

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
Hearing:	Q&A on the EA's Part 8
Date:	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_PT8

Created on: 2025-05-01 15:01:50

Project Length: 02:00:05

File Name: M&M_1MAY_ISH1_PT8

File Length: 02:00:05

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:14 - 00:00:37:14

All right. Thank you very much, everyone, for, um, returning on time after that rather short break. Um, apologies to Deborah Helm. We were aware that you wanted to make a comment, but we had to close up that, um, discussion. If there's anything you want to say, then please put it in writing. Um, we're now continuing the, um, the issue specific hearing one. Uh, our intention is to close this meeting, uh, by 515. Um, so there's still a lot to, um, get through.

00:00:37:23 - 00:01:03:20

Um, but on the whole, we we'd rather than having, um, general representations, we want to sort of stick to the, um, uh, the major points as, um, as we'd like to, um, to raise them. So moving on now to agricultural land, uh, those points. Um, Louise Staples from the NFU was here earlier, but I don't think she's here now. Um, she has put in.

00:01:04:04 - 00:01:05:18

Um, I am here.

00:01:05:24 - 00:01:08:03

Ah, you are here. Welcome.

00:01:08:14 - 00:01:15:09

But I can't see you. Actually, I've lost all, um, I don't know anybody else got the same thing, but. Or perhaps it's just me.

00:01:15:11 - 00:02:00:12

All right, well, as you're there, we'll keep you in the background. I was going to sort of, um, refer to your submission, but, um, uh, as it is, we'll, um, perhaps you could wait until you come in at, um, uh, a later point. Um, uh, but, uh, yeah. Thanks very much for attending. I know you've had to move things around a bit. Um, if I could just start by, um, uh, referring to paragraph two, .3.2.8 of PDA 005, um, and in in this, the applicants say that any areas required on a temporary basis to facilitate construction of the onshore substations will also be reinstated at the end of the construction and return to agricultural use.

00:02:01:15 - 00:02:29:11

However, with two separate projects, there is likely to be a time lapse of several years. This assertion assumes that the farm is still operational. Still has access to the markets with which it previously had

contracts, and can still employ agricultural workers. Is it not a rather large caveat to the statement concerning a return to agricultural use? So if I ask the applicants to respond to that, please.

00:02:32:25 - 00:03:03:27

Julia Tindale, on behalf of the applicants. Good afternoon. Good afternoon. In terms of reinstatement, um, with the construction compounds, there wouldn't be an issue with that. We have, um, obviously, uh, identified techniques within the outline soil management plan, um, that can be implemented, that's referenced, um, at 200, which would represent good practice measures in relation to the reinstatement of soils within those zones.

00:03:04:21 - 00:03:09:21

Um, in terms of I sorry, I didn't quite understand your second part of the point.

00:03:10:15 - 00:03:41:23

Well, the the point is that we were discussing construction timelines earlier, um, today, uh, and it was clear that it could be seven, ten even longer. Uh, now, if you take a the farm limited production during those years, that's a serious, significant length of time. And the chances are the farming business would have lost contracts. It would have lost workers. Is it still going to be viable for it to return after after a considerable length of time?

00:03:43:03 - 00:04:30:29

Julia Tindale on behalf of the applicant. Apologies for not quite understand your point. Yes, of course. So the compounds will be obviously in relation to, um, the individual parts of the project. So Morecambe and Morecambe. So there are separate compounds so it wouldn't be out of use for that a seven year period. Um, if they were built individually. So that's, that's the key to those points. So that that's a shorter period of time. We would assess that as a medium term impact in terms of EIA. And yes, we're working with the farm holdings, um, which the outputs have been doing are very diligently working with the farmers to look at, um, implementation measures to make sure that those businesses can basically be supported and continue in viable operation during the construction period.

00:04:31:01 - 00:04:34:18

And then once we're in operation, they would then continue in that in that way.

00:04:36:09 - 00:05:07:03

I hear that, but there's two projects here. So, um, first project might come along and the farmer is interrupted, waits a few years. Second project comes along, interrupted again. Uh, so in that time and it could be some some years the farmer could have lost his contracts, could well have lost his employees. Is it realistic to say, when you're returning it to agricultural use, that the actual business is still capable of running?

00:05:08:20 - 00:05:26:03

Well, for each project there would be, as I said, that they will be done individually. So there will be a 36 month and a 30 month duration of construction, and if there was a gap, they would be restored individually in an event so they can be returned to the farm holdings. So then they can continue.

00:05:26:24 - 00:05:29:08

So Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants, um,

00:05:30:24 - 00:06:03:26

are we talking about the land itself or are we talking about businesses? And because they are slightly different issues, um, in terms of agricultural land, um, and I think we started off talking about the construction compounds. So as we've made clear, there are separate construction compounds for each project. So in terms of the disturbance from those construction compounds, it's very difficult to talk about this theoretically, but let's talk about it theoretically. Um, uh, so there are separate construction compounds for each project.

00:06:03:28 - 00:06:50:17

So the area of land that is required for those construction compounds would only be taken out of use for a particular project for that period of time, which may or may not be the whole of that project's construction period. You've then got the cable corridors, which again, um, are a part of the reason they've been identified separately is so they're separate areas of land that each project will take as it goes through and from an agricultural and, and, and sort of soils perspective, agricultural land, as it were, as um Miss Tyndall has said, those areas will be reinstated, um, once construction has been completed so that they are restored to a restored to agricultural land.

00:06:50:23 - 00:07:14:25

They can be reused and the soil management plan, which I don't have the document reference number in front of me, I'm afraid we'll ensure that that that happens, that there is a condition survey that is, is undertaken prior to those works commencing and then, uh, restoration of the site, um, of the of the cable corridors. Um, once the construction of that part of the corridor has been completed.

00:07:15:05 - 00:07:54:24

I hear that is done, but I think that misses the point. The point is, and it referred to paragraph two, .3.2.8 where the reference was returned to agricultural use. And that just assumes that the land that the business is capable of being sustained. Uh, and I sort of said a number of reasons why the business might be in difficulties. So, um, you know, I hear what you say separately, I, I just repeat that. I think it's a rather large caveat to say it's going to return to agricultural use when that ignores some of the the implications on the business of loss of workers, uh, loss of contracts.

00:07:54:29 - 00:08:25:18

Um, and that's something which, um, uh, I don't think have been taken into account in the reply to paragraph 2.3.2.8. But anyway, let's move on. Um, I'm not going to move on to articles 29, four and five of the draft DCO. No, we're going to talk about the draft DCO separately, but this is in specific reference to, um, the agricultural land. It says, uh, the land will be returned to agricultural within one year of completion.

00:08:26:14 - 00:08:30:14

So please can you clarify when completion takes place?

00:08:33:15 - 00:08:51:02

Uh, Julia Tyndall, on behalf of the applicant, the completion of the restoration would take place at the end of each project. So as soon as the operations or construction operations are finished or a section of the routes. They would then be restored and can then be returned to the agricultural use.

00:08:52:03 - 00:09:28:22

List on behalf of the applicant. Can I just add something in that? Actually, if you continue to read, um, on in respect of, uh, that article, uh, it says, uh, which, um, the the end of the period of one year beginning with the date of completion of the work for which temporary possession of the land was taken. So what you need to do then is identify the specific land parcel that is being considered there. Refer it to, uh, the, uh, schedule regarding temporary possession, which indicates the purpose for which temporary possession for that, uh, that particular piece of land can be taken.

00:09:28:24 - 00:09:33:00

And that is the trigger for which the for, uh, for which the year period starts.

00:09:33:02 - 00:09:53:28

Yeah, I appreciate that. Um, it's the question of, uh, how does the individual landowner, the individual farmer know when that period. When construction ends. Why can't it be something along the lines that, um, no more than one year after commencement of the works?

00:09:55:18 - 00:10:21:13

Um, listen, on behalf of of the applicant, um, it it can't be a year between. Um, sorry. This this wording within this article, um, is, is standard wording across a number of development consent orders, and it relates to the taking of possession. It's a compulsory acquisition article. So possibly it's something that we should be talking about tomorrow rather than today. However.

00:10:21:26 - 00:10:24:09

Um, I'm asking you about it today and.

00:10:24:20 - 00:10:53:06

You're asking that today. Um, and, um, the reason it can't be a year after commencement of the works is that that the duration of the works in that particular area on that particular parcel may extend beyond a year. It it can't be dictated by the commencement of the works. It has to be dictated by the completion of the works, and that gives the time period within which that year, then, uh, would then, um, uh, that start to run.

00:10:54:00 - 00:11:26:08

Fine. I mean, it was just the point. I think I was trying to get over that. From the farmer's point of view, there's no certainty he's got no he or she's got no control over the time period. Anyway, moving on again. Um, and, uh, as Louise Staples is, is in the virtual room. Um, several farmers have instructed, um, uh, agents to represent them. Uh, they're also represented by the NFU. Uh, and they've raised a variety of questions in there.

00:11:26:17 - 00:12:07:06

Um, uh, are one five, nine six. Um, many of the points they're raising relate to uncertainty, uh, as there is insufficient detail on many of the issues. Um, I think you're going to say that, uh, that there's a

submission going to be coming in at deadline one, uh, dealing with some of those points. Um, Miss Staples, is there any particular point you want to raise? Um, bearing in mind I think the applicant will be responding pretty soon on, on on the the issues in your, uh, in your representation and your later representation, which is PDA.

00:12:07:08 - 00:12:08:12

Oh 41.

00:12:10:05 - 00:12:48:03

Thank yes. Louis Staples for the NFU and and a few members affected. Um, I just wanted to pick up on two points. Um, just with what you've been asking. Um, what I wanted to say is obviously the farmers in question that that are impacted. Just to highlight the impact. The problem with it being a linear cable route is that obviously when one scheme is built out, even if that one is reinstated first of all, and then the second one starts, you still have that linear impact of severing land through a farm.

00:12:48:17 - 00:13:19:06

So that is why I was trying to emphasize how important it is to know what the maximum length of time is that some of these businesses are going to have to withstand. I don't think it has been stated, uh, within the impact assessment, how many farm businesses may not be able to continue. And that sometimes is done. So that might be needed. And now that we know the maximum length of time could end up being 11 years.

00:13:21:02 - 00:13:45:22

Um, then just in regard to the completion of works, there always is a slight, um, practical issue here that it's more or less left to the landowners, farmers to keep asking, have have worked completed and and now are we the one year after? Because there isn't, as you say, a date that clearly marks that.

00:13:47:13 - 00:14:28:25

But just in regard to my submission, I did want to, um, just ask just 1 or 2 things because I'd been rechecking the project description, uh, documents. Um, and I know I've asked it and my, my, three of my areas of concern are the link boxes and wanting to know the worst scenario of how link boxes could be located in a field, especially if the two projects are built out at different times, because the worst that the staggering is, the more impact those link boxes will have on day to day operations of the farmers.

00:14:29:12 - 00:15:12:13

And I've been asking for a sketch plan to show this, but that that is yet hasn't been forthcoming. Um, then de watering it does state it, um, in the project description document that if they if they have to, they might have to, as in pump water out of a trench onto the land. And everyone who is acting, all the agents acting and the NFU is really concerned about that and then decommissioning it, there is a problem that we would really want to see if decommissioning takes place, that anything down to 1.2 is is removed.

00:15:12:20 - 00:15:30:09

So that means that link boxes and the cables that connect between the link box and the jointing pit would be removed at decommissioning. Otherwise those features stay there and again have an impact carrying on even after a scheme is being decommissioned on day to day operations.

