get a full written response to all your points at that stage.

00:40:49:22 - 00:40:50:25

Yeah. That's fine. Thank you very much.

00:40:50:27 - 00:40:51:12

Thank you. Okay.

00:40:51:27 - 00:40:54:29

Okay. So I'm going to move on now.

00:40:56:27 - 00:40:58:27

Oh, sorry. Mr. Morgan.

00:40:59:17 - 00:41:43:08

Phil Morgan, news from Clifton Parish Council. Uh, just to back up some of the concerns about Lower Lane and the points made by Mr. Barlow concerning the Bloomfield solar farm application. Um, this is only just gone in. I've touched on it before. Briefly. Um, the amount of HGV movements on that, and they'd call it HTP movements would be up to ten a day during the course of the works itself, which will take place over a couple of months. Uh, there'll also be 20 people arriving each day in cars. So lower lane during the course of that construction, which may or may not be contiguous with this one, would be very heavy and very detrimental to both the local people and, of course, problems with traffic congestion if those two sets of traffic overlap with each other.

00:41:43:12 - 00:41:52:19

That's not a matter for you today. It's a matter for our friends at Fylde. Um, but it's important that you're aware of this because this is a change to what had been previously planned.

00:41:53:19 - 00:41:54:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:41:55:03 - 00:42:29:00

Let's make a general point that it sounds it might be helpful. I don't know of any more. Meetings are planned between the applicants and the county highway authorities in the next week or so. So that when the highway authorities get to make the risk representations stroke local impact reports, then the matters that are still in disagreement after those discussions can be made clear in that and those in the statements of common ground. And then we can we can then examine those matters that are in disagreement. It does sound to me as though a meeting might help to sort of get through some of these issues and then leave us with the issues outstanding at the end of that, that process.

00:42:29:20 - 00:43:00:00

Yeah. Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. I think Lancashire County Council and the applicants have confirmed that we are in ongoing discussion with the local highway authorities. The matters that are being raised today are from local residents and communities that typically would defer to the local highway authority to resolve those matters. We are in that process and we will continue to be in that process. I've shared our timeline in those matters and specifics around that. Again, we will discuss with the local highway authority as a matter of course.

00:43:00:03 - 00:43:41:23

I do want to be absolutely clear, though. There is no heavy goods vehicle traffic to be proposed to go down Lower Lane. Lower Lane is included as an operational access to the onshore substation. As Mr. McKay, my colleague, confirmed, that means that it is. It is rated for light goods vehicles and for car

access. It is already used by agricultural farm acts as an agricultural farm access. So what we are proposing there is not to take HGVs down that route. Okay. And also if there is a need and that is secured, that is secured through the development Consent order as authorize part one of the works descriptions.

00:43:43:18 - 00:43:47:02

Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Yes. S Blackpool.

00:43:47:25 - 00:43:55:24

Night. Blackpool Council local housing authority I confirm that arrangements have been made at the moment for a meeting on Thursday of next week, and we welcome and thank the applicants for this.

00:43:55:27 - 00:44:18:20

Okay. Thank you for that. Okay. So I'm going to move on now. Uh, so, uh, I understand that the applicants have commissioned wins to assess the viable routes for, uh, for abnormal indivisible load movements include transformers for the proposed substations. Um, will that take into account the Department for transport, water, water preferred policy guidelines?

00:44:21:23 - 00:44:24:26

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. Yes it will.

00:44:25:11 - 00:44:37:08

Okay. Um, is Preston Marina on the north bank of the River Ribble and Priory Park on the south bank, both being considered as potential locations.

00:44:40:24 - 00:44:44:17

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. It is included. Yes.

00:44:44:19 - 00:44:51:03

Okay. Thank you. And can you give me an examination deadline when that report will be received?

00:44:54:13 - 00:44:58:02

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, it will be deadline two.

00:44:58:20 - 00:45:00:03

Okay. Thank you for that.

00:45:01:19 - 00:45:05:28

Uh, water for construction. Can you explain how that will be sourced?

00:45:14:13 - 00:45:22:28

So, Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Uh, do you mean in relation to construction activities in any particular aspect of the proposed project?

00:45:23:07 - 00:45:37:09

Well, I'm trying to understand is whether you're going to have to import water for construction, uh, which will involve water tankers. And if it would involve water tankers, have you taken those tanker movements into account in your assessment?

00:45:39:09 - 00:46:05:17

Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, it's that's quite a detailed our question. I know that the answer is probably within the construction trip generation assumptions document, which can probably get a reference for I don't have an answer to hand. It is very likely that importing of water will be required if we cannot obtain a utilities connection, depending on where where it is, but I will provide a response in writing. The applicants will provide a response.

00:46:05:27 - 00:46:15:29

To provide a note, because if you have to import water, that's the got a potential for quite a few thousand additional vehicle movements. So it's quite an important point really.

00:46:19:17 - 00:46:34:16

For Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, well, we understand your line of questioning the construction trip generation assumptions. References. App 115. Um, but as noted, we'll provide something in writing.

00:46:34:18 - 00:47:08:03

Okay. Thank you. Uh, table 7.5 of app Dash 108 It indicates that you have used crash map with data from 2018 to 2022 to identify personal injury accident locations in the study area. Um, this data is quite old now. Have used any other sources of fresh accident data, validated or invalidated, to confirm that the conclusions reached on the basis of the crash map data remain valid.

00:47:21:12 - 00:47:43:21

Sam Taylor, on behalf of the applicant. Um, just in relation to crash map data, that was the latest data available at the time of application. And it's important when, um, considering road safety data that you use the most, um, use validated data. So that's data that's been processed and validated, and that was the data available at the time of application.

00:47:44:20 - 00:47:51:07

So you haven't, uh, more recently checked for more up to date validated data to confirm your findings?

00:47:57:14 - 00:48:30:13

Thank you. Sir. Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I'd just like to point out that the, um, the outlying construction traffic management plan has, uh, provisions for continuous monitoring of road safety condition conditions during the construction, the construction stage, the the document applies to, uh, as a mechanism of bringing, um, the the network performance up to date.

00:48:31:01 - 00:48:41:16

Really? Um, so in that reference is, uh, EP 2113.

00:48:41:18 - 00:48:58:17

Williamson on behalf of the applicants. We're not aware of any additional data that could be used, but we will go away and do a check. Um, just as I don't believe the local highway authorities have raised the validity of the use of the of that source. Um, but as I say, we'll go away and see if there is anything more recent.

