

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
Hearing:	Q&A on the EA's Part 6
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_PT6

Created on: 2025-05-01 10:36:18

Project Length: 01:26:14

File Name: M&M_1MAY_ISH1_PT6

File Length: 01:26:14

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:22 - 00:00:22:14

Okay. It's 11:25. Um. The meeting. Um, the hearing is restarted, and I'm going to start by giving the interested parties opportunity to speak. Now, is there anyone who would like to make a comment at this point? Mr. Walker, please.

00:00:23:06 - 00:01:02:19

Thank you, Madam Angus Walker for Newton with Clifton, etc.. I just make one comment in in response to your last question about how different how a lot of the differences between the sequential construction here and if it was two separate projects in different places. Clearly, for the people affected by this project, it is worse because they're getting both projects sequentially, whereas if it was in two different places, they'd only get one of them. Um, so although more people may be affected by two separate projects, the people who are affected in this case get double the impacts.

00:01:03:04 - 00:01:04:22

That's the point I'd make. Thank you.

00:01:06:13 - 00:01:10:04

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to make a comment at this point?

00:01:13:06 - 00:01:21:23

Okay. I've got just a few more questions before I, um, ask the applicant to reply to that. So I'm going to move on with it.

00:01:24:07 - 00:01:55:19

So explain in outline terms how the applicants have sought to avoid potential environmental and community impacts in the coordinated design with regard to the approach taken to the number and location of the proposed substations. And I do appreciate this was covered yesterday in terms of deliverability and operability of those substations. Um, but I would like to focus on minimizing impact on the environment and local communities.

00:01:56:23 - 00:02:14:01

Uh, les Liz Dunn, on behalf of, uh, the applicants, this is the site selection matter. So we'll just need to, um, bring in, um, relevant people who can talk to site selection matters, which I think we would have. I thought we would probably have covered under item four.

00:02:18:25 - 00:02:43:00

So, as I say, you have covered it to an extent, but not all criteria that, um, we are testing against from the NPS have been explained. So environmental impact and community, local community impacts have not been explored. So this is the basis for the question. So if there's nothing further to add we can move on. But I wanted to confirm.

00:03:10:15 - 00:03:41:08

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. Um, I think Miss Dunn has touched upon. Um, sort of drawing comparisons with a non-existent project, i.e. the radio project that you're talking about, but in terms of demonstrable evidence that of the co-location and alignment through the site selection process. I could point to aspects of the onshore substation site selection, which, as we said, needed to site two onshore substations. Um, we coordinated align the onshore substation process right from the start.

00:03:41:25 - 00:04:17:13

Um, and really what we were talking about through that process and underlined by the guiding principles of it, was aiming to site them in proximity to one another to avoid infrastructure proliferation. So rather than impacting on multiple communities and trying to prevent that extent, that proliferation of extent of infrastructure and maintain that coordinated grid connection route as far as possible. So if you were to compare, um, a radial connection with, um, the coordinated approach that's been taken, if one project was to go in first and take the most economic and efficient route, i.e.

00:04:17:15 - 00:04:51:04

a straight line route, the second project being coming in second radial would have to either cross it in multiple locations, affect different um communities, essentially spread the proliferation of effect to get from essentially the same point i.e Blackpool Airport over to Penwortham. So by coordinating our site selection and design, it reduces that proliferation of effect and therefore reduces the impact on other communities, multiple communities and potentially spreading the effect on the same community into wider areas.

00:04:51:07 - 00:05:32:26

So, for example, um, you may have one part of the community facing the project. However, in a radial connection, it may need to root around the back of it, for example. Um, again, I'm talking very hypothetically here because, you know, it's a comparison against a design that hasn't been put forward. Um, as we've said, it's the merits of this project. Um, I talked yesterday about rather than forcing co-location into immediate proximity, we aim to site the onshore substations so that we can have maximum effectiveness of their individual mitigation requirements, primarily to do with landscaping, but also covering ecology, um, and um, and, and uh, drainage requirements.

00:05:33:24 - 00:06:22:23

So as I said yesterday, that means the scenario where, for example, if one project is built, it is sited most appropriately rather than co-located with a project that does not come forward and therefore doesn't align, the siting of that individual would not align with the site selection principles. And all of that is underpinned by the use of the zonal approach for the site selection process. Um, there are aspects as well in terms of the coordination, um, of the site selection, in that there's a coordinated site selection process and the response to section 42 consultation feedback, although it's separated between the response from the Morgan Onshore substation and the Morecambe onshore substation,

because it was able to undertake that section 42 consultation feedback, together we can respond to community comments in a coordinated and aligned manner.