00:15:31:29 - 00:15:39:23

I'm not going to highlight any more because they're obviously in my submission. But but those are three quite serious points of concern. Thank you.

00:15:41:06 - 00:16:04:21

Thank you very much for, for for that submission and, and um, uh, coming along this afternoon. Um, as I say, I think the applicant is going to respond by saying that, um, they will be making a submission at D1. Uh, responding to your, um, your PDA. Oh 41. Is there anything else you want to say concerning Miss Staples? Other points?

00:16:04:25 - 00:16:39:11

Uh, Liz, done on behalf of the applicant. Um, that response has already been sent to Miss Staples directly, so it's just it will just be submitted to the examination. Um, I would just like confirmation from Miss Staples as to those, um, affected parties that she's specifically representing for the purposes of this application, you did mention, sir, that she was representing parties. Um, we're not aware that she's actually actually instructed by any party that she's appearing for the NFU in general members rather than anybody in particular, but be helpful to have confirmation of that.

00:16:39:15 - 00:17:03:15

Yeah. I mean that's fine. I mean, it's entirely usual on DCO projects for the NFU to become involved and to be representing a number of parties, Miss Staples. And if you could just, um, uh, send in details. Don't obviously need to do it today, but if you could send in details by one of the parties that you're representing. Um, I'm sure. Sure. That's no problem.

00:17:04:00 - 00:17:06:29

Yeah. I confirm I can send the list in for the next deadline. Thank you.

00:17:07:10 - 00:17:08:15

Thank you very much indeed.

00:17:11:24 - 00:18:02:18

Um, can we can we move on to, um, soil management? Um, Natural England, um, uh, has made, um, a representation, and they, uh, they say that the applicant needs to undertake a detailed Tailed agricultural land classification. At this stage, um should be undertaken during. During the summer. Um, they they they further say that the commitment to restore land needs to be secured. Uh, what steps are being taken to meet the concerns of Natural England? Uh, as at the moment you've seen that they've given the issue red status, uh, which means that the issue around ALC is so complex, um, that it's unlikely to be resolved during the examination period without a fundamental change in approach.

00:18:04:28 - 00:18:45:18

Uh, Julia Tyndall, on behalf of the applicant, um, the approach we've taken to the ALC and soil surveys, um, does provide a, uh, robust baseline both for producing an outline soil management plan

and also for the assessment of effects on ALC. Um, This is quite an unusual cable route, in actual fact, because there is very good detailed soil published information available via the sort of the Lancashire, sorry sort of the Lancashire coast plus also um coastal plain and also the shores of Preston district and they are quite a detailed scale which is unusual.

00:18:45:20 - 00:19:21:03

You normally are dealing with national soil mapping at a scale of 1 to 250,000, whereas those plans are at one to an inch to a mile. Um, so therefore you have a good baseline of information. And those surveys were, were are on other sites that I've dealt with. A lot of them are pretty accurate. So that's a really good starting point. From that we scoped um at scoping stage that we would undertake RLC surveys within samples of the district, different known soil types to identify the, um, basically the nature of the land classification within those.

00:19:21:12 - 00:20:02:22

And that's what we've done and survey data within the soils annex to chapter six of the ES, which is um app 106 uh, contains the results of those surveys. If it would be useful, I could show the plans and just take you through the main soil types that we have looked at. Um, but they provide a very good representation of those soils and of the ILC within those. And on that basis, we can therefore assess, um, based on the detailed published soil mapping and those representative soil types, the distribution of, of ALK grading across that site.

00:20:02:25 - 00:20:37:06

And we have taken a precautionary approach to that in that where we've assessed a certain grade or grades within each soil type, we've applied the highest grade to those, um, that assessment to ensure that we're precautionary in how we've done that, that assessment. We've also undertaken detailed site assessments at the substation areas and the areas of permanent land loss. And that has shown there to be a major adverse effect of permanently on agricultural land and land classification on best, most versatile land.

00:20:37:08 - 00:20:40:05

So we have undertaken a robust assessment in that term.

00:20:42:23 - 00:21:22:12

Thank thank you for that. Um, obviously you've, um, taken into account, uh, the, the, um, provisions in, in, um, paragraphs 511 of n one, uh, and the policy requirements, um, and, uh, yeah, I mean, you've, you've given a helpful explanation, but I think I, I want to hear specifically not today, but you can provide a written note as to how those tests in one are going to be met because, um, uh, Natural England seem to think at the moment you're struggling to meet those tests.

00:21:22:14 - 00:21:32:13

So as I say, I don't necessarily need to hear about it today. But can you provide a written note by deadline, one, as to how those tests at paragraph 511 are going to be met?

00:21:33:15 - 00:21:56:26

Yes, we can provide clarification. I would also just want to add that. Then of course, we've then built that information about soil types, etc. into an outline soil management plan, which would then

basically lead to the restoration of the soils in terms of those qualities of land, so that if the only significant effect would be a permanent loss, basically at the substations of best and most versatile through a land.

00:21:57:02 - 00:22:17:07

Okay. And I'm also going to ask, um, uh, you to, um, provide a notice to, uh, what other DCO projects, um, have gone ahead without an ALC, um, being undertaken? Yeah. Again, a note will do.

00:22:17:21 - 00:22:21:21

Yes, I can give you several examples of which I have actually personally been involved in.

00:22:21:23 - 00:22:22:29

That would be most helpful.

00:22:23:09 - 00:22:41:03

So I'd just like to say that where surveys have been undertaken, they have been undertaken at a detailed scale. They have been undertaken at one boring per hectare, which meets the guidance of Natural England. Um, but as I said, they have been undertaken in representative soil types, which has been approached, we've used on many acres.

00:22:41:29 - 00:22:56:01

I just press you a bit more in relation to that. Um, because the requirement in the DCO says that, um, a soil management plan will be undertaken at the appropriate stage of the route.

00:22:57:02 - 00:23:40:24

I can list down on behalf of the applicant. This comes back to the staging point that we talked about this morning. The stage is the grouping of works that are pulled together, that are joined together to be discharged by the local authority. So it is in respect of a potentially Either a single or a grouping of work areas, um, per project. That would be and that's where the soil management plan would be done. So the likelihood, the reason for doing it in a staged approach is that the soil management around, um, uh, let's say the golf course and the, uh, and the airport potentially is going to be very different to the soil management that you're looking at for, um, some parts of the cable route and elsewhere.

00:23:40:26 - 00:23:57:00

So it won't be the same soil management plan in terms of the way that things are being done. It will be bespoke to each stage of the project, i.e group of works that are carried out at a particular point and have a have a management plan that attaches to them.

00:23:57:21 - 00:24:12:13

So is there any way that a farmer can, can can work out when his assessments could be undertaken? And so is there any decision as to uh, is there is there any where set out as to where that what stage is where?

00:24:14:29 - 00:24:21:04

It is done on behalf of the applicants? No. At this stage, we haven't provided an indicative staging plan.

00:24:28:24 - 00:24:33:10

Um, Miss Staples, you you you want to come back in? I think so, please.

00:24:33:12 - 00:25:04:10

Please. Thank you. Louise Staples for the NFU. Um, we have requested, um. And I believe it has been agreed that there will be, uh, like a soil condition, uh, survey undertaken and then a statement produced actually for each farm. And this is so specifically when it gets to the end of the construction, we every farmer will know, uh, what condition their soil was before any work started.

00:25:04:15 - 00:25:13:28

And then what, um, aftercare is required when the reinstatement is carried out to get that soil back to the condition. It was before the works started.

00:25:16:28 - 00:25:29:01

Liz. Just to appreciate, you haven't asked me to respond to that, but I thought it might be helpful. That's all set out in the outline soil management plan, so I suggest Miss Staples has a look through that. Thank you.

00:25:35:09 - 00:25:42:22

Right. Um, I noticed that, uh, there's another hand up. I think that might be Sheila Hall. Is it? Do you want to?

00:25:44:09 - 00:26:24:26

Yes it is. Thank you. Is Sheila Sheila Hall, local farmer? I just wanted to flag, um, that there are many fields that are going to be impacted by the access to compounds, the location of the compound or the cable, um, trenches for both projects, so that if the projects happen sequentially, those fields will be out of production for more than the duration of just one project. So I think it is a very important concern that you were exploring at the beginning about the impact on the viability of the farm businesses from the protracted nature of the project duration.

00:26:28:00 - 00:26:31:25

Thank you. Thank you for that. Mrs. Hall, um.

00:26:35:22 - 00:27:10:14

Can I just ask, um, next question about, um, livestock security? Um, the the the outline construction fencing plan, which is AP 203 203, provides some indication of the proposals. But several of the farmers, um, are emphasizing that they require 24 hour access to their livestock and machinery. Um, we heard yesterday from from one of the IPS, uh, the interested parties that, um, the gates of her farm were left open when inspections were undertaken.

00:27:10:29 - 00:27:23:00

So how can the applicants ensure that such access is continued? 24 hour access is continued during the construction periods and thereby livestock security is maintained.

00:27:24:24 - 00:27:26:19

Any taken on behalf of the applicant.

00:27:26:21 - 00:27:27:07

Um.

00:27:27:19 - 00:27:53:20

We are in ongoing engagement with the landowners across the corridor regarding their livestock farms and the practices on the farm holdings. And, um, during the pre commencement stage of the works, we will be talking to them about accommodation works, which include the use of crossing points and fencing types that will be required to ensure those safety measures are put in place. Um, and that secure through the outline code of construction practice.

00:27:55:09 - 00:28:05:28

Can you comment on what we heard from from the from the IP yesterday about, um, uh, when the initial inspections were undertaken, gates were left open.

00:28:12:11 - 00:28:21:18

On behalf of the applicant. I think Miss Hall was relating to survey works, and I think we addressed that with her at the time of the works to resolve those concerns.

00:28:23:12 - 00:28:24:06

How, how how.

00:28:24:10 - 00:28:30:16

Can you be certain that the same situation will not arise when then further inspections are undertaken?

00:28:42:22 - 00:29:15:29

On behalf of the applicant. Um, the applicants are have have had feedback regarding the survey work that was undertaken. Um, the uh construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with the outline codes of construction and management plans. Those weren't in place for the purposes of the survey work. Um, which is unfortunate. Um, but there isn't a requirement for them to be, um. So the, the the applicant has taken on board. Um, what happened during these things do happen occasionally.

00:29:16:01 - 00:29:50:27

It's unfortunate. Uh, and, um, not intentional is all I can say. Um, but, um, there is a, there is an appropriate, um, and secured framework around the way that construction activities will be undertaken. Um, in respect of all of those land holdings through the work set out in the Code of construction practice, uh, working with the agricultural liaison officer who will be on site and, uh, known to all of the, uh, to all of the farmers in terms of the work that's going on and through the soil management plan and those other those other mechanisms.

00:29:52:02 - 00:30:25:24

Thank you for that. And, you know, it's appreciated that, that, um, uh, problems sometimes do occur, but obviously livestock security is so important and particularly with, um, the fact that farmers are facing quite significant demands from supermarkets, etc., for, for, for contracts. So they're under

regular surveillance. So it is it is an important issue, as I'm sure you appreciate. Um, is there anybody else in the room who wants to make a comment? Mr.

00:30:25:26 - 00:30:27:15

cope steak. Yeah. From file council.

00:30:27:17 - 00:31:03:09

Yep. John Council. Just very brief, um, with a bit of a recurring theme, um, throughout the session so far, but we've heard concerns about lack of, um, detail and information just to highlight that we are required by our local plan when considering renewable energy development will affect grades one, two and three, in this case two and three agricultural land to balance the economic, um benefits and other benefits of the of the agricultural land as existing against the benefits of the proposed development, and it's very difficult to do that.