00:48:59:10 - 00:49:00:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:49:05:04 - 00:49:19:26

So commitment 37, uh, restricts vehicle movements associated with the operation and maintenance to 700 hours to 2300 hours. What's the reason for these really long hours?

00:49:21:12 - 00:49:30:29

And why can't these activities to be restricted to normal? Working day of 900 hours to 1700 hours, with an exception for emergencies.

00:49:55:18 - 00:50:00:23

Bill Williamson on behalf of the applicants. I think we'd like to take that one away and provide a response.

00:50:00:25 - 00:50:16:14

Okay. If you can come back to me on that at that point. Um, okay. I think that's all I want to raise today. I'll just give another opportunity for people in the room to raise any other issues. Traffic and transport? Yes. Got the poster lady at the back there.

00:50:21:02 - 00:50:44:25

Thank you. It's Jennifer Frost. I'm a local resident. I had two points to make, so I appreciate your patience. Um, regarding traffic, I needed a clarification on Morgan and Morcom, so I know it's a joint application in the horrific event of this increased traffic resulting in a fatality. Who would be responsible?

00:50:48:04 - 00:50:50:01

Okay. Would you like to comment on that?

00:51:03:01 - 00:51:16:26

Half of the applicant and the circumstances in which in any accident on the highway would apply, whether it's a I'm, I'm slightly at a loss as to how to answer that question, but it's no different to any other situation with any.

00:51:16:28 - 00:51:17:13

Other.

00:51:17:19 - 00:51:18:26

Vehicle on the highway.

00:51:19:04 - 00:51:21:10

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevens.

00:51:21:12 - 00:51:23:10

Thank you. Sorry, I had one other point.

00:51:23:12 - 00:51:24:02

Sorry you had to.

00:51:24:04 - 00:51:26:18

Sorry. Jennifer Frost, local resident.

00:51:29:14 - 00:51:30:10

Neal Stevens.

00:51:31:08 - 00:51:32:19

Sorry, sorry. Paused.

00:51:32:29 - 00:51:35:00

Uh, Miss Frost had one more point.

00:51:35:02 - 00:51:53:08

Then we'll come to you. It's Mrs. Jennifer Frost, just for the recording. Thank you. I understand that there's a long process being undertaken, and I would just like to know at what point, uh, the applicants contact Nwas or any of the emergency services with their data, or whether that's in the hands of the Lancashire County Council. Thank you.

00:51:54:05 - 00:51:56:08

Mr.. You'd like to respond to that.

00:51:58:27 - 00:52:27:02

Listen, on behalf of the applicant, I'm not entirely sure what the question is to be honest about what data we would be providing. There's been engagement with the relevant, uh, stakeholders. Um, they um, through the statutory consultation and prescribed consultees are not aware that any concerns have been raised by those consultees in respect of this application. Um, so I'm not. Apologies. I'm not entirely sure what the question is.

00:52:27:05 - 00:52:33:09

And that that includes, uh, that particular organisation, which I presume is the North West Northwest West Ambulance Service.

00:52:33:11 - 00:52:42:29

My apologies sir. It is the North West Ambulance Service. Yes. Our local emergency services are Lancashire Constabulary. I believe the RNLI run the lifeboats and the fire service. Thank you.

00:52:45:05 - 00:53:01:18

Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants, they are a statutory consultee for the purposes of this application. They've made no comment on the on the application. They were consulted in accordance with the requirements and have made made no comment. We've also been in contact with the RNLI and again they've made no comment regarding safety.

00:53:02:00 - 00:53:05:14

Okay. Thank you Mr.. Thank you, Mr. Stevens.

00:53:06:12 - 00:53:23:17

Thank you. Um, just in response, if there is an accident on on the highway network, um, what would generally happen is the police would be involved, they would do an investigation. It may also include a health and safety executive looking at the causation factors, and then who is responsible and also who is liable.

00:53:24:18 - 00:53:27:00

Okay. Thank you. And I think you had a point of your own.

00:53:27:02 - 00:54:04:10

Yes. Whilst we've sort of highlighted, um, the junctions and the links. Um, again, it is in my local impact report. I do have concerns about whilst looking at the the short lengths of highway which have been mentioned. These are on uh, roads which are not constructed to modern standards. Uh, the Fylde coast is subject to most roads. Uh, undulating roads and high levels of maintenance. Whilst those roads are suitable for current conditions, they are not suitable for heavy usage as would be promoted by this proposal.

00:54:04:21 - 00:54:34:22

So in some ways, from the county's perspective, whilst the door is always open for discussion and dialogue, hopefully try to reach a resolution on all matters. Uh, I do have big concerns on the, uh, the ability of the highway to be able to accommodate such loads. So with that, there would be my suggestion would be pre commencement work would be required. Monitoring would be required and any the associated costs to maintain those roads to a standard suitable for this project needs to be picked up by the development.

00:54:34:24 - 00:54:37:28

I know that's an element of detail, but it is a fundamental point.

00:54:38:17 - 00:54:45:29

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevens. Um, yes. If you make your point and then I'll go to Mr.. And for any final comments, you might.

00:54:46:06 - 00:55:13:24

Feel more confused with Clifton Parish Council. Just like to support many of those points. I think we did touch on the guild wheel yesterday, uh, which I think our friend referred to as having Htts going along it. Uh, this is the main cycle route, um, for going around Preston. Um, and obviously for some concern, but the wider points have been raised about some of the roads being mentioned being completely unsuitable for this level of traffic and this nature of traffic we would strongly support.

00:55:14:04 - 00:55:18:21

Okay. Thank you. Mr.. Do you want to just respond to those two points at all?

00:55:22:23 - 00:55:50:19

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, as referenced previously, we are in discussions with Lancashire County Council Highways Authority in relation to precondition road surveys, monitoring of that and also all of that wording to be updated within the Outline Construction traffic Management plan. We believe there are there are resolutions available and it is a matter of discussing those and agreeing those with the local highway authorities. Um.

00:55:53:11 - 00:56:07:24

Okay. That's great. Thank you. We are going to move on now. That concludes the agenda item six B. So we now move on to agenda item six C which is aviation. And that's going to be led by my colleague Mr. Gorst.

00:56:36:21 - 00:57:07:26

Thank you everyone. And particularly thank you for those waiting for this this matter. Been waiting a long time. Um, if I just start off with the, um, the applicant. Um, you heard the representations from BA systems with regard to Walton er, Drome, and also the representations from black player port. Could the applicants briefly outline their justification, uh, for the choice of locations and extent of the proposed biodiversity benefit and mitigation areas?