00:06:22:25 - 00:06:56:07

So, for example, in relation to site accesses commentary through section 42 consultation feedback said that we need to separate the construction accesses, not utilise lower lane for construction access. And in response to that both the Morgan Onshore substation, sorry, the Morgan Onshore substation sited their connection access from the north and the Morecambe from the south. A5, A3 and A5, A4 respectively. Um and that meant that the construction traffic impacts are not proliferating on one particular highway link and therefore one particular community.

00:06:56:09 - 00:07:29:05

So that does cover your environmental and community impacts. So that's a response to the consultation feedback that we did and that allowed. And that is underpinned by that coordinated approach that we could do that again in a hypothetical scenario where you might have a radial connection. Um, if one project was to come forward, they might the second project might determine that, yes, it's the same access point is most appropriate, bearing in mind there are obviously safety aspects to do with highway access. But you would then be then you would then be focusing where that impact is is going.

00:07:29:13 - 00:08:04:27

And again, it's a hypothetical scenario, um, in terms of the sighting of the onshore substations, um, because again, of that coordinated section 42 consultation feedback response, um, the Morecambe onshore substation was able to relocate outside of the separation area from the greenbelt. Associated with zone one. And again, the more onshore substation, option two is able to avoid crossing the proposed Blue Field solar farm development. So again, all of these considerations are feedback from the community via the section 42 consultation.

00:08:04:29 - 00:08:22:21

Feedback and the responses from both projects as a single applicant is able to coordinate how that would how they respond to that. And again, that ultimately results in a reducing community impact, although that's not quantifiable. But then also reducing the environmental impact as a consequence.

00:08:24:07 - 00:09:00:13

Um, you asked me not to talk about deliverability and engineering, but it also means that the cables don't cross one another. So the the entry and exit points for the Morgan onshore substation do not undermine the landscaping requirements of the Morecambe uh, onshore substation mitigation Requirements if they were to come forward in a radial connection. Again, hypothetical scenario you may have. Let's say, for example, Morgan established their landscape mitigation. And then if Morgan were to choose the location they had, they may need to remove some of that landscape mitigation in order to establish their substation.

00:09:00:27 - 00:09:25:12

Again, these are inherent in design decision making process and the site selection process. And that only occurs because of the coordination and alignment in a radial connection where there is no coordination and alignment. There are very different conversations to be had. Miss Dunn outlined

where mitigation might be removed from the first project and essentially compensated in the second project. We do not. That does not apply to us in this scenario because of that coordination.

00:09:27:03 - 00:09:43:06

Thank you. Um, we will be exploring those, uh, impacts in more depth as we move on to specific topics. So just to let you know, I've got two more questions and then I will invite parties to speak.

00:09:46:28 - 00:10:22:18

It's noted that other similar projects were construction. Cable corridors are shared between different projects appear to have been able to provide far for a more coordinated for more coordination in their potential construction scenarios through, for example, a shared approach to trenching and ducting or shared substations. Noting the applicant's explanation for the constraints upon coordination in the proposed development, why have other and CIPs been able to include such options.

00:10:23:03 - 00:10:56:21

As done on behalf of the applicant? It's exactly the point I've made throughout and is made throughout the application documentation. This is the first project that has been brought forward by two completely independent, uh, uh, developers, um, for, for the transmission assets for two entirely separate offshore wind farms. The projects that you are referring to. So the Dogger Bank projects, for example, they work, they are to development, they are to, sorry nationally significant infrastructure projects within the same development consent order.

00:10:56:23 - 00:11:32:05

But they were promoted by a single joint venture company. They were the same organisation bringing that that project together. Similarly, um, with the uh Sheringham and Dudgeon projects, um, there was a very high degree of alignment between those projects in terms of the companies and the way that they worked. And they were able therefore, to, uh, to identify that there may well be joint working across the project. You've probably noted that in this project, unlike others, one project is not seeking rights to do works on behalf of the other.

00:11:32:07 - 00:12:11:22

I know we haven't talked about it yet, but in terms of other, uh, in terms of other projects, Project and that ability for effectively the first project that comes forward to do. Works for another uh, is always, uh, in a position where it's the same organization promoting the, uh, promoting the project, whereby therefore they can make that anticipatory investment for that second project because effectively they're within the same company structure within these projects, because they are entirely separate projects being brought forward by entirely separate companies.

00:12:12:05 - 00:12:36:00

Um, there isn't that ability for that anticipatory investment to happen. There is no mechanism by which the cost of that can be recovered or whatever. So so they have to be entirely separate and delivered entirely separately. We have said this a number of times, and that that's the reason why they can't be committed to, and they are different to other projects that have come forward. Do you want to say something?