00:31:03:12 - 00:31:11:20

When we have these legitimate concerns being raised, when we don't have sufficient information. At this stage to carry out that balancing exercise.

00:31:14:15 - 00:31:34:02

Juliet, half the applicants in terms of the BMV, we have produced a robust assessment and it's on a conservative basis. And therefore. That that judgment can be made. And we have identified, as I said, a major adverse impact on the best, most versatile land in terms of predominantly through a land being permanently affected.

00:31:36:00 - 00:31:51:06

Just very briefly, the point I'm making is we're specifically required to balance the economic benefits on both sides and other benefits, and we're hearing questions. There have been questions that the examining authorities provided about business and economic impacts that have not been answered.

00:31:52:21 - 00:32:14:09

Okay. Thanks. If we just move on to my last, last question and it's more to ask for something to be provided. Um, and hopefully you can do this fairly easily, but could you provide plans showing how the proposed development would affect the land held by individual farms, so that we can get a better understanding of the effects on each farm?

00:32:22:11 - 00:32:24:27

Taken on behalf of the applicant, yes, we will provide that.

00:32:25:04 - 00:32:29:18

So hopefully by deadline, one by deadline. That's great. Thank you very much indeed.

00:32:31:15 - 00:32:38:27

So that completes this, um, this section on on agriculture. Oh hang on. No it isn't.

00:32:40:18 - 00:32:41:09

Yes.

00:32:41:27 - 00:33:19:09

Very briefly sir. Um, Angus Walker for Newton with Clifton, etc.. Um, I think Mr. Cope state was possibly quoting from paragraph five 1134 of Ian, one about balancing economic and other benefits of the land that is being taken. I'm glad that the applicant acknowledges that the it is a major adverse impact, the loss of BMV land. And I note that the two substations are on such land, and these obviously didn't feature very highly in their brag assessment of where they should be sited, but we think it does.

00:33:19:12 - 00:33:37:09

The project does not fulfill this paragraph that it says they should not site US scheme on best and most versatile, versatile land without justification. We don't think there is sufficient justification because there are alternative routes available. That's all I wanted to say.

00:33:40:08 - 00:33:53:04

Thank you, Mr. Walker. Um, I think there's no need for the applicant to respond to that. So, um, we're now moving on to the next section, which is flood risk. Thanks. Thank you very much. Who contributed to to that section? Thank you.

00:34:34:24 - 00:34:54:27

Okay. Can I ask my first question in relation to flood risk? Is the applicant ready? Okay. So very briefly, could you please explain, um, or describe what's going on with your negotiations with the Environment Agency at the moment. This is in relation to flood risk specifically.

00:35:04:12 - 00:35:45:20

Um, Leo as well. On behalf of the applicants, um, the applicants met the Environment Agency on the 24th of April to discuss the responses to the relevant reps. Um, with respect to progress on on that, we went through all of the relevant reps to for the for the Environment Agency to understand our responses to their comments. Um, one key one was that with respect to the the protected provisions, um, which we the applicants would want to note that we are engaging with the Environment Agency to ensure that these are agreed within the examination period.

00:35:46:10 - 00:35:57:18

Um, we believe that there are limited points that need to be agreed. And we are we? We have you know, we have the assurance that this will be agreed during the examination period.

00:36:01:03 - 00:36:30:22

Okay. Thank you. Just, uh, um, a slightly more specific question in relation to Environment Agency requesting specific word specific wording for, uh, hydrogeological risk assessment and, um, and the requirement for a foundation risk assessment. Now, you've responded to that stating that you do not consider, um, that it's necessary. Is that matter being further discussed with the Environment Agency?

00:36:35:18 - 00:36:54:15

Um, Leo, as well, on behalf of the applicant? Um, yes, we have progressed that discussion in terms of the wording on foundation risk assessment with the Environment Agency. And um, we do, we do. We do believe, like I said, that this we agree on a set of wording and that will be updated accordingly.

00:36:56:02 - 00:37:15:28

Thank you. That's helpful. Uh. Moving on. Could you, uh, briefly, um, summarize if there has been further engagement with United Utilities Water Limited up to date and this is in relation to flood risk, water supply and hydrogeology and the issues they have raised.

00:37:28:23 - 00:38:05:08

At least on on behalf of the applicants. Um, matters related to United Utilities are in respect of the protected provisions. Um, that will be agreed, um, with United Utilities in order to protect um assets that they have, um, in the vicinity of the project. So, um, there's nothing particularly in respect of the assessment that we've carried out or any of those matters. There matters for the, uh, agreement and discussion on protected provisions, which is ongoing, uh, at the moment. And we were going to provide an update, I think, tomorrow on where we are with negotiations with various parties on protected provisions.

00:38:09:09 - 00:38:10:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:38:12:20 - 00:38:41:27

In relation to Lancashire County Council, as, um, the lead local flood authority, they have expressed several concerns, uh, and requested um and basically requested further negotiations with yourselves. You stated that you are confident that all the matters that they have raised can be addressed through the examination. I would just like some, uh, progress. Um, update, please.

00:38:46:21 - 00:39:27:07

Um, there are so many. On behalf of the applicants. Um, the applicants can confirm that. Yes, we are indeed working closely. We are closely aligned with the local flood authority. Um, with respect to the relevant reps they put in. Um, the applicants met the the local authority on the 24th of April, and the applicants are preparing an updated draft to reflect the discussions of that meeting. Um, we believe that there are limited points again, um, in terms of the discussions remaining, and these will be updated and agreed in the protective provisions during the examination periods.

00:39:27:23 - 00:39:43:05

Um, there are specific issues with respect to, to, to flood flood risks, which were mentioned in the relevant steps. And all of that will be captured. Um, if you have specific queries, I believe my colleague can can pick blows up.

00:39:46:27 - 00:39:57:28

In the interest of time management, I'm just looking for general updates at this point. So are you going to provide a note, maybe covering, uh, the key points discussed?

00:40:00:09 - 00:40:20:07

That is done on behalf of the applicant. Um, as I said, we're giving an update on, uh, discussions with various parties on protective provisions. One of them is the lead local flood authority. So we'll pick that up. Um, in terms of of where we are in progress and certainly be giving an update with a view to resolving those as quickly as we can in the examination.

00:40:21:19 - 00:40:43:06

Thank you, I appreciate that. I have several parties who have expressed a wish to speak on this item. Um, I will open this now and allow those parties to make representations. Is there anyone who wishes to speak in relation to flood risk or Drainage issues. Hydrogeology.

00:41:06:27 - 00:41:07:15

Okay.

00:41:08:02 - 00:41:41:18

Um. Ross. Forsey. The Squires Gate residents group. Uh, one of the main reasons I've come here today is to hear what has been said and what has been recorded, and what is how the progress is going. With discussions around what's happening to our sand dunes and the flood risks. I'm just appalled that I'm sitting here again. It seems to be a repetitive thing that the information is not here.

00:41:42:12 - 00:42:12:25

There is nothing to be told that people have spoken to one another. But we, the people who live here, the public, we are not to be told what's said, what stage it's at. All I know about the sand dunes is they've been there for a very long time, and in the mid 80s, local people started at Stargate to contribute to the building of those sand dunes to make sure that we had good strong flood defences.

00:42:13:07 - 00:42:43:18

And as recently as 2022, the Environment Agency gave £1 million to this area to continue making sure that we had a properly good natural flood risk. So anything that messes with those sand dunes, anything, any idea of digging them up and putting concrete underneath them, or whatever the hell it is, is utterly ridiculous.

00:42:43:26 - 00:43:14:15

And for people to sit here who are paid vast amounts of money in great numbers, all of you people, and nobody can say, after all this time, we've all congregated here, and I'm sitting here thinking, oh, great, this is my bit. What about the sand dunes? Oh, no. We'll talk about that another day. We can't we don't know. We've talked to some people. We're going to write a report. It'll be on the 20th of May. Maybe it'll be in this period. All I'd like to say is it's not good enough.

00:43:15:00 - 00:43:27:29

And in most areas of life and work, you wouldn't get away with behaving like this. It wouldn't be acceptable. So that's all I'd like to say. Thank you.

00:43:30:06 - 00:43:34:08

Thank you. Can I ask the applicant to very briefly respond to the.

00:43:39:12 - 00:43:41:25

Sorry. What's another hand up at the back? Oh, yes.

00:43:43:00 - 00:43:43:17

Okay.

00:43:46:21 - 00:43:48:06

Hi, Deborah. Home from.

00:43:48:08 - 00:44:22:07

Walcott. Um, I live close to the airport, but I also live quarter of a mile away from the sand dunes. The sand dunes are our flood defences. There are flood defences in Blackpool. There are flood flood defences in lithium. There are conversations about new flood defences in Saint Anne's. The sand dunes are our areas, flood defences. If you dig into under them two massive tunnels and fill them with concrete, you display, you displace the drainage of water.

00:44:22:09 - 00:45:12:10

I've seen what happens when the high tides wash away the sand and expose the roots. This project will slice the roots of the maroon grass off, thereby destabilising the sand. I do not see how it can do otherwise. These sand dunes have been built up year after year, with everybody's Christmas trees in good faith to build these sand dunes to stop us from the floods that are likely are predicted to the sea level, rising to wash into our very flat, uh, residential lands affecting um, transport links, shops, businesses, residential homes.

00:45:12:28 - 00:45:48:11

It's not a small thing to do to destabilise the sand dunes. And here I am once again, living at, uh, the very forefront of what will happen when this project goes. If this project goes along, it's all very well to say we've had discussions. Um, we believe that this will happen, which is a word I keep hearing, but I don't feel very comforted by that. I don't want any destabilisation in the flood defences that we have.

00:45:48:29 - 00:45:51:11

Um, seems pretty inhuman to me.

00:45:54:17 - 00:45:59:28

Thank you. Thank you. Gentlemen. The front row, please. Mr. Barlow.

00:46:03:10 - 00:46:39:13

Hi. David Barlow, uh. Lower lane. Um, I should probably wear off now. I live opposite at the substation, so I'd like to ask the applicant. Uh, where are they going to take. Obviously, these substations are 22 hectares. Where are they going to take the top water, uh, from these substations. Um, I'm aware that Dale Brook, uh, takes in, uh, many fields further up from. From me. From there it goes into certain dykes, and then it ends up in one dyke that's at the back of my property.

00:46:40:00 - 00:46:58:24

From there it makes its way out to the River Ribble. But on high tide it can't make its way out. I've had my barn under one foot of water, just under heavy rain conditions. So can I ask the applicant where all this top water is going to be drained off to? Thank you.

00:47:02:07 - 00:47:10:18

Thank you. I've got two hands up online as well, so could I invite those submissions? I'll

00:47:12:09 - 00:47:13:13

first please.

00:47:15:19 - 00:47:18:02

Is that environmental agency? Just to clarify.

00:47:19:09 - 00:47:24:07

Yes. Good afternoon. It's Liz Lochhead speaking on behalf of the Environment Agency.

00:47:25:21 - 00:47:26:20

Yes. Thank you.

00:47:27:11 - 00:48:01:08

So I'd like to make a couple of comments. Um, following on from the discussions. Um, the first one. Well, to begin with, I'd like to say that we have, um, had, um, continuing productive conversations with the applicants, and I thank them for that. Um, we have got, um, we've made our relevant reps and you have seen those and they have, um, responded to those. And as Leo said, we had a meeting on the 24th of April to discuss that further, and that was productive.