00:57:11:04 - 00:57:37:17

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. Um, I think the matter that's being raised here is actually better to be covered under the onshore ecology, um, topic matter. We have aviation experts at the table rather than ecologists who would be able to provide that detail justification. I can take a guess where this is leading to. But if you would like to take or ask a question in relation to where this is going, I think we might be able to give you a better answer.

00:57:45:23 - 00:58:17:21

So before you listen on behalf of the applicant, I wonder if the way to deal with this is to is perhaps for the applicants to outline the concerns that we understand them with are BA, Warton and Blackpool Airport in respect of these matters. So we're at least setting some context around where we think those issues are, where discussions are with those parties in terms of of matters for resolution and, and what we see, the timetable for those matters being.

00:58:18:09 - 00:58:42:09

And then I suggest, as Mr. Williamson has said, the explanation as to why the biodiversity mitigation area is where it is, is a matter for the ecologists. Um, in terms of the location of that, but that discussion will then be in the context of having heard the, uh, heard or set out where we are with the various aviation interests. Does that sound like a.

00:58:42:13 - 00:58:47:12

Yeah, I'm grateful for that. And that that sounds a sensible way forward. So please proceed on that basis.



00:58:47:14 - 00:58:47:29

Thank you.

00:58:48:01 - 00:58:48:17

Thank you.

00:58:57:21 - 00:59:00:06

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants.

00:59:02:18 - 00:59:46:04

I think it's been referenced a few times over the course of the hearings, um, that the applicants are engaged with both Blackpool Airport and BA systems. The relevant chapters in relation to aviation, um, are the ah, um app 130. zero. As well as the commitments register, which is A0 three zero. Um, one of the key commitments within the commitments Register in relation to Blackpool Airport is commitment number 105, which states that no construction works in the operational boundary of Blackpool Airport will commence until civil Aviation publications 791 parts one and two have been obtained from the Civil Aviation Authority in connection with these works.

00:59:46:24 - 01:00:17:03

Um. This underpins the conversations with relation to the cooperation agreement that was referred to yesterday by, by Mr. Paul from, from Blackpool Airport. Um, notwithstanding there are there are matters within that conversation, within those conversations that we seek, that we are currently seeking to agree with Blackpool Airport. Um, primarily these are in relation to, uh, reducing and minimising any operational impacts to Blackpool Airport during the construction activities associated with the transmission assets.

01:00:18:09 - 01:00:48:29

Um, And I do want to provide. Um. And I'm not an aviation expert. I do want to provide a very layman's terms explanation of what the 711 process is, because I think there was some confusion when it was discussed earlier regarding what that process is and how it relates to the commitment that was made by the applicant in relation to Blackpool Airport. Um, so I've outlined what the commitment is, but I do want to I do want it to be very clear that the cap 791 process is not a consent or a licence to undertake works.

01:00:49:04 - 01:01:20:09

It's a procedure for notifying the Civil Aviation Authority to changes to aerodrome infrastructure. So that means that that process ensures that there's compliance with the requirements, which includes safety. And that is fundamental to this when making changes to aerodrome facilities. And that in this specific case it's that the applicants, um, it secures the ability to commence on, on aerodrome construction of the transmission works. So the Cap 791 process is not something to be undertaken by the applicants.

01:01:20:12 - 01:01:45:16

It's undertaken by Blackpool Airport to satisfy their Civil Aviation Authority licence to operate. I don't think it's necessary to go into the detail of the Cap 791 process, unless you particularly want that. But

I did want to reassure the examining authority, as per Mr. Paul's comments yesterday, that we are working with Blackpool Airport regarding the provision of all the information that they require to undertake the Cap 791 process.

01:01:47:25 - 01:02:20:13

Yeah, thank, thank you for confirming that. And yes, you know, we're not aviation experts either. So we were struggling a little bit with the process. And uh, Mr. Paul, very helpful, helpfully, um, put us on the right track. And you've confirmed that today. Um, so, so so that's, um, uh, really appreciated. But we if we could move on, um, on on the Morgan offshore offshore project, um, ba B systems, and they're obviously here in the room. And we'll speak later about, um, their comment.

01:02:20:15 - 01:02:48:15

But they made a late addition to their closing statement. They made it on the on the day of the closing of the examination, 10th of March. Um, they referred to various matters outstanding being the, the gnats and the Osprey report, uh, the mitigation proposal at the Wharton Aerodrome and the DCO requirements. What? It's not this DCO, it's it's it's Morgan. But what progress has been made with those issues.

01:02:50:03 - 01:03:10:13

Is done on behalf of the applicants. We're not in a position to, uh, to discuss those in relation to another application. That examination. Uh, certainly the Morgan application, uh, generation application closed in March. Uh, and I think the Morgan application closed quite recently. Um, any further discussions between the parties in relation to those matters are between the parties.

01:03:13:18 - 01:03:20:24

Sorry, Liz, can I just. Sorry. Also want to add that those are matters related to the generation assets, not to the transmission assets.

01:03:21:05 - 01:03:51:08

Well, of course, because that was the application which closed and we are currently dealing with the transmission assets. Um, at this hearing today, um, but it was, um, the point I'm making was that, um, the applicant there, um, tried to put out a position which was actually countered by BA on the closing date of the examination. It resulted in them putting in a later statement to their closing statement.

01:03:51:21 - 01:04:26:07

So there was still some disagreement between the parties there. So, um, we'll hear from them in a moment. But, um, it's just making the point that, uh, that there wasn't agreement. And, um, I'm going to be looking to, um, uh, to, to, you know, to try and get some reassurance that things have moved closer. So so moving on to this examination. Um, in their initial submission, which is ah 0208 um BA systems summarized three major concerns.

01:04:26:29 - 01:04:58:01

Um, the potential for increased bird strike, um, the potential for buildings and other built, built developments, including construction machinery, uh, interfering with safe aircraft movement, uh, and the potential to impact on the operation of radar and communications equipment at water, water and

air Drome. Um, the applicants have sought to respond to these points in their latest submission, which is PDA 008 uh, and confirmed that further engagement will take place.

01:04:58:12 - 01:05:03:11

So when can the, um, the panel expect to hear about progress for these issues.