00:12:37:07 - 00:12:58:28

Laura fell for the applicant. And just to clarify, on the Sheringham and Dudgeon applications, that was a single applicant. It was the application was made by Equinor on behalf of both companies because they are a mutual shareholder. Sorry, they are a shareholder in both. Uh, this extension limited one of the undertakers and the Dudgeon Extension Limited, which is also an undertaker.

00:13:02:27 - 00:13:15:18

With an access to a service I was going to ask about, I think you mentioned that the Sheringham and the. This is the degree of alignment. I think you said between the companies.

00:13:16:09 - 00:13:18:01

That's what Laura.

00:13:18:17 - 00:13:28:10

How is that different to the. I don't see lack of degree of alignment between the companies. In this case that was not the case. But how does that differ in the to the to this case?

00:13:29:17 - 00:13:30:13

So in.

00:13:30:15 - 00:13:35:29

The I'm writing saying that the Sheringham there were there's still separate companies involved.

00:13:36:25 - 00:14:05:05

For the applicant. So the. There are two separate undertakers in the Sheringham and Dudgeon DCO which was Shearer Extension Limited and Dudgeon Extension Limited. Equinor are a shareholder in both of those companies, and they are promoting both projects on behalf of both those companies. In this case, we have two entirely separate companies. There are no mutual shareholders between the two companies, and that's all set out in the funding statement.

00:14:09:02 - 00:14:11:02

It's just one.

00:14:12:24 - 00:14:37:25

But is it the case that the makeup of the companies and shareholding has an effect on the way that a project might be able to deliver? And obviously that has an effect potentially on communities and the environment is enough, and they're not ways of actually having more alignment in this case, in order to get more of a more of a say, more of a coordinated approach because I've heard what you said about the coordinated approach, etc. and that is and that is understood.

00:14:39:13 - 00:14:44:06

So, said Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, I don't quite understand your question.

00:14:44:20 - 00:15:13:14

Um, it's more it's a way of actually. Is it? I understand what you said about the companies involved, etc. but despite that, isn't there still a way of having more alignment in or in this case in order to get more of a coordinated approach? And I was going to ask two in that respect, I think in your project

description, you mentioned the work being led by Ofgem to support the potential need for anticipating better investment mechanisms, which is obviously not in place at the moment.

00:15:15:19 - 00:15:54:14

At least on behalf of the applicant. Yes, that isn't in place at the moment. Um, I, I'm, I'm not entirely sure. Um, what I can say more in terms of alignment. I think when I spoke yesterday and I'm happy to say it again. Um, the alignment that has happened between these two independent companies, uh, has, in my experience, been unprecedented in terms of the sharing of data, uh, the working with a single, uh, environmental, uh, a single consultancy, preparing a single environmental statement that fully considers the cumulative.

00:15:54:16 - 00:15:57:18

And that is very much noted and that that is absolutely understood.

00:15:58:00 - 00:16:30:22

I so I'm slightly struggling to understand what further degree of coordination, um, might be expected between the project, given they are entirely independent, as we've explained. They will be they they must be funded separately. They must be, uh, each of the joint venture companies that takes this project forward have to be satisfied with that through their own due diligence, that they have the funding in place and they're able to deliver those projects. And there cannot be Interdependency between those projects.

00:16:30:24 - 00:16:40:14

If you have a situation where one project is dependent on another project to do something over which it has entirely no control. It you know, there are.

00:16:43:12 - 00:16:46:24

It's unfunded. I mean, this is the kind of fundamental.

00:16:46:26 - 00:16:47:29

So I just want to make.

00:16:48:01 - 00:17:16:28

Sure that everything is delivery. My question is, can I just finish that? Sorry. Um, I'm happy to provide some more information on this. I think we have provided quite a lot of information already. But if it would be helpful to understand a bit more about the financing and delivery and why there needs to be this, why there cannot be one project being dependent on another in terms of delivering things or committing to undertaking, uh, particularly construction at the same time. It

00:17:18:14 - 00:17:25:27

I suspect we thought it would be obvious, but if it needs to be further explained, then we can certainly provide some more detail on it.

00:17:26:06 - 00:17:56:24

Thank you. That's helpful. I think it would be helpful. And part of the reason for the question is that everybody can understand what the difference between this project is. Another project. I know there's

information in the project description, but I think it's important that everybody understands that. And if you could just include in that, in that, in that note, just a comparison with those of the projects as to make it clear as to why those things that they are proposing in that case are not able to be proposed in this case, just so people, everybody can see why there are those differences.