00:48:01:26 - 00:48:50:15

Um, a couple of things I'd like to highlight now. One, regarding, um, the hydrogeological risk assessment for the, um, works that would go under the dunes. Um, we do have, um, outstanding concerns at the moment that although there is a commitment to, um, do that, um, risk assessment at the moment, that commitment is not secured, um, in a way that we feel is sufficiently, um, upfront in the design per design process so that, um, the findings from that risk assessment can usefully, if necessary, influence the design of the crossing as it goes under the dunes.

00:48:51:04 - 00:49:21:19

Um, as the local resident said, the dunes are obviously a really vital flood defence. Um, and we support the the intention to go under the dunes rather than to, um, trench through them. Um, but obviously any works that would disrupt the groundwater, um, the movement of groundwater under the dunes, the, the dunes do support a, um, an ecosystem that's dependent on the groundwater.

00:49:21:23 - 00:49:54:10

So they, they have two, To two functions. One is as a defense and one is as a terrestrial ecosystem that is dependent on the groundwater underneath. So from those two aspects, we're concerned that, um, those risks are properly identified in sufficient time so that they can influence the design of that crossing. Um, so we're in discussions with the applicants at the moment as to how those concerns can be addressed.

00:49:55:00 - 00:49:58:02

Um, so that's my first point. Um.

00:50:04:15 - 00:50:41:19

The other point, this is just a minor point, but it occurred to me, as is um, previously there was talk about water supply. Um, and it was in the, the vehicle movement section. And there was talk about bringing tank potential for bringing tankers of water, um, onto site. Uh, we have raised this is a minor point, but we did raise the importance of, um, if abstraction was required for construction water purposes, then it does need to be recognized that that would need a license from the Environment Agency.

00:50:41:22 - 00:51:13:12

And they can take time to come through. And we have had experiences in the past where it's recognized it's mentioned in the construction management plan. Um, but it's not um, it's not really taken into account until, um, too late down the line. And then, um, the Environment Agency is accused of causing delays to the project because it takes the time to grant, um, that abstraction consent.

00:51:13:14 - 00:51:18:14

So that's a minor point, but I just wanted to include that here. Um.

00:51:20:24 - 00:51:37:12

The other point that I did want to raise was, um, with regards to our protective provisions, we are in productive, ongoing discussions with those though, um, I can agree concur with Leo's statement to that effect. Um.

00:51:39:23 - 00:51:41:08

The, um,

00:51:42:27 - 00:52:13:20

the other remaining point I wanted to flag was to do with the the crossings under the main rivers. Um, so HDD or whichever method is used to go under the main rivers. Um, we are in discussion with the applicants about the measures to, um, ensure that those are done, um, so as not to cause flood risk, not to cause damage to the, um, the watercourses, flood defences, whatever. Um, so that's ongoing.

00:52:14:02 - 00:52:41:04

Um, but we we do need to make sure that the Efficient design detail. Um, we that we are consulted on sufficient design detailing in good times so that we can have constructive input into that, um, design rather than just being presented with a finished design that we then have to, um, try and work with or comment on.

00:52:44:15 - 00:52:45:00

Thank you.

00:52:45:02 - 00:52:47:09

Thank you. Thank you. That's very helpful.

00:52:49:01 - 00:52:55:15

And and finally, if I could move to Miss Staples, I think your hand is up as well.

00:52:56:13 - 00:52:57:06

Thank you.

00:52:58:29 - 00:53:34:23

So Louise Staples for the NFU. Um, it was just one question in regard to field drainage. Um, I can confirm that we are in discussions about how field drainage will be dealt with. Um, and this is ongoing. There's just one final sort of aspect that hasn't really been covered yet is what happens in, say, 30 years time once everything's operational. How? How will it be possible, say, for a land drainage contractor, if new drainage is needed to cross the cable line? So how will.

00:53:34:25 - 00:53:52:17

Yeah, how will a connection? So if the outfall is on one side of the cable route and they're trying to put. Yeah. To take, you know field drainage in the other side, we haven't yet really secured how our drainage contractor will be able to go. Or if they will be able to go under the cables. Thank you.

00:53:53:28 - 00:53:59:03

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to make a comment? Mr.. Oh.

00:54:00:15 - 00:54:32:25

You'll see if Lancashire County Council, I can confirm that there have been some good discussions between the Alpha and the applicant on, on this project, which is, which is welcomed. But there's a couple of risks that I want to sort of highlight that need to be recognised and taken on board. Whilst in looking at watercourses and ordinary watercourses we use a map system, but there are the unmapped watercourses where that is above ground and below ground. They need to be taken into consideration when looking at mitigation.

00:54:33:02 - 00:54:46:16

That's point one. And the second point is when we haven't got a watercourses, it's about having buffer zones around trees and hedgerows. So therefore those watercourses remain stable. Thank you.

00:54:48:01 - 00:54:48:22

Thank you.

00:54:50:20 - 00:54:54:02

That's the applicant is going to respond to the points.

00:54:54:04 - 00:55:27:18

Write this down on behalf of the applicant. I'll try and orchestrate a response to um to those points.

Um, which will be please doesn't involve me saying anything. Um, so, um, I think that first of all, Mr. Elson is going to, uh, who is an engineer for the project, is going to explain how the, uh, how the cables will be installed underneath the, um, the sand dunes, because I think there's potentially some misunderstandings around what that is and how the impacts are going to be.

00:55:28:02 - 00:55:58:02

Uh, and then, uh, I think Miss Russell is going to deal with the, uh, hydrological. Uh, apologies. Mr. Graham, who's sitting next to Miss Russell, will deal with the, um, the point around the hydrological

risk assessment that the Environment Agency raised. Uh, and then we had questions around surface water drainage at the substations, um, and, uh, some on, um, uh, drainage, agricultural field drainage.

00:55:58:08 - 00:56:12:04

Uh, I realize there's quite a bit of material to, to cover, and we are heading towards closing times if it can be kept brief, and any further elaboration can be provided at deadline. One, that's probably a good way forward because there are some other items we would like to get on to.

00:56:12:18 - 00:56:14:28

Yes, but it is also important that we have an opportunity.

00:56:15:00 - 00:56:15:15

Absolutely.

00:56:15:17 - 00:56:16:02

Yes.

00:56:16:04 - 00:56:22:17

Yeah. And you'll be able to respond in the library's deadline one as well in writing. So just be conscious of that please, in the responses.

00:56:22:23 - 00:56:25:19

Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Olsen, do you want to. Thank you.

00:56:25:25 - 00:56:31:03

So Paul Olsen, on behalf of both the applicants with regards to the crossing.

00:56:31:10 - 00:57:07:21

At the risk of increasing flood risk through interference through the sand dunes. Um, we can confirm that the sand dunes are being crossed underneath by treacherous technology at a suitable depth and designed so there'll be no impact to the overall height of the sand dunes. Um, so it won't impact the existing flood defence, um, situation that you have with the sand dunes in place. We've also given the commitment that this treacherous crossing underneath the sand dunes will punch out on the beach side of the sand dunes to at least 100m away from the existing, uh, sand dune boundary.

00:57:07:23 - 00:57:08:08

We.

00:57:09:28 - 00:57:16:29

List on the up. The other point is that there will be no concrete involved in this. I think there was a comment regarding concrete. Thank you.

00:57:21:24 - 00:57:54:21

Uh, this is Richard Graham, uh, acting for the applicant just to respond on the query regarding the hydrogeological risk assessment. So those, um, meetings that were just mentioned earlier are ongoing. Um, the applicant is in discussion with the EA to essentially delineate the scope of a risk assessment

to be undertaken. Um, we did a preliminary sort of screening assessment within the ES, um, where we looked at very, um, precautionary approaches to, to identify likely dewatering risks and found those to be very, very low.

00:57:55:15 - 00:58:05:18

Um, those will be refined. And then we will essentially present that information to E and alongside the detailed design and progress, those, as everyone hopefully would expect.

00:58:13:26 - 00:58:21:24

On behalf of both applicants. With regard to the comments made with substation um drainage. The applicants have produced an.

00:58:22:10 - 00:58:22:25

Outline.

00:58:22:27 - 00:58:23:12

Operational.

00:58:23:14 - 00:58:23:29

Drainage.

00:58:24:01 - 00:58:25:09

Management plan. That's EP.

00:58:26:00 - 00:58:26:27

215.

00:58:26:29 - 00:58:38:10

Which sets out the arrangements for management of sub of surface water from the substations, including the outfalls to Dowd Brook, and those will be in line with existing greenfield runoff rates.

00:58:41:08 - 00:59:20:05

And then listed on the applicant. Um, just the point that Miss Staples raised about, um, putting in additional drainage, um, once the cables are installed, um, uh, the, uh, the restrictions that will be put in place over the cable corridor, um, allow the, uh, allow agricultural speak, agricultural practice. Um, down to 0.6m to be undertaken without the consent of the applicant, but if it's below that, it needs to be with the consent of the applicant, so the position of the cables will be understood, and then how those are, how those interact and how any future drainage would, would do that.

00:59:21:23 - 00:59:43:00

Thank you. Um, we are going to move on from this item. I do realise it was fairly brief. Uh, but I want to reassure everyone that there will be future opportunities to explore those subjects in depth. And so the next item on the agenda is onshore ecology, uh, including biodiversity, net gain. So.

01:00:07:23 - 01:00:29:05

And so first I've got a request without going into further discussions on that matter. Could I ask the applicant and that a note is submitted explaining to what extent a bird strike has been considered when uh mitigation areas, uh were selected,

01:00:31:00 - 01:00:34:10

mitigation areas and biodiversity net gain areas?

01:00:35:09 - 01:00:36:01

Laura Martin.

01:00:36:03 - 01:00:36:18

On behalf.

01:00:36:20 - 01:00:42:27

Of the applicant, um, taking on board the comments raised earlier, the applicants will organize a organize.

01:00:42:29 - 01:00:44:13

A strategy workshop with both.

01:00:44:15 - 01:00:51:16

Blackpool Airport and BAE systems. And this will include site selection and further refine details on the mitigation and.

01:00:51:18 - 01:00:52:18

Biodiversity.

01:00:52:22 - 01:01:05:10

And benefit areas. Following this workshop, we will provide an update to the Examining Authority at deadline one, and we'll also include details on the site selection for those areas.

01:01:05:21 - 01:01:40:01

Thank you. That's very much appreciated. And so moving on. Um, impact on ripple um and out estuaries, um special Protected area and Ramsar site has been briefly mentioned in relation to offshore ecology. And but my question is if agreement can't be reached with Natural England when we as an examining authority, uh, can expect the derogation case to be submitted into the application.

01:01:42:12 - 01:02:03:03

Laura Martin, on behalf of both the applicant, as my colleague Miss Schakowsky outlined earlier, we did, in fact have a, um, meeting and site visit with Natural England on Monday, and both parties think that there is appropriate mitigation for um and therefore a derogation case will not be submitted.

01:02:08:18 - 01:02:21:04

If that position doesn't change, at what point would one be provided though, unless you're so confident that it will? Well, obviously I'm not going to Natural England here today, but if the position didn't change, what would the situation be?

01:02:23:05 - 01:02:29:24

What's the sort of the the date beyond which one would need to be provided of agreement, wasn't there?

01:02:35:04 - 01:02:53:03

Um, list done on behalf of the applicant? Um, the the applicants have agreed aurally with Natural England that there's no issue for the rebel and alt spa, so that needs to be documented and then submitted to the examination. Thank you.