01:05:05:05 - 01:05:44:20

Through Williamson on behalf of the applicants? Um, the hearings have provided a very helpful opportunity for the applicants to have brief discussions with Bas systems, and we have agreed that we will have a meeting early next week to provide an update on on progress of of on matters similar to to the to the agreements that we have with Blackpool Airport. Um, I do want to make a point in relation again to the safeguarding assessment. Um, I think yesterday there was also some confusion about whether the assessment contained within the aviation chapter was was robust and the applicants maintained that it is.

01:05:44:29 - 01:06:21:16

And I think it's about wording associated with that. Again, I am not an aviation expert, but in relation to the safeguarding assessment that is referred to in the relevant representation. I just want to confirm that Warton Aerodrome, or BA systems, is responsible for the technical safeguarding of their own communications, navigation and surveillance systems in accordance with the Civil Aviation Authority requirements, which means that any safeguarding assessments to be undertaken in relation to penetration of building heights into um, into those areas, is the responsibility of Bas systems to demonstrate compliance with their Civil Aviation Authority licence.

01:06:21:28 - 01:06:59:04

That being said, we are in conversation and referring to the engagement I've just referenced. We are committed to working with BA systems to provide them that information, the necessary information to to undertake that safeguarding assessment and will continue to do so through the through the examination to provide that assurance that these matters will be closed out before the end of examination. We, the applicants, are confident there is no effect expected regarding obstacle, limitation, surface and communication, navigation and surveillance systems as the onshore substations are in close proximity to existing one through two kilovolt overhead line pylons.

01:06:59:10 - 01:07:30:17

Those overhead line pylons are indicative of 42m in height, and the maximum above finished ground level height of the onshore substations is is 30m for the lightning protection mast. So although there is another aspect of topography to consider within that there is already infrastructure in the area of, of of a relative height or potentially higher. And BA systems have raised um questions regarding the construction um, plant to be used. Um, and I think it's fair to say that we will provide that information in our engagement with BAE systems.

01:07:31:17 - 01:07:32:10

Uh, it was brief.

01:07:32:15 - 01:07:35:11

Any idea when you will be able to provide that detail?

01:07:43:15 - 01:08:17:23

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, uh, of the applicants, just to clarify, are you asking when are we going to provide that information to BA systems or. Okay, uh, Phil, I'm sorry, I don't need to say, um, the, um, we haven't had a full scope of the information that's required to undertake that safeguarding assessment. That is the next meeting that we need to have. It will be provided as quickly and as soon as possible. Once we have that full scope. I think the next meeting that we have with them will give us that indication, and we can probably provide an update at deadline one in terms of what's been requested.

01:08:19:14 - 01:08:36:12

Okay. Thanks. Thank you for that. Um, perhaps we could turn to BA systems or obviously, um, in the room and been very patient to have their say. So, uh, is it Mr. Forshaw? Yes. Can you just sort of let us have your comment? Thank you. Uh, Paul, for sure.

01:08:36:14 - 01:08:41:23

On behalf of PA systems. Um, I think there'll be a number of points and some additional.

01:08:41:25 - 01:08:42:10

Points that.

01:08:42:12 - 01:08:46:12

We would like to raise in terms of, uh, the scope of assessments.

01:08:46:14 - 01:08:46:29

That.

01:08:47:01 - 01:08:48:21

We think are required. Um.

01:08:49:00 - 01:09:19:25

On the on the sort of technical safeguarding assessment point that was just raised by the applicant, that's on the, um, so the OAS and IFP and communication systems. Um, I think it's correct that that one needs to be constructed by PA systems. Um, and we're happy to work with you applicants to provide the details of what we need from them to undertake that. I think we will be looking to recover costs from the applicants to undertake those assessments. It's the applicants that are making the changes in the area.

01:09:20:06 - 01:09:52:00

Um, what hasn't been touched on is, uh, the safeguarding assessment that's required in relation to bird strike. Um, that is not something that the systems will undertake that will be for the applicants to undertake. Um, there have been some comments in the applicants response to our relevant representations on potential scope for, uh, in relation to bird strike risk and in particular as a, as a mention of a, a mitigation plan.

01:09:52:08 - 01:10:26:00

I think what what we need to see understand first is before we get to mitigation, to understand what mitigation is possible and if it is possible, all um, is it needs to be an assessment of what the risk may be, which hasn't been undertaken, uh, at this stage. Um, I think all impacts on Wharton was scoped out of the, um, as I think, on the basis of a 2.5km radius from the aerodrome, which I don't we don't understand where that figure has come from.

01:10:26:02 - 01:11:07:07

A distance has come from um, I've been going to detail now, if you want on on what we would potentially want the assessment to look at at a high level and obviously provide more detail in writing. Um, but it's such an a on a comment I made yesterday on, um, things like landscaping around, around the, um, substation areas, but also the location and the habitats at some mitigation and biodiversity benefit sites, which we are not clear on yet. Um, I think essentially in their response to our relevant representations, they talk about, um, that they're confident that mitigation can be provided on the basis that, um,

01:11:08:25 - 01:11:42:25

there's not going to be an increase in birds in the area that, um, so essentially that the mitigation they're providing is replacement for what's being lost through a permanent or temporary temporary for the development. And then that I think the simple assumption that the birds in that area will come to the other sites, um, and they won't be an increase in birds in the area. I think that's a very simplistic view. Um, migratory patterns of birds are changing. Quite significant moment, partly due to climate change. But, you know, if a suitable habitat is changing around it may attract others.

01:11:43:00 - 01:12:13:21

Um, I think we also need to look at a much more micro level in terms of it's not just the numbers of birds, it's how close they will be, what changes in the distance they'll be from the aerodrome and from flight paths. Um, I think we really need to understand that. And again, touching on the point I made yesterday about landscape design and the detail of that on some of the um, mitigation sites, communication sites and the biodiversity benefit sites.

01:12:14:10 - 01:12:48:18

Um, there is no detail at all really on the habitats, and the applicants have mentioned to us that some of these habitats are not specifically designed for birds, but there are potential issues there with um, I suppose the example could be if one of the sites are designed as otter habitats, otters maybe being, uh, fish to feed on, to eat onto the these sites cuddly carcasses. That in itself attracts birds and potentially large goals. In particular it's these sort of issues that we need to understand what that risk is before you start looking at mitigation.

01:12:48:26 - 01:12:49:11

Um.

01:12:50:00 - 01:13:07:13

So just just to help us a bit, Mr. Forshaw, um, this assessment, uh, relating to possible risk, Ask, is that a similar assessment being undertaken on other projects that you could sort of point to point the applicants too, towards? You know, I want something like this.