01:02:56:27 - 01:02:58:10

Okay. Uh,

01:03:00:08 - 01:03:25:28

in relation to, uh, the construction scenario statement as, um, 070, that was recently submitted. What are the implications on the Habitats regulation assessment? And is this assessment going to be updated to, um, take into account the four year gap scenario?

01:03:31:04 - 01:03:45:00

Uh, lays down on behalf of the applicants. Um, the um, the potential gap of up to four years between the projects was taken into account in the Habitats Regulations assessment, so there's no further update needed.

01:03:50:09 - 01:03:58:03

Uh, on on behalf of the applicant. So if it's helpful, we can we can signpost that. But there's nothing further that's needed in respect of that, that assessment.

01:03:59:00 - 01:04:02:18

Okay. If you could just provide the statement of that effect.

01:04:08:23 - 01:04:22:02

I realized there were questions before, uh, about a stand lizard's and, um, specifically. Would you like to come back on those points? Uh, good afternoon, everyone.

01:04:22:04 - 01:04:27:29

Um, I'm Joe Atkinson, a terrestrial ecologist. Um, for both the applicants. Um, obviously made some notes.

01:04:28:01 - 01:04:28:16

From the.

01:04:28:18 - 01:04:50:25

Lady at the back when she made her comments. Uh, there was a gentleman over there that also made some comments. And, uh, Mr. Dunlop online. Um, and I think it's it's regarding a reassurance point, I think. Um, we've obviously got the information about the sand lizards, um, which the Lancashire

Wildlife Trust have very kindly, um, provided us, which provides us information where these species are.

01:04:52:14 - 01:05:34:15

We know they're very rare and they're very sensitive. Um, and we obviously want to provide the necessary reassurance that that we're going to take those into consideration. We've we've assessed the impact of noise and vibration, um, in the impact assessment, um, and we've provided a list of mitigation options that will be provided as part of the final ecological mitigation plan. Um, but I think the other point that I picked up, um, from Mr. Dunlop regarding, um, the vehicle movements on the existing tracks or the track in question, is the small, um, track through the centre of the dunes that was previously, um, the work, the sand winning, um, access compound.

01:05:34:22 - 01:06:04:16

And that compound will be used as temporary compound one for construction. Um, so I think maybe we just need to provide a bit more reassurance to all the interested parties and the stakeholders. Um, that there's not there's not going to be an impact. It's an existing track. You know, we're not there's not a vast amount of movements here. Um, and there's certainly we're not anticipating that there would be any damage to the dune systems and certainly, um, no damage to the, to the habitats for the sun lizards, because we're we're a warehouse sensitive there.

01:06:06:26 - 01:06:11:22

Thank you. That's much appreciated. I'm now opening the discussion to interested parties.

01:06:12:14 - 01:06:55:18

Um, thank you, madam. Um, I actually have to leave in a minute, so that's very good timing. Um, not on the points you've raised so far, but I do have a couple of points on ecology, on biodiversity, net gain in particular. Um, the biodiversity benefit statement of the revised one is as 054. I've had a look at that, and it seems that it has only assessed the permanent land take. And it's only offsetting for biodiversity that that land, whereas the rules for being are that if land is disturbed and not fully restored within two years, then it should also be counted even temporary land take.

01:06:55:25 - 01:07:28:27

So I think that the whole of the, um, cable route probably should be included and assessed. I accept that PNG is not yet a legal requirement, but it is certainly in, um, national policy statements already. Not for DCS. It's not a legal requirement yet. The second point related to that is on this bird strike issue, if the Lee Marsh proposed biodiversity habitat is altered so that fewer birds visit it, presumably that means its habitat value will be lower.

01:07:29:09 - 01:07:48:12

And so the PNG calculation should be carried out again. And I suspect there may be an issue that is impossible to satisfy both PNG requirements and not increasing bird strike risk. Thank you very much. And good bye.

01:07:52:15 - 01:07:58:05

Thank you. Um, we've got an idea.

01:08:10:03 - 01:08:43:19

Deborah Helm, walkers Residents Association and local residents very close to the dunes and the nature reserve. Um, can the applicant confirm that there won't be workers from Morgan and Morecambe walking on the dunes around the area? So. So that they that no one whatsoever from Morgan and Morgan will be walking over the dunes where the sand lizards are. That's my first point. Um, because you cannot they have burrows.

01:08:43:21 - 01:09:20:13

They are camouflaged. They are pretty vulnerable. Um, and then the other point is around the nature reserve. There are a lot of hedgehogs that actually go, um, they travel on to the dunes. They've been sighted in some towns. I have up my road, has a high hedgehog population. They're an endangered species. They are on the, um, the nature reserve. Um, any fencing off that is done around that area will impact the hedgehogs.

01:09:20:15 - 01:09:53:29

Their movement, their search for food, their mating, their ability to care for their hoggets. Um, it's not a small thing to really, um, mess up this system, including the electromagnetic vibrations, which will then come through the ground. Um, I have just to let you know, I have 4 to 5 hedgehogs Togs. In my garden there is a significant hedgehog population which perhaps you haven't, um, totally considered, but they are using, um, the land.

01:09:54:08 - 01:10:24:14

It is a nature reserve reserved for nature, which is laughable at the moment. It's already decreased its size. Um, it saddens me. It really saddens me when I realised the route, whether it's dug, whether it's dug, tunnels, um, or or not, it's going to impact it. And I just want one more thing to answer. Uh, regarding the concrete, my apologies for saying it was concrete till is done.

01:10:24:20 - 01:10:39:29

Um, of course I'm not party to exactly the exact material that will be encasing the cables, but I'm. I'm pretty sure it's going to be, uh, pretty durable and not of organic material.

01:10:46:10 - 01:11:05:10

Okay. Thank you. I can see that there is a raised hand online, but in the interest of time management, we we will have to move on. Can I please ask for this submission to be done in writing? Um, and before I close this item, does the applicant want to reply?

01:11:07:00 - 01:11:07:18

Hello?

01:11:07:21 - 01:11:41:00

Joe Atkinson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, yes. Just in response. Um, obviously there's a this lady who's very has very strong feelings about the dunes, and we understand that they're very sensitive. Um, and like I said, we're going to have a mitigation strategy to make sure that we don't damage them. The dunes are already publicly accessible. Um, but of course, as part of our management plan, we wouldn't be allowing any, um, put site staff personnel. They'll all be briefed that this is a really

sensitive area, and we can incorporate that within the ecological management plan. Um, and just touching on the point regarding fencing very quickly.

01:11:41:09 - 01:11:48:02

Um, we wouldn't anticipate that the type of fencing used would block hedgehog access, but we certainly wouldn't be fencing across the dunes.

01:11:51:11 - 01:12:10:07

Look, Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicants, just to build on this Atkinson's point, I would just like to highlight that works. Number six A and six B, which encompass the triple C do not does not allow for um construction pedestrian access within the dune. So we cannot go through the dunes.

01:12:13:07 - 01:12:47:17

And finally done on behalf of the applicants aware that Mr. Walker has left. But as he knows, um, the requirement to provide um biodiversity net gain is not a legal requirement for nationally significant infrastructure projects. Um, and um, this is being provided as I think is made very clear in the biodiversity biodiversity benefit statement. This is being provided on a voluntary basis by the applicants on the basis that the necessary land right to deliver it can be secured either through agreement or through the securing of compulsory acquisition powers.

01:12:47:22 - 01:12:48:07

Thank you.

01:12:49:19 - 01:12:50:10

Thank you.

01:12:55:29 - 01:13:22:10

All for your offer by systems. Just a quick point that we know that the privacy benefit sites and the BMG is a voluntary uh, so it is benefit for ecology. Um, I think careful consideration you need of, of what those, those benefits against. So the ecology benefits against the bird strike risk that could be attached to those sites as well. And then some of the balance really.

01:13:24:24 - 01:13:40:10

But sorry list on behalf of the applicant. Can I just answer that one. The biodiversity benefit areas are not the sites that are the mitigation areas, um, that we've been talking about in respect of to Bud, but we'll be able to clarify all this with the airports when we discuss it with them. Thank you.

01:13:41:20 - 01:13:53:26

Thank you. Um, as before, I realize this is quite a broad subject, and we went through it very quickly, but there will be future hearings and opportunities to speak on that matter. Thank you.

01:13:55:03 - 01:13:55:18

Thank you.

01:13:56:00 - 01:14:30:23

Thank you. Just turning now to archaeology, which I think I can do in very short form and other heritage assets. Um, because one of the two of the points I wanted to make can be, can be reserved or written questions as required after the local impact reports, etc. and written representations come in. My question is on Quakers Wood burial ground, which has come up in the representation several times and has been responded to by the applicants, uh, at uh, procedural deadline a and I've read the response.

01:14:31:23 - 01:14:54:22

I'm not absolutely Be clear still as to where the actual what area the burial ground relates to and its relationship with the proposed works. One of the problems with that, I think, is that the Freckleton 1838 tithe map is not particularly readable.

01:14:56:28 - 01:15:16:21

And so a readable I know it's an old map being 1838, so that's probably understandable. But if a more updated version of that map showing the plot numbers and then relating things more clearly to the actual, um, proposed works areas, that would be really useful, uh.

01:15:18:27 - 01:15:40:27

That's my point, really. I'd just like further clarification, which can be provided for deadline one if you want to make a short come and say it now, then absolutely do so. But I just need some more clarification on the extent of the burial ground and obviously the the map needs to be made. Updated to 2025 version of an 1838 map, if you see what I mean. So it's more readable.

01:15:44:18 - 01:16:02:17

And if there can be agreement on this matter with Lancashire County Council through discussion, that would be very helpful to going up towards deadline one, and I apologize not for having a more detailed opportunity to discuss this, because obviously we are running out of time today, but this is the one issue I wanted to flag up for archaeology.

01:16:08:00 - 01:16:20:29

Uh, Mick Rollings for the applicant dealing with the Heritage Afternoon. So if if what you want is an updated map where we annotate the tithe map so that the numbers are shown more clearly, that's fine. We can provide that.

01:16:21:01 - 01:16:54:04

With the works overlaid on it would be quite useful as well. So it's absolutely clear where the proposed works are and where the known burial ground is. If there's Disagreement on where the burial ground is between yourself and the county council and possibly others. And obviously that needs to be resolved, and I don't think we're going to resolve that at 5:00 this evening. But I'd encourage discussion, really, to get to the bottom of that. And then, as I've said before, I'd be interested to see the results of that at deadline. Once again, I consider discussing it at another issue specific hearing or dealing with it for further written questions.

01:16:54:25 - 01:17:33:21

Okay. I mean, we will deal with it in writing, but I'll just give you a very brief summary of that position. I'm not sure there is any disagreement with it between any party or that. That's good news.

Locations. Um, there's there's a small area of woodland outside the order limits next to Lower Lane known as Quakers Wood, which is the recorded site of Quaker burials. There's one headstone, and we think there's recorded burials in the number of 35 in that area in the woodland. And it's not surprising that there's only one headstone, because burial without headstones was a Quaker tradition, so the trees might be the result of that in the 1838 tithe map for Freckleton parish.

01:17:33:28 - 01:18:09:07

That little piece of woodland is marked, and on the tithe apportionment, which is a document that goes with the tide map. That little piece of woodland is described as a burial ground. It sits within a larger field, and the name of the larger field on the apportionment is burying Yard. And across the other side of Lower Road there are two other contiguous fields. One is called on the map. This one's called Lower Burying Yard and one's called Higher Burying Yard. So the implication from the tithe map is that the burial, the Quaker background, could have extended into those fields.

01:18:09:24 - 01:18:40:22

However, in the first edition of the US six inch survey that was only surveyed six years after the tithe map was published. Non no burial grounds are shown there, just shown as fields and we have not seen or ourselves in our surveys found any evidence for any burials outside of the woodland itself? There may be, but we've not seen evidence. What we've done to respond to that is we've after the peer consultation stage, we.

01:18:40:24 - 01:19:22:10

We moved the cable corridor. So it went outside of the two, uh, burial yards on the south side of Lower Lane. So we avoided them completely where we crossed Lower Lane to go up to the substations. And the onshore export cable route divides. We cross the plot within which the piece of woodland is. We're about at that point 55m from the woodland. So we then cross a piece of land that's named on on the tithe map as a burial yard, and the whole of that section where we cross it with both parts of the cable route, will be delivered through tremulous technology.

01:19:23:04 - 01:19:34:26

So we're essentially not disturbing any of the land that's marked on the tithe map, even though, I mean, we don't know for sure whether the burial is in there or not, but we basically our mitigation is total avoidance.

01:19:36:20 - 01:19:46:09

Okay. Thank you for that helpful clarification. Uh, do Lancashire County Council wish to for the local council? The council like to comment on this.

01:19:50:27 - 01:19:56:10

Okay. Thank you again. That sort of updated map sort of um,

01:19:57:28 - 01:20:03:12

in relation to the works plans overlaid on it, that would be very helpful.

01:20:03:21 - 01:20:06:02

Uh, certainly. So we can provide that to you.

01:20:06:04 - 01:20:08:28

Yes. Thank you. And thank you for that clarification.

01:20:11:27 - 01:20:46:00

The other point on any other points in heritage matters, I just want to raise today, I don't think it necessarily needs a response is that if the local authorities Or consider that any more relevant, designated or undesignated heritage assets need to be assessed, which haven't been assessed already. Could they flag those up to the applicant applicants through? Well, obviously through your local impact report and rep, but by all means, you know the separate means of communication to not just during the submissions at deadline.

01:20:46:02 - 01:21:20:02

So feel free to sort of furnish some of that information beforehand as well. And then again provide the outputs to us as examining authority at deadline one. I don't think I need further comments on that now. That's all I've got on Heritage Matters. Okay. Thank you. Landscape and visual. I'm afraid we're going to have to come back. Well, may well come back to this, uh, if necessary. Following the further submissions, the, uh, have you got your relevant people or person here to discuss or make any points on this?

01:21:22:16 - 01:21:24:03

Was done on behalf of the applicant.

01:21:24:05 - 01:21:24:29

They're coming forward.

01:21:25:17 - 01:21:30:16

We do. Um, I suspect it may be a reasonably long item.

01:21:30:18 - 01:21:31:03

Yes.

01:21:31:05 - 01:21:41:29

So I'm don't think there's anything that we need to say. So that's fine. That's fine. But I suggest, um, we postpone it to written, um, to written questions and written material.

01:21:42:01 - 01:22:16:10

That is, that is along the lines of what I'm thinking. The only thing I wanted to say now, given the time that we've got, is obviously the Outline Design Principles document is an important document that sets out the considerations to inform the detailed design. And that's what presumably the local authorities will be using when they consider the detailed design. Uh, could that be. Could the short the council be looking at it anyway? But I'd be quite. Well, I'd be encouraging that the council's do consider that those principles in detail.

01:22:16:12 - 01:22:24:06

And they feel there's any enhancements or changes or amendments. Those principles, then that's fed back to the to the applicants. Uh,

01:22:25:28 - 01:22:34:14

because I won't say any more on that, but obviously that's a very important document. Uh, going forward, and I think in order to get.

01:22:36:27 - 01:23:07:06

To a level of design that is appropriate. Potentially, then that document needs to be, I think, a sort of a fairly sort of detailed. Document. It's difficult to talk about it now in terms of because I was also going to talk about more details about what is the design vision, uh, how does it reflect local context, all these matters. But I think, as Miss Hall says, there's not going to be any detailed time for that. So I think once we open up the discussion, we'll be here for the next hour or so, which is, I don't think, anyone's intention. So apologies for not getting to this item.

01:23:07:09 - 01:23:23:26

Sometimes it's the way these hearings go, but I would encourage the councils to engage on those, uh, design principles and provide feedback to your selves. And again, that doesn't need to be through the examination. That can be through informal measures with the outputs of it provided to us at deadline one.

01:23:24:27 - 01:23:43:01

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, just to reassure the examining authority that Fylde Council have approached us that have approached the applicants with regard to setting up a landscape expert working group meeting. So we look forward to that engagement and the discussions and the outline design principles. Okay. Through that process.

01:23:43:03 - 01:23:55:25

And I've included it, there are any extra visualisations or images, etc. that the council requests which might be helpful. That was discussed yesterday. If there could be agreement on that as well, that would be helpful.

01:23:58:15 - 01:24:24:17

Okay, I think that's all. In short, I can say today on landscape and visual and the design of the substations in particular, uh, no doubt we will come back to it either in writing or at a, at a hearing. Uh, during the remainder of the six months of the examination. We mustn't forget we're still at the very start of the examination. There's still a long time to go, so there's plenty of time for submissions to be made and for questions to be asked. Okay,

01:24:26:03 - 01:24:32:14

so that concludes that item. And I think Mr. Gorse has one question to ask on local businesses and tourism.

01:24:33:29 - 01:25:14:29

Yes. I was hoping to talk about the lithium Festival because this looks very interesting. But what's lined up there? But, um, my question is, is um, on tourism, um, in their representation, which is our

0705 Fylde Council say that coastal tourism and recreation account for 1 in 10 jobs in the area, and then there are more than 4.25 million tourist days. Uh, now looking at the socio economic chapter, which is app 141 um, the assessment that the proposed development will have no significant effects on the tourist industry.

01:25:15:03 - 01:25:58:27

And that's repeated at paragraph 2.21.2.2 of the thematic responses. That's PR 005. Um, I think my question here is that the study area for this chapter is extremely wide. Centers on the north west of England. Uh, and in such circumstances, the conclusion reached is hardly surprising. Paragraph 2.6.6.1 of the chapter refers to other key attractions, uh, including Merseyside Maritime Museum, Lancaster City Museum, uh Lancaster Castle, uh, and also the the forthcoming Eden Project in Morecambe.

01:25:59:24 - 01:26:11:14

Um, these are all a long, long way apart from each other. Would it not be more relevant and appropriate to concentrate on the Fylde region alone and its immediate surrounds.

01:26:13:14 - 01:26:48:27

Thank you, Joshua and James, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so the first point to make is that there is no statutory guidance for selecting socio economic study areas. And so the socio economic study area process has sought out and relied upon the best available non-statutory documentation available to inform selection of socio economic study areas, which includes tourism. Um, and you've provided the references already. The guidance establishes a 60 minute commuting catchment as local, and I'm sure everybody in this room would have a different definition of what local means.

01:26:48:29 - 01:27:28:06

And so we've needed to fall back on what the guidance says or recommends as a local definition, um, in terms of the appropriateness of the study area. And so what we are assessing is the receiving environment of the visitor economy or the tourism economy, um, Which is broad and varied, and in terms of assessing tourism and EIA level, a hyper localised assessment would not necessarily, um, provide the level appropriate for the receiving environment that we are looking at because economies.

01:27:28:08 - 01:28:07:21

So we're looking at socio economic economy, societies and within an economy, the sectors they operate in, in in ways that are harder to define than picking a town or a local authority. There's permeable, permeable boundaries between um, between governance areas, whatever, however, however they may be defined. And so the um, in terms of the specific tourism assets that that you raise and especially the festival, um, it is important to, um, to note that the film festival.

01:28:07:23 - 01:28:50:24

There's also a 1940s festival, which is is an enormous attraction and attracts 40,000 people, um, over a weekend. These these assets in in rhythm. There's also there's also Blackpool, albeit in a um on the other side of the development. And I could name all, all the attractions in in Blackpool. The key point to make is that the sites of real value, um, locally to the tourism and visitor economy, they're going to be entirely unaffected by the project in in terms of the visual impact and the recreational impacts of, um, of the project that have been assessed within other, other chapters.

01:28:50:26 - 01:29:28:24

So visitors would have been following on from visual impacts. Um, and what we've done is we've taken a view on the interactions between the, um, the, the viewpoints and such like the are assessed just within, um, within visual impacts and how they might interact with, um, with tourism. Um, users, tourists, visitors. We, we like we prefer to call it the visitor economy, because tourism suggests that it's only people from elsewhere that come. But the visitor economy, you know, there's people who live more locally who will kind of, um, use, use the same assets for, for leisure purposes.

01:29:28:27 - 01:30:02:13

And so I think the the important thing is, is to understand the pathways that might affect tourism. So there's visual impacts. And um, we've gone through and taken a view as to as to whether the, the viewpoints that are assessed would have a significant impact on tourism in terms of people's decisions as it no, no asset would be at risk of existence. It would be, um, maybe a potential potential, um, visual impact for a short, short, temporary period of time, which would, would go away and then return to baseline conditions.

01:30:02:15 - 01:30:19:06

And so the long term impact on the visitor economy from visual impacts and similarly with recreation. So if there is a public right of way that might be temporarily obstructed, um, or um, for, for whatever reason, that would be a temporary, um, temporary impact during construction.

01:30:19:12 - 01:30:34:11

Okay. Thanks for that. If I could just interrupt. Uh, so so you've come to the conclusion that there's no significant effects on the tourist industry. Um, I don't know whether Fylde Council have got any thoughts to comment on in respect of that.

01:30:35:17 - 01:31:21:19

Yeah. Thank you. Council. Um, obviously I understand that time is very limited. Um, so, um, I won't repeat what we've already set out in our reps, but the the tourist economy is of crucial importance, um, to the area. And, um, and that's only one element that's being impacted here. There's also the rural economy. But in terms of we're just specifically talking about tourism, the coastal areas and rural areas that will be impacted are kind of fundamental to the appeal of of the area and the activities that people carry out in the area, and also in terms of how people travel to and from the area, kind of impacts on um, uh, the, the highways as well, um, are of concern.

01:31:21:28 - 01:31:56:10

Um, but yeah, just in terms of keeping it brief, I think the scope of the assessment that's been carried out is far too high level. The there is such great significance, um, at a, at a, at a more local level, um, even if you just looked at Fylde, uh, Blackpool, Wyre, South Ribble, Preston kind of level, um, the activities are really significant. So we do not think the assessment is appropriate. And they've said that there's no statutory guidance on how that assessment should be scoped and carried out. Um, we we suggest that their approach is is severely lacking.

01:31:57:09 - 01:32:22:19

Thank you. Thank you. Mr.. Um, is is there any way that you could do an assessment limited to, to the Fylde area in Blackpool concentrating on that as opposed to the much wider area because, um, you're hearing the council um, uh, saying um, that they think it's too limited before you respond. Just ask, um, Blackpool Council to make a comment.

01:32:23:18 - 01:32:53:20

Ask Lucas from Blackpool Council. We would welcome a more detailed assessment in respect of the area itself. Tourism is a major importance to Blackpool Council in respect of continuous funding. I understand approximately 22 million visitors to that area are where we're expecting the, uh, construction. So we and the forefront and the beach area. So we would welcome discussions. Um, for the submissions are going into our local impact report, obviously on this point.

01:32:53:29 - 01:32:54:18

Thank you.

01:32:56:00 - 01:33:07:12

Thank you. Josh. Alan Jones for the applicant. The significance of the tourist tourism industry locally is noted, and I'm going to defer to Liz Dunn on the matter of potential other works.