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

And can I ask my colleague, Mr. Merriman, who's beverage manager, to respond on that point?

01:13:25:23 - 01:13:28:00

So could you introduce yourself as well?

01:13:28:05 - 01:13:28:20

Good afternoon.

01:13:28:22 - 01:13:29:07

Yeah.

01:13:29:09 - 01:13:30:25

Kieran Merriman via systems, Water.

01:13:30:27 - 01:13:31:12

And.

01:13:31:14 - 01:13:31:29

Aerodrome.

01:13:32:01 - 01:13:32:16

Um, I.

01:13:32:18 - 01:13:34:15

Think in terms of answering your question with regards to.

01:13:34:27 - 01:13:35:12

Where.

01:13:35:14 - 01:13:36:19

That information would come from or.

01:13:36:21 - 01:13:37:15

Pointing in the direction.

01:13:37:17 - 01:13:38:21

Of how that would be undertaken.

01:13:38:23 - 01:13:39:08

Uh, there's.

01:13:39:10 - 01:13:40:12

A specific, uh, civil.

01:13:40:14 - 01:13:43:18

Aviation publication, the Cap 772.

01:13:43:20 - 01:13:44:05

Which.

01:13:44:07 - 01:13:44:28

Breaks down and highlights.

01:13:45:00 - 01:13:57:25

Six significant areas. Um, and then there's subsections to them. So you can just bear with two seconds. I'll just refer to my notes and read through those for you, just to give you an understanding of what it is we're trying to assess with regards to.

01:13:57:27 - 01:13:58:21

To bird strike.

01:13:58:23 - 01:14:29:29

And then if a male just summarize the importance of the subject with regards to bird strike. So the the six areas are under the titles of bird attributes attractants, surface analysis, weather conditions, airport area and airport use, and then the subsections within all of those individual headings. And but if I just come back to the point that I was making just previously before with regards to aerodrome use, I would like the panel to understand the strategic national importance of PA systems Warton and to the defence of the realm for the UK.

01:14:30:05 - 01:14:30:23

I would also like.

01:14:30:25 - 01:14:31:10

To.

01:14:31:12 - 01:14:45:02

Inform the panel of the importance with regards to the manufacture of Eurofighter Typhoon as the single indigenous manufacturing capability within the UK for for faster aircraft. I'd also like to make the panel aware of the future use of.

01:14:45:04 - 01:14:45:19

Warton.

01:14:45:21 - 01:14:54:12

Site with regards to sixth generation fighter and the transnational project with regards to Japan and Italy. And why is that important? Well, we're not dealing.

01:14:54:14 - 01:14:54:29

With.

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

Civil aircraft and.

01:14:55:23 - 01:14:56:08

The normal.

01:14:56:10 - 01:15:25:10

Flight patterns, flight approaches, flight departures that your experience at a normal civil aerodrome. We're talking about high performance, high maneuverability and different levels of approach. Some of the specific test and development activity for which Wharton is the center of excellence for test and evaluation, and includes different flight patterns and different approaches and departures. So a standard approach to undertaking that hazard assessment with regards to birds wouldn't be suitable and sufficient in this instance. So it's a particularly.

01:15:25:12 - 01:15:26:08

Specialized risk.

01:15:26:10 - 01:15:43:16

That we're talking about, which is why we're embellishing the point of how important bird risk mitigation is for us. To the extent that, um, we've we've recently introduced a bird radar, such as our concerns with regards to mitigation for bird strike and and aircraft.

01:15:44:09 - 01:15:44:26

Thank you.

01:15:45:10 - 01:15:59:09

That's really helpful. And and I hope it gives the applicants a little bit of guidance as to as to what's being looked for. Um, have the applicants got, um, an idea as to how they could progress such an assessment?

01:16:00:29 - 01:16:34:01

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, and as mentioned, we have been in conversation with BAE systems. Um, and I have made reference in those short conversations to, um, the next meeting we would have with them, essentially, which is to agree the strategy towards the agreeing the bird strike mitigation plan. Um, the intention is for us to align whatever we do produce with the guidance within seven, seven, two. And I think it's important to state that Warton Aerodrome already will have a or does have a bird strike mitigation plan for their existing environment.

01:16:34:15 - 01:17:06:11

Um, and so any um, anything related to the transmission assets will be provided to Walton Aerodrome for them to own and implement as part of their existing bird strike mitigation plan. I don't and I don't want to go into necessarily too much in terms of what the strategy is, because that's not been presented to BA systems, but at a high level, it is a seeking the baseline, seeking the baseline of existing, um, migratory patterns, uh, quantum of ornithological. Um, sorry, I'm not an ornithologist either, so that's fine.



01:17:06:13 - 01:17:36:01

And before you lose me as well. But I mean, the point that I'd just like to, to, to emphasize here is that, you know, we're now less than six months for this examination. So if there is going to be an updated assessment, work needs to be starting on it as soon as possible. Um, uh, because, uh, otherwise, you know, six months would tick by pretty quickly. Is there going to be an updated assessment? Um, and if so, is work going to start very soon?

01:17:37:02 - 01:18:20:21

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, we do not believe there is a need for an assessment. This is part of the mitigation that will be agreed with with BA systems and us also Blackpool Airport as a holistic bird strike mitigation plan. Um, the, uh, the process of doing that, um, is agreeing the strategy work on baseline has already begun because we this obviously was raised that the relevant rep stage, we immediately started looking at the the issue and how we would resolve it. Uh, so gathering that baseline, uh, presenting more information on the ecological mitigation areas, we do know that we need to do that, provide additional detail as to how that will function, and provide that both to Blackpool Airport and BA systems, and then use that to underpin the bird strike mitigation plan.

01:18:20:23 - 01:18:47:20

I'm talking through our strategy slightly now, um, underpin that bird strike mitigation plan, which will be undertaken at the applicant's cost and provided to both the aerodrome and the airport for their implementation. Upon agreement, the intention from the applicants is to agree the strategy and a draft of the bird strike mitigation plan, including baseline information on the ecological mitigation areas by deadline, one with either an update or submission of that information into examination by deadline two.

01:18:47:28 - 01:18:53:21

Okay. Thank you. By systems. Is that an approach that that reassures you at all?

01:18:53:23 - 01:19:27:16

For sure. On behalf of Bay systems, I think just to stress again that we we really need the details of, um, of the risk, you know, a lot to talk about with mitigation plan, but I think we're probably quite a way off that yet. We need to understand what the risk is. And the very first instance, um, you know, the may there could be an instance where mitigation may not be possible. Um, and we need to know that as soon as possible. That could have implications for as a point, I wanted to come on to yesterday, but we have to defer it to this item agenda.