01:33:08:06 - 01:33:11:00

Hang on a second. There was another question just coming in.

01:33:11:10 - 01:33:40:06

Stephen, I think we're sorry. Phil Morgan, Newton Council. Just to reinforce the point, some of the relevant representations you've got are from rural industries. Ruby Hall is probably the most significant one. They feel they will be very impacted by traffic. But others I mentioned before, such as Norcross camping site. You know, there is a fundamental impact. And talking about places like Lancaster and Merseyside don't help very much in terms of understanding what the impact will be locally. Thank you.

01:33:41:05 - 01:33:41:27

Thank you.

01:33:42:05 - 01:34:21:24

Slide to respond. Behalf of the applicants. Um, I think, um, we will provide a note on this, um, for deadline one, in terms of, um, the way the assessments been carried out and how it accords with the environmental impact assessment regulations in terms of the approach that's been taken. Um, we'll also provide, um, any further information or um, regarding, as I say, how that assessment has been undertaken. If, if the council's um are aware of any evidence, um, that exists that shows that, um, this type of project has an impact on the tourism economy, we would, uh, very much like to see it.

01:34:21:26 - 01:35:07:11

So these projects have been taking place, um, in coastal locations around the country for many, many, many years. Uh, mostly in, in, uh, heavily populated and, and very, uh, important tourism areas as, as, as this is here and, uh, there is no evidence of an impact on tourism as a result of the construction of these projects. So, uh, I would ask the council's, uh, and I would suggest it would be helpful to the

examination, uh, that if the councils have evidence from other projects of impacts of tourism, there are tourism studies and surveys available there, then that is submitted to the examination and we will provide a note on the assessment that has been undertaken.

01:35:07:13 - 01:35:41:11

Thank you. Thanks for that. There is a slight difference here in that, in that there is water on two sides of the Fylde. So there's there's much, um, more impact to this area than there would normally be from a coastal settlement which only has water on one side. Um, this has been raised by a lot of residents. It's been raised by the councils. Um, and, uh, when you put your notes in, I think, uh, it would be helpful if you, if you at least considered having a more focused assessment.

01:35:42:23 - 01:35:47:22

Done on behalf of the applicants. We will consider that. And the water on both sides point.

01:35:52:06 - 01:35:58:25

Tonight. Blackpool Council are. The council has further data that may assist the applicants and we are happy to provide that to them.

01:36:00:04 - 01:36:00:19

Thanks.

01:36:02:28 - 01:36:09:28

Right. So is there anybody else who wants to make a comment on tourism? Not in the room, not online. Over to Mr. Cliff.

01:36:10:14 - 01:36:43:16

Thank you, Mr. Gore. I think we agreed earlier we didn't need to go further into, uh, item J, which is insulation of other projects, including cumulative effects assessment, because that was covered briefly before we come back to that as need be. Uh, throughout the examination, the draft consent order, unfortunately, we're not going to get a chance to go through that as we had envisaged. It wasn't meant to be a major item anyway at this point. Uh, what I would say is that I would encourage all parties to engage in the draft development consent order.

01:36:43:20 - 01:37:18:14

And accompanying that, there's the explanatory memorandum, which explains all the provisions in the draft development consent order. and whatever our recommendation is to the Secretary of State, we have to present our version of the development consent order and whether or not the recommendation is to approve or refuse. So it is an important document, and any discussion on provisions of that is without prejudice to our our decision. And I think parties can make their comments on the draft of the consent order also without prejudice to the overall position.

01:37:18:16 - 01:37:40:17

And it is important to us, we do get the comments of the interested parties and anybody else for that matter, on the provisions of the draft Development Consent order. And again, that will then feed into our written questions. And as I said the other day, I expect we'll be having an issue specific hearing focus just on the, uh, draft consent order. Uh.

01:37:43:27 - 01:37:58:25

One very, very small point on the the draft. Is it possible to add a contents page with page numbers on it? To the draft development consent order. Because I've spent quite a bit of time finding bits, it's quite difficult to navigate without that. And then all of them have it, but.

01:37:59:10 - 01:38:03:17

It's list done on behalf of the applicant. It has got page numbers on the bottom.

01:38:03:23 - 01:38:10:11

Oh, sorry, it's not on the contents list. Then there's no contents list. That's that's that's it's that way around. There's page numbers, but no contents list.

01:38:13:15 - 01:38:31:27

It's on the list. On behalf of the applicants, I understand that the version that we submitted, um, at in response to section 51 advice does have those, um, those page references on it. It's, uh, and a table of contents. And that is um, as 004.

01:38:33:21 - 01:38:35:19

Okay. Bear with me.

01:38:45:16 - 01:38:48:00

The page. numbers on the street.

01:38:53:10 - 01:39:07:26

Right. The Wi-Fi link isn't working, so I can't even get through to it. So if they're in with page number, I'm sure the version that I've seen is not. And I'm sure it's the most up to date version, but let's let's both check, please. Uh, I, by the way, did you manage to get.

01:39:11:05 - 01:39:11:20

Yeah.

01:39:11:22 - 01:39:28:09

There's there's no page numbers. There's there's a contents list, but there's no page numbers on the contents. That's the problem. So there's a contents list with sections on it. But it's because it's such a big obviously draft eco because we've got marine licenses, it would be helpful to get easy navigation for myself and for everybody.

01:39:28:11 - 01:39:58:24

I appreciate that, sir. Um, the format it is in is the one that accords with the statutory instrument checker that the document has to go through and has to be validated through to come through to this process. So if we provide one with page numbers. It doesn't comply with the statutory instrument, uh, validation requirements. So it would be a separate document that isn't the effectively the formal document that would be validated for examination.

01:39:59:01 - 01:40:17:00

For the purpose of the examination before the final one is submitted. Is it possible to have one in circulation as the one we're considering examination with page numbers. It does take time to go to define the relevant bits in it. Uh, and I've seen it on other projects done. So can you go away and consider it? I've seen it done another project.

01:40:17:02 - 01:40:21:15

So we can but um, but noting that that's the point.

01:40:21:17 - 01:40:27:21

Yes, the final 1st May not have them, but for the purpose of examination, everyone looking through it, I think it will really help with navigation.

01:40:30:12 - 01:41:02:09

Uh, and also just one final point that as appropriate, obviously, the draft development consent orders for the generation assets projects. I've come to the end of their projects. Come to the end of their examination where there are matters where those provisions, etc. articles have evolved and they cross over with this. These projects or this proposed development and appreciate a lot of them don't. When it is necessary for this detail to catch up with those two echoes.

01:41:02:11 - 01:41:04:27

It would seem appropriate for that that to happen.

01:41:05:07 - 01:41:28:14

At least on behalf of the applicant. That's something we're picking up for. Deadline one. Um, obviously those, um, examinations have now closed, so there may be a further update depending on in the event that those projects are consented. Okay, Morgan generation, maybe before the close of this examination to pick up, um, any final drafting the Secretary of State puts forward.

01:41:28:29 - 01:42:01:09

Good. Thank you. That's. Yeah, that. That's fine. Thank you. That's all I think I need to raise at this point on the draft of the consent order. Is there anything you just want to briefly raise in relation to it, I'm assuming. I have heard that you have been talking to people about protecting provisions, etc. so that is obviously sort of is good that those things are, are, are progressing. And I assume that those discussions will take, take place on other outstanding matters. And we can discuss, as I say, that the the residual matters outstanding at an issue at an issue specific hearing in due course.

01:42:02:17 - 01:42:15:12

Thank you. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants, we will be putting an updated DCO in development consent order in a deadline. One picking up some of the drafting points that have been picked up through the relevant reps and other matters.

01:42:15:17 - 01:42:16:02

Okay.

01:42:16:24 - 01:42:55:05

Thank you. And the outline management plans. I was going to ask you to do an overview of those. No time for that now. My point is again though, that these are potentially important documents in time in terms of how the the project is constructed. Uh, and I would again encourage all parties to engage with the content of those. And if you have any suggested amendments or alterations. Again, to inform the applicants, either through a written submission, so that those can be can be addressed by the applicant as appropriate.

01:42:55:17 - 01:43:04:21

And again, we can come back to those later in the examination. Uh, that's all I need to say on those at this point. Do you want to say anything else on.

01:43:07:10 - 01:43:10:10

Which takes us to action points.

01:43:12:29 - 01:43:18:16

Which who's wants to lead there? Do you want to?

01:43:20:00 - 01:43:38:20

Mr.. Yes I can. And then we can just double check against our our list, which I'll try and get up on my computer so we can just bear with us for this. I know it's been a long day, and I appreciate everyone's, uh, patience throughout the day. Uh, but this hopefully will only take five minutes or so.

01:43:38:24 - 01:44:18:18

So the first item we have is in respect of proposed design parameters and project flexibility. Provide a note explaining the use of indicative in the context of the Rochdale envelope, and how various elements of that are secured elsewhere. Provide examples, um, of the uh, of how they apply to various elements of the work. Uh, and, and as we've said, how how that will be managed through the DCO. Uh, so that was for deadline one um, uh, five see, um, note to signpost where the DCO confirms construction won't be phased in the traditional sense.

01:44:18:20 - 01:44:35:26

I suspect that's probably just a clarification that, um, the on neither generation assets development consent order is phasing permitted and therefore that the transmission assets wouldn't be phased. But I will confirm on that one at Up five um.

01:44:36:27 - 01:44:37:12

Uh.

01:44:38:11 - 01:44:50:19

Uh, add to the or provide an additional plate for a sequential construction gap with a full, uh, sequential construction with a four year gap. That was for deadline one. Um.

01:44:52:26 - 01:44:53:11

Uh.

01:44:53:27 - 01:45:02:12

Provide a table showing what the total time frames program would be with a four year gap. Uh.

01:45:05:15 - 01:45:06:03

Um.

01:45:09:06 - 01:45:32:25

We were going to provide a note on, um, the project alignment, um, with the, uh, NPS policy in five in respect of coordination. Uh, then we're also going to provide some information of further information on financing and delivery, explaining why one project.

01:45:35:05 - 01:46:09:16

Why? The projects can't be delivered together. They have to be. They have to be independent. Uh, and referring to other, uh, joint CEOs with things like the Sheringham and Dutch and Extensions projects, uh, and others. Uh, we were going to provide a note on, um, the impacts on, well, the, um, the need for Saturday working hours. So the justification for Saturday working hours, um, and what the impacts of reduced hours of Saturday would be in respect of the construction scenarios.

01:46:11:19 - 01:46:22:01

Um, we were going to look at the planning statement and the statement of reasons, um, in respect of, um, sort of local area and local benefits. Um.

01:46:24:05 - 01:46:25:29

Um, actually, what that note on the link.

01:46:28:07 - 01:46:58:12

Um, uh. the we were going to provide for deadline to. I think this is something we're working through with Lincolnshire Council, the um the the sort of last leg routes, um, and um, providing information that we've been discussing with Lincolnshire, um by deadline. One Lancashire. Sorry alongside of the country. Um, we were I think there were possibly some further written wraps coming in from parties who made submissions.

01:46:58:18 - 01:47:19:26

Uh, uh, I think Doctor Tryon, um, there was quite a detailed submission, but we'll respond to that deadline too, because obviously we need that for deadline one. Uh, we were going to provide a clarification note on water for construction. I think the point around whether that was going to be tankard in where that might come from and if it's been assessed, um.