01:19:27:18 - 01:20:00:14

I think it's been deferred again, potentially to the onshore ecology. It's a location of these of these sites that, you know, potentially alternative areas may need to be found for these potentially, um, you know, if there is no way of mitigating the risk of in terms of what impacts there may be from where these sites are proposed currently. Um. I think it is worth pointing to the, you know, the real what? The risk actually is here. And, you know, but I know that water bird strikes do bring planes down and that is a significant risk to life.

01:20:00:16 - 01:20:22:15

So this this is a very serious matter. And we really need to understand what those risks are. Um, and mitigation if possible, needs to be robust as possible. And you can't have a robust mitigation plan without understanding those risks. So I think the first stage is and as as you mentioned, it needs to be done very quickly as looking at what those risks may be.

01:20:24:13 - 01:20:45:09

All right. Thanks very much, Mr. Forshaw. Um, I think Mr. Paul, um, might have some thoughts on this as well. So, Mr. Paul, can I invite you into the meeting? Hello again. Yep. Can we. Can we hear from you? You obviously been listening to the discussion about, um, the assessment and the possible risks. What's the position from Blackpool Airport.

01:20:46:07 - 01:21:21:01

Thank you sir. Ask Paul on behalf of Blackpool Airport. Um. Really? Just to, um, explain that, um, we have been working with the applicants and also liaising with BAE on this issue. Um, but I think it's fair to say that the issue. Um, came to light, um, pretty fairly shortly before the start of this examination. And so, um, we, um, we do feel that it's an issue that needs to be top of the priority list. Whilst, um, as I've alluded to a couple of times now, we we are in negotiations over a commercial agreement which will hopefully address operational impacts on the airport.

01:21:21:03 - 01:21:51:06

This issue, um, in the sense that, um, the, the ecological mitigation areas and one in particular is is of concern to the airport, which is delivered loss mitigation area because of its proximity to, um, the the eastern end of um Blackpool airport's runway. Um, uh, we feel that because this forms part of the proposed development. It's not something that can be readily mitigated. Um, through, um, specific construction methods. For example, within within the within the airport.

01:21:51:08 - 01:22:21:15

The fundamental piece of of the proposed development that we need further information on us to, um, the risks associated with delivering that mitigation on, on um, uh, bird strike risk, but also, um, how that mitigation might be mitigated. Um, I fully appreciate that the the applicants are working, um, on producing a mitigation plan, but we would we would echo bas concerns that, um, that, that, that there needs to be a greater understanding of the risks before we jump to a mitigation.

01:22:25:02 - 01:22:34:20

Thank you very much for that. Um, I think we might have Mr. Dunlop as well who might want to make a contribution on this. Mr. Dunlop, can can you join the meeting?

01:22:35:15 - 01:22:56:13

Yes. Just a brief comment, because I don't want to preempt, uh, the onshore ecology, but we do have common concerns with the bee and the Blackpool Airport in terms of the detail of what kind of mitigation and biodiversity gain is proposed and what kind of wildlife and wildlife habitats it would deliver everywhere.

01:22:59:00 - 01:23:17:11

All right. Thank you. Mr.. Mr. Dunlop, um, and, uh, for, for for confirming that, um, I'll come back to you in a moment, Mr.. Paul, because I've got a question for you. Can I just ask the applicant to

respond on what they've heard and the fact that, you know, this is, you know, potentially a serious risk to life.

01:23:19:02 - 01:23:52:13

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, absolutely understand the concerns raised by the airport and the aerodrome. Um, we've had these we've had conversations, um, in relation to the risks that they are required to manage and fully understand the responsibility that we have in relation to in to ensuring that they're ensuring that, um, I think the important thing to raise is that there are already birds in the area, and they are already managed via a bird strike mitigation plan by the airport and the aerodrome. The applicants are not proposing to introduce birds, new and new numbers of birds into the area.

01:23:52:15 - 01:24:22:08

It is a displacement associated with temporary mitigation. Um, obviously there is nuance and there is detail around that, and there is obviously a risk which the airport and aerodrome are outlining in terms of the potential to to introduce birds and how that might be managed. I think that is the crux of the mitigation, the bird strike mitigation plan, in terms of how we monitor that, and then the mitigation hierarchy is put in place to ensure that numbers are not increased and therefore there is an increase in risk. But I take the points raised and and and.

01:24:22:19 - 01:24:30:19

I hear what you say. But Mr. Forshaw was saying that possibly mitigation. You know, it's questionable whether or not it could actually be appropriate here.

01:24:33:00 - 01:25:03:09

Paul Fischer, on behalf of Bay systems, I think it's an unknown at the moment. We need to know whether it is at risk mitigation as possible. Um, I think just to repeat what I said earlier, it's not just about numbers. It's about the location of those birds. Even if numbers don't increase their being potentially being brought closer to the aerodrome, close into flight paths. That that itself would increase the risk. It's not just about numbers of birds. It's where they are in and around the aerodrome, which is which is crucial as well.

01:25:03:11 - 01:25:03:26

Here.

01:25:05:02 - 01:25:37:22

Thank you for that. Um, Mr. Paul, uh, wants to come in again. Um, uh, before you speak, if I could just put a point to you, Mr. Paul. You you spoke yesterday about, um, the commercial negotiations, and you couldn't disclose too much detail at this stage, and we fully understand that. Um, all I would say both to to you and the applicants is that, um, uh, we we will be having another issue specific hearing, um, in a few months time, and I think that will be.

01:25:37:24 - 01:25:58:06

It will be the halfway point of the examination, and we will be expecting either to hear confirmation that, um, uh, you've actually reached agreement or a detailed update on your negotiations. So we don't need it now, but we will we will want to hear something quite concrete in three months.

01:26:00:29 - 01:26:25:10

So that's helpful. As to Paul, on behalf of Blackpool Airport, I mean, I think in terms of the timeline, that's certainly where we'd hope to be. Um, but by the middle of the examination, in an agreed position, and I think I probably speak for the applicants on, on, on that as well. So, um, I think that seems like a very appropriate point at which to, um, report to you on where we are and if we're not in agreement with you in full on the issues that are on our list,

01:26:26:29 - 01:26:32:25

um, if I might just just one further point on the bird strike issue. If now's an appropriate time.