01:47:24:21 - 01:48:11:25

Uh, there's a one here on commitment 37. Um on active. Oh, this was, um, activities? No, this was activities on the, um, the operations accesses and y um, uh, y there would be activity on the, um, operational accesses, um, between 7 and 11 that we've got that as the date. The times for that one. Um, we are going to, um, work with the councils, uh, sorry, with the airports in respect of, um, providing information on the selection of the bird mitigation areas, um, and then work through them with that on the bird strike management plan, but put in what information we've provided to them as soon as possible, hopefully.

01:48:11:27 - 01:48:45:20

Deadline one. Uh, uh, I think by we're going to put in a note on this cap 791 process up, not ba sorry Blackpool Airport I am it is late now. Um, we are going to put in our and a few representative response to the relevant rep, which I think we agreed previously. Um, uh, we're going to put in a note on soil surveys and the, um, the appropriateness of the, um, information that the uh,

01:48:47:09 - 01:49:03:09

applicant has provided for this application with respect to other DCO applications. Uh, we're also going to provide a plan showing, um, the, um, individual farm holdings, um, down the cable route. Uh.

01:49:05:17 - 01:49:41:24

I think we've got a response, um, to certain drainage matters that we didn't deal with, um, in, uh, orally. Um, we obviously need to confirm with Natural England in respect of the rebel and alt space. Um, we'll be doing that for deadline one. Uh, we said we'd confirm that, um, in respect of the sequential scenario, with the gap of, uh, with the gap of the maximum gap that the HRA documents don't need to be updated because they've already it's already been considered.

01:49:42:17 - 01:50:13:03

Um, we, uh, were going to provide a copy of the tithe map, hopefully making it more readable if possible in respect of Quakers would and overlay the, uh, the works areas on that so that can be seen. Uh, I think the local authorities were to provide us with any further details on heritage assets that they felt should be considered, um, as soon as possible, uh, ideally before they're ally off, just in case there is anything that, um, that they feel we need to look at further.

01:50:13:24 - 01:50:39:02

Um, we were going to, um, look at the socio economic assessment, particularly in respect of the tourism element and the consideration of filed counts, the filed council area. Um, and, uh, I had asked that if the councils have any evidence on impacts on tourism economy, that those were provided to us for deadline. One, that was our list.

01:50:45:23 - 01:50:55:27

But I think it's just a few. Thank you very much. That's really helpful. Um, there was the point file mentioned about Sports England, whether it's actually consultee.

01:50:57:15 - 01:51:01:04

Um, if that could be decided one way or the other.

01:51:02:05 - 01:51:14:18

The applicant I can answer that. They're not a statutory consultee for the purposes of the Planning Act. They may be for the NPO, but they're not for the purposes of the Planning Act. Um, I can, I can we can provide a confirmation on that.

01:51:14:20 - 01:51:18:14

Okay. Yeah. Um, if you could. Um,

01:51:20:02 - 01:51:37:09

sorry. Did you mention about the measure of equivalent environmental benefits point? Um, I think there was a the suggestion was you were going to submit a, um. This was for the Marine Conservation Zone.

01:51:38:06 - 01:51:52:25

We're going to do that. Sorry. That was that was less because we were going to do it anyway. Um, so yes, it is an action point and it will be done that will be submitting that without prejudice. Um, measures of equivalent environmental benefit case at deadline one.

01:51:52:27 - 01:52:09:03

Okay. Thanks for that. And did you mention about the discussions with Natural England about the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area? Um, uh, because you I think you said further discussions were taking place and then an update would be provided.

01:52:11:26 - 01:52:13:12

Heather Koski, on.

01:52:13:14 - 01:52:15:22

Behalf of both the applicants, those discussions.

01:52:15:24 - 01:52:16:09

Are.

01:52:16:11 - 01:52:17:04

Ongoing.

01:52:17:19 - 01:52:22:24

Um, It depends on when we get the information from Natural England and.

01:52:22:26 - 01:52:23:11

How.

01:52:23:13 - 01:52:23:28

To had a chance.

01:52:24:00 - 01:52:25:25

To review that and then discuss the appropriate.

01:52:25:27 - 01:52:26:19

Mitigation.

01:52:26:21 - 01:52:28:14

So I suspect it would be no later.

01:52:28:16 - 01:52:29:19

Than deadline two.

01:52:30:14 - 01:52:37:28

So I'll put down hopefully deadline one, but possibly deadline to appreciate there may be difficulties with getting response from Natural England.

01:52:38:03 - 01:52:39:04

We can give a general.

01:52:39:06 - 01:52:39:21

Update.

01:52:39:23 - 01:52:40:08

For a.

01:52:40:10 - 01:52:41:19

Deadline. One approach to that.

01:52:41:27 - 01:52:43:00

Yeah, fine.

01:52:47:24 - 01:53:03:19

Yeah. We'll just say a general, um, general update. Um, did was something mentioned about the unexploded ordnance detonation? Was that one picked up because I think there was um, there was going to be a note concerning that.

01:53:07:28 - 01:53:16:13

Sorry. List done on behalf of the applicants. Um, I have got that. I've got notes on the linkage between high order explosive removal and the associated restrictions.

01:53:16:15 - 01:53:18:05

Uh, you might have mentioned it, and I missed it.

01:53:18:07 - 01:53:41:09

I didn't read it out, to be honest, because I didn't know what it was. We were agreeing to do there. So we're removing. Hi order. Sorry. It has been a long day. We're removing high order UXO clearance from the, uh, Draft marine license. Um, sorry. Somebody telling me what it is we're doing. Um. Uh.

01:53:43:00 - 01:53:46:19

Well, I think we're in the same boat here. I'm not entirely sure what it is either.

01:53:46:21 - 01:53:56:00

I think I think it is that we will be providing, um, an update on removing high order clearance. I think there was a question about separate marine licensing.

01:53:56:06 - 01:53:57:06

Uh, it was what?

01:53:57:09 - 01:54:09:06

How were we moving? The higher order ordinance impacts the need for restrictions, because there's a suggestion that if we remove it, it has an impact on the requirement for restrictions.

01:54:09:15 - 01:54:16:11

Thank you. That was coming to me at that point, but I think we've got it noted there. Thank you very much.

01:54:17:12 - 01:54:26:07

Okay. And was the Lancashire County Council point concerning road which was that mentioned.

01:54:26:25 - 01:54:44:00

Um, lays down on behalf of the applicant. I haven't added that in just because that's part of ongoing discussions with Lincolnshire County Council. So Lancashire. Sorry. Um, uh, so it, it in a sense, it isn't an action point that something needs to happen because, I mean, I can add that we're in ongoing discussions.

01:54:44:02 - 01:54:49:11

I think how I heard it was that detail was going to be provided to the council by deadline one.

01:54:52:06 - 01:54:55:01

So not not not to the Xa, but to the council.

01:55:01:19 - 01:55:12:12

Thank you Liz. Done. On behalf of the applicants, it's the information being provided to Lancashire by deadline, one with then being submitted into the examination for deadline two. Thank you.

01:55:14:23 - 01:55:18:00

And then the only other one I've got is the, um.

01:55:20:05 - 01:55:28:24

Abnormal, indivisible load movements, including transfer. Oh, that would be deadline two, I think. Yeah, it was.

01:55:29:02 - 01:55:30:28

Down to half the applicants. Yes. That's right.

01:55:31:00 - 01:55:31:15

Yeah.

01:55:31:17 - 01:55:34:03

Okay. Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Cliff.

01:55:36:05 - 01:55:39:03

Okay. Thank you. That's that's very.

01:55:39:28 - 01:55:47:26

Um, sorry, but it would be helpful if you could submit a note of of your your note through of what you've just read through. Is that possible?

01:55:49:04 - 01:56:02:24

I think you send it. Would you email to our case team if your note is in a format that you'd be willing to do it, just be happy. We'll just collate that with our note to make sure we get the best possible notes on the website.

01:56:03:17 - 01:56:04:05

Thank you.

01:56:04:12 - 01:56:05:00

Thank you.

01:56:05:24 - 01:56:08:21

Mr. Smith. Do you have a brief comment you wanted to make?

01:56:08:29 - 01:56:11:10

Sorry. Uh, Gordon Smith. Uh, Um.

01:56:11:28 - 01:56:12:13

Um.

01:56:13:01 - 01:56:14:19

EWG, um, just.

01:56:14:21 - 01:56:21:01

Wanted to check. Did I miss, um, that you were going to put in a note about, uh, local community benefits,

01:56:23:00 - 01:56:26:02

but deadline one was that. Mr. Gorst.

01:56:26:04 - 01:56:31:24

I think that was picked up. I think that was included in the, um, in the list about the community benefits.

01:56:32:21 - 01:56:33:22

Sorry if I missed it.

01:56:34:12 - 01:56:42:20

At least on behalf of the applicants. Uh, I can certainly give I can. I mean, there will be a note of the meeting, but we can put an update in respect of. Yeah.

01:56:42:27 - 01:56:56:28

Yeah. It was it was read out. Applicants will provide a schedule of benefits for the local community in their main documents, such as the planning statement and statement of reasons, concentrating on, on, on, on local rather than national benefits.

01:57:00:06 - 01:57:00:21

Okay.

01:57:02:18 - 01:57:03:07

Okay.

01:57:04:19 - 01:57:05:13

Mr. Forshaw.

01:57:07:00 - 01:57:10:01

Sorry. Hiding behind the cameras. Um, Paul Fischer, on behalf.

01:57:10:03 - 01:57:21:06

Of Pi systems. Um, I made a note that there was an action point for the applicants to provide a justification for not undertaking a risk assessment. That was our intention.

01:57:25:25 - 01:57:38:01

Yes. That was the point that I think Mr. Gauss raised. And I was assuming that would be incorporated into your note on the general matters concerning bird risk in aviation, or does it need a separate note.

01:57:38:20 - 01:58:08:22

Down on behalf of the applicant? I'm sorry, I thought I'd set this out. So, um, the applicants are preparing the, um, explanation note around, um, the identification of the bird mitigation areas, particularly at the MOS. Um, and that information would be provided to, uh, Blackpool Airport and BA systems as part of the discussions around the development of the bird strike mitigation plan. Um, it wasn't the.

01:58:08:27 - 01:58:15:00

That discussion around the need for a risk assessment is something that would be discussed as part of that, as part of that.

01:58:15:04 - 01:58:26:28

And if it's decided, whatever reason, that a risk assessment isn't required, that would include what it's a justification for that. Because I think that was the.

01:58:27:00 - 01:58:32:15

Point of the applicants. Yes, but that's part of that process of working through with the airports.

01:58:32:17 - 01:59:10:17

That's that's understood. Okay. Okay. Everybody happy with the action points okay. Those will be published on our website as soon as possible. Okay. It's 5:45. So it's high time I think for for closing. Again thank you for everyone's contributions over the two days. It's been a long two days, but it's been a very useful two days for us. So thank you for everybody's contributions and online as well. Uh, if you spoke in today or yesterday, it would assist as if you could provide a written version of your submissions or a summary of those by deadline.

01:59:10:19 - 01:59:19:29

One which is the 20th of May 2025. The recording of this hearing will be published on our website as soon as practicable after the hearing.

01:59:22:24 - 01:59:52:28

And a reminder that tomorrow morning, we have the compulsory acquisition hearing on the applicant's strategic case for compulsory acquisition, and that will be commencing again at 930. And importantly, it will not proceed beyond 1:00 because I know people have long journeys or some people will have long journeys tomorrow, not least 1 or 2 of us. So, um, yeah, we'll be closing at 1:00 tomorrow and. No, no later. Uh, thank you for everyone's participation today and yesterday.

01:59:53:00 - 01:59:57:21

That's been very useful. And I confirm the hearing is now closed.