01:26:33:10 - 01:26:34:02

Yep, yep.

01:26:34:16 - 01:27:10:08

It was. It was just. It was just to add, um, just to lead on from the point that I just made, um, I think some of this comes around, um, site selection, which I know we touched on yesterday, but but obviously this this agenda item was, was put for today. Um, I think in terms of that sort of further information piece, we would want to understand, uh, the extent to which impacts on Blackpool Airport, um, were considered when the live and moss site in particular, but also other ecological mitigation sites, um, were selected between um the preliminary environmental um stage of the EIA process and the and the is itself.

01:27:10:13 - 01:27:23:16

Um, I'm conscious that there are a number of sites considered, um, at the stage. And I think, I think if we could have some further information in relation to that and some comfort that, um, in the airport were considered, that would be helpful.

01:27:26:07 - 01:27:31:07

Thank you, Mr. Paul. Um, I don't know if the applicant wants to to come back on that point at all.

01:27:32:00 - 01:28:03:17

I Williamson on behalf of the applicants. I don't think we're going to close this within this hearing. I think the main point we need here to to reassert here is that we are in conversation with both the airport and the aerodrome. There is planned engagement, and I understand the concerns that have been raised. And I think what what I'm hearing is that we might need to bring forward more information sooner, rather than necessarily outlining a strategy. I think our next meeting will try and provide some of the clarity that has been requested within this hearing, and then we'll take it forward from there.

01:28:04:00 - 01:28:30:27

Yeah. Um, I think that's fine. Um, I think I think we would would like a note from you at deadline one if, if you're not providing a risk assessment which you said you're not going to, then I think, um, we do need to hear from you with robust reasons. So I, you know, I would like as an action point that you provide a, a note explaining why, um, that has been provided. The risk assessment isn't being provided.

01:28:32:07 - 01:28:36:11

Valerie Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Yeah, we can absolutely do that for deadline one.

01:28:37:28 - 01:28:38:21

Thank you.

01:28:41:28 - 01:28:47:00

Mr. Forshaw. I was about to move on, but you've just a final point you want to make.

01:28:47:02 - 01:29:03:23

Yes, it's a final point. Sorry. Um, so, Paul Fischer, on behalf of our systems, it's relating to your question earlier about the, um, generation assets. Um, I wasn't involved in that examination, but my my colleague was so happy to have some clarification to the point you raised. Essentially.

01:29:04:21 - 01:29:17:16

I think we probably ought to move on from, from from there. So, um, that that that's fine. So, um, sorry, we've got a question from over here if you'd like to, um. Yep. Thank you.

01:29:19:28 - 01:29:32:15

Keith. Keith Mackay from Freckleton Parish Council on the subject of bird strike. I might be able to give you some assistance because the birds themselves. Not the birds, The aircraft themselves are designed on a probabilistic basis,

01:29:34:01 - 01:29:53:00

so anything that increases the frequency of occurring, frequency of occurrence of birds in an area is likely to have an adverse effect on the bird strike probability and the birds that matter there can be of various size. The really bad ones are flocking birds.

01:29:54:22 - 01:30:10:03

If you run into a flock of birds, you really know about it because it usually goes down the engines and that if you're at low level over an airfield, that's not a good place to be. Uh, I recommend, if you haven't seen it, go and go and watch Sully. It gives you a good idea of what it's like.

01:30:11:22 - 01:30:12:09

Um.

01:30:14:08 - 01:30:15:01

What are you saying?

01:30:16:28 - 01:30:28:12

Sorry. Yes, I should say that the reason I'm interested in that is, uh, I was airframe manager at Bear Systems, and I was responsible for the certification and qualification of the typhoon and the Nimrod programs.

01:30:30:06 - 01:30:32:08

You might want to go and chat to them while they're here, then.

01:30:32:23 - 01:30:39:14

Well, we already have. So they know me of old. Um, but yes, I will certainly help them.

01:30:40:06 - 01:30:46:15

Thank you for that. A lady at the back. Could you introduce yourself and, uh, let's hear your comment. Thank you.

01:30:47:05 - 01:30:47:22

Hello, I'm.

01:30:47:24 - 01:31:18:08

Deborah Helm from Walkers Residents Association. I have grown up in this area, so I know it very, very well. What I'm hearing here is, uh, bird strike mitigation, safeguarding. And I'm also hearing that, uh, some of the risk possibly cannot be mitigated both from Blackpool Airport and, um, at bay. Um, I live right by Blackpool Airport.

01:31:18:10 - 01:31:54:03

I see the flight path of the aircraft from Warton over my house. We are the people that would be at risk from, um, uh, those any thing that goes wrong because of the applicant's, um, choices of where the cable should go. Um, Warton, Freckleton they're very densely populated areas. And I want to echo that any bird strike, um, would result in terrible fatalities.

01:31:54:06 - 01:32:27:00

So this has been chosen. This route has been chosen, but actually impacts on so many people. I live on Westgate Roan Road in a house in the 1930s semi with my daughter, and we see, um, we've got helicopters going over, light aircraft going over our house all the time. Any disruption to, um, that happening, anything changing, anything could be absolutely Devastating for any people in my road, any people in the area.

01:32:27:02 - 01:32:55:21

Any people in Wharton. And it's. We're using words. We're using jargon. But this is the reality. This is my house. This is my neighborhood. This is my home for for many years. And you can pay fast and loose with this. But this is the situation. And I just wanted to put a face to a residence that would be impacted from this. And I don't I don't appreciate anybody smirking from this side either.

01:32:59:12 - 01:33:01:00

Thank thank you very much for that submission.

01:33:01:02 - 01:33:02:29

And off of the applicants. Can I just say something?

01:33:03:01 - 01:33:18:00

So sorry, can I in a moment to just say thank you for that submission? And, uh, I think you've heard from the discussion over the last few minutes that everyone is taking this very seriously. So thank you very much for your for your for your participation this afternoon. Sorry, Miss Dunn.

01:33:18:03 - 01:33:50:04

Thank you. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, I was going to say something similar, which was, um, that, um, I am slightly concerned about some of the language that's been used in this session, particularly in regard to, uh, safety and, uh, potentially risk to life, I think was mentioned. I just think it's really important, again, that we put this into context. This is a bird mitigation area that's been identified to manage, uh, the temporary effect of the of the construction of the, of the cables and the trenching works.

01:33:50:14 - 01:34:21:19

Uh, it's replacement habitat for disturbance. We will not be adding bird numbers. This isn't about. There are already birds in the airport that are already managed through a bird strike mitigation plan. Both. Both airports are dealing with birds already. So everybody knows this is a heavily designated area where there are a lot of birds flying around. This is this is a, a measures to, uh, effectively um, um, uh, provide some replacement, uh, feeding areas for these birds.

01:34:22:00 - 01:34:52:16

And as the applicant has made entirely clear, it will be working with BA and with Blackpool Airport in conjunction with the bird strike mitigation plans they already have in place. Let's not forget that to manage this risk, they know how they do this already and we will be talking to them about how we do that, how these two things can safely co-exist. So it is it is being managed already in the current situation. And uh, there is absolutely no intention that that's going to change that position.

01:34:52:18 - 01:34:58:12

So I just want to make that entirely clear. We will update the examining authority at deadline one and at deadline two.

01:34:58:18 - 01:35:18:06

Thank you. Thank thank you for that. And I appreciate what you say. But we do have people from BA in in the room who who are emphasising their concerns. And I think they know better than possibly anyone else as to what those what the concerns are. So, you know, it's clearly, you know, we need to sort of listen to what they're saying.

01:35:18:08 - 01:35:18:23

So can I.

01:35:18:25 - 01:35:23:27

Just come in very briefly? I know you are quite keen to move on, but it is. It is relevant to that point.

01:35:24:07 - 01:35:26:15

Um, sorry. Can you just reintroduce yourself?

01:35:26:17 - 01:36:10:02

Sure. Samantha Grange for BA systems. Um, I think what we're saying is, yes, we we accept that there's obviously going to have to be ongoing engagement with the applicant, with the airport and ourselves. There was a lack of clarity around what has driven the selection of these habitat mitigation areas and the benefit areas. What we're trying to get to grips with is what has driven that selection, what assessment work has been done in order to drive the selection of those areas, and what account has been taken of any risk which may arise with regard to bird strike, in terms of not just the creation of new bird numbers, there may be new an increase in bird populations.

01:36:10:04 - 01:36:43:05

We don't know because we haven't seen the information. It's simply not part of the application. But in terms of displacement of existing populations. We also need to see that the assessment work has been done by the applicant, so that they are satisfied that will not happen, or give rise to a risk over and above what is the baseline position, which is something that I think we and the airport, Blackpool Airport would acknowledge. We are currently managing through our own mitigation plans, but that's a moving piece and it's forever changing.

01:36:43:09 - 01:37:15:05

So it's what assessment work the applicant has done to inform the selection process for those habitat creation, um, and creation areas and also benefit areas. And I think the other point I would like to make is around when this information is going to be available. And obviously we we've included this information within our relevant representation. It formed part and parcel of the rule nine letter. That rule nine letter came out in February. We're now some three months down the line and we're no further forward.

01:37:15:11 - 01:38:07:06

All we have is a holding response from the applicant that they will do X, Y and z to provide us with information. What they are saying they're going to provide, we have serious concerns, isn't going to satisfy us and isn't going to move us forward. And that's the principal reason why we're here today, to flag that to the applicant and to make that crystal clear. And that is in the context of the other DCO applications that we've we've been involved in, where, as you've identified, there were significant perhaps that's too strong a word, but there were areas of unresolved points at the end of both of those examinations, um, where we weren't able to get to a satisfactory, um, mutually acceptable position between ourselves and the applicant, those issues of ongoing discussion, areas of um, unresolved issues at the end of those examinations remain.

01:38:07:08 - 01:38:23:13

So we're no further forward in respect of those items either. And I think we come to this examination in that context, and that's why we're very keen to get the information we say we need and to get it as soon as possible so that we're not in the same situation at the end of this examination.

01:38:25:13 - 01:38:33:24

That's appreciated. Thank you very much for for that contribution. Mr.. Paul, did you want to make a final comment or is that a legacy hand?

01:38:34:27 - 01:39:10:25



No, it's one final comment and it will be short on the Bergerac issue. And then just two further points, which I just, just hopefully helpful um, to the examining authority on on another matter entirely, but under the aviation heading, um, the first point on the, on the bird strike issue and, um, I just want to make clear that the principal concern of Blackpool Airport is not necessarily the numbers, but it's the proximity of the live and moss, um, mitigation area to the airport's flight path. And it's that proximity issue, which is why I mentioned site selection, um, that we'd really like to, uh, drill down on through the further information that's hopefully going to be provided by the applicants.

01:39:11:25 - 01:39:43:13

Um, the second two points. Um, just a point of clarification. Miss Williamson made reference in the context of the cooperation agreement that we are negotiating to reducing, uh, impacts on Blackpool Airport. Um, one of the key principles underpinning that agreement is actually for no operational impact. Now, we are obviously negotiating the exact wording of how that principle is captured in legal terms. But I just wanted to make that clarification that that, um, we are seeking for there to be no operational impacts as a consequence of this project coming through the airport.

01:39:43:25 - 01:39:53:13

And then just the third and final point, I just wanted to offer up, um, a short technical note on the cap 791 process produced by the airport, if that, to the examining authority.

01:39:57:16 - 01:40:00:21

Sorry. Can you just repeat that very last point, please? Again.

01:40:01:16 - 01:40:08:25

It was just just to offer up. I know there's been a bit a bit of back and forth on on the cap 791 process. This is the process that the airport would have to go through.

01:40:09:02 - 01:40:15:23

Very, very helpful because, certainly I was certainly very confused about it. So that would be really helpful. Thank you for that.

01:40:16:22 - 01:40:19:17

Yeah, that's absolutely fine. We'll endeavour to provide it by deadline one.

01:40:19:22 - 01:40:22:17

Yeah that'll be fine by deadline one thank you very much indeed.

01:40:23:06 - 01:40:23:23

Thanks.

01:40:25:10 - 01:40:37:18

I don't think there's any more points that are going to be raised on this. So that does close the discussion about aviation. We're now going to go for a break and we're going to return at.

01:40:40:10 - 01:40:43:23

Ten minutes. So it's ten minutes okay. A short break.

01:40:45:19 - 01:40:49:18

1010 to 15. Yeah we're going to return at 10 to 4.

01:40:50:01 - 01:40:51:27

No not 10 to 4. That's 20 minutes.

01:40:53:13 - 01:41:02:15

Okay. Let's let's have go and guess my rules. Let's have 12 minutes because we need to move on, so I will we'll return here in 12 minutes.

01:41:02:17 - 01:41:03:27

1345.