00:17:57:13 - 00:18:09:11

And I note too as well that sharing them, for example, there are only options. So it's not the different scenario. So I know at that point as well, which I'm sure you might want to cover in the note as well. So that is that is understood. Okay. Thank you.

00:18:11:01 - 00:18:17:21

Um, I've got one last question and then I'm going to open it to the interested parties. And so.

00:18:17:29 - 00:18:18:14

Um.

00:18:18:28 - 00:18:49:15

We understand the point about, uh, entirely independent companies, but on that basis, can the applicant explain further how the actual construction planning for the proposed development will be coordinated in order to minimize adverse effects? And I also note that there's quite a lot of work moved to the post consent phase, including different surveys and assessments. So could the applicant explain the coordination during that phase?

00:18:54:03 - 00:19:24:15

List on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think what you're asking is, um, how the, um, how the applicants will, um, when we come into construction, coordinate or or be working together to facilitate that, um, delivery. So I think the first the first point is that, um, because of the proximity of the project to each other, um, They have to work together.

00:19:24:17 - 00:20:19:01

There is no there simply is no kind of option not to be able to do that because these projects are co-located. Um, secondly, um, through the mechanisms in the development consent order and through the um, the staging plan and then the discharge of the requirements under the development consent order. Um, if those if, if, if, um, construction is happening concurrently, the the the the parties will need to coordinate between themselves to ensure that they can construct concurrently at the same time that they're staging plans align and that will be going to the local that those will all be going through the local authority in terms of both staging plans and and then the discharge of the various outline plans that are needed to deliver the development.

00:20:19:03 - 00:20:52:10

And that's where the detail of those things will be. as I've said. Um. The the outline plans are the same across both projects. So you're starting from the same set of principles again. If you want another example of why coordination here is important and will be important, you've got you've got you're working from the same basis for both projects as opposed to having entirely different approaches to, for example, uh, the code of construction practice or, or highways accesses all those sorts of things. This is being done in a coordinated way across both projects.

00:20:52:27 - 00:21:26:28

Um, so, so the working together will be facilitated through the, um, as I said, the staging plan, um, agreed. Um, with, with the local authorities and then the discharge of the requirements that that come through there. Um, if that's in a concurrent situation. Um, and clearly, when the local authority receives the staging plan and the applicants will have coordinated the staging plan, and it will make sure that that, you know, insofar as works are taking place in the same area.

00:21:27:13 - 00:22:08:08

They you know, when those are going to be and therefore the various management plans that are then discharged for those particular stages of the work take account of whether actually you've got one project constructing on its own, or you're in a situation where there's concurrent construction happening. So that will be happening at that point. If you've got a situation where one projects come forward, it would be discharging its plans in respect of that on the areas where it is able to work. And then you'd have a subsequent, uh, discharge process for the second project to the local authority on the basis of the first project, having effectively put its plans through.

00:22:08:10 - 00:22:13:26

Those will all be public documents, and the applicants will be liaising and coordinating around those anyway.

00:22:17:00 - 00:22:18:08

Okay. Thank you.

00:22:20:10 - 00:22:25:09

Answered the applicant. So just building on what, um, Miss Dunn said.

00:22:25:11 - 00:22:25:26

So.

00:22:26:08 - 00:22:27:21

Um, just explain a bit more about.

00:22:27:23 - 00:23:06:06

The post consent phase. So if the projects were to get consent or the project was were to get consent, there is a whole process involved and a lead in time to construction. So alongside, um, you know, in the background, maybe looking for funding going through internal stage gates, the projects will need to look to, uh, undertake surveys. They'll need to engage with landowners. Um, and as a part of that process, we have to, um, as set out by the development consent order and all the conditions and requirements, consult on, um, say, survey requirements or, you know, um, the details of the outline management plans.

00:23:06:20 - 00:23:33:18

So as a part of that process, again, I think the point we're making is, is inherent in the processes that take place post consent that we would need to be making authorities aware. We need to discharge requirements and we will need to be talking to one another if the construction timeframes are going to

be close enough together. And that is just by virtue of the steps that we have to go to in order to discharge requirements and then to get onto land and start construction.

00:23:34:28 - 00:23:47:24

Okay. You said you will have to consult on plans, for example, but will you be consulting together or is it going to be one project consulting and then another project consulting on the same, uh, requirement?

00:23:48:25 - 00:24:26:15

Answer in behalf of both applicants. That's very much dependent on the the timeframes on which the projects have come forward. So unfortunately, we're not able to give that clarity at this stage. So, you know, there may be if we, um, are constructing with up to a four year gap. So say a four year gap, there is likely to be very little benefit or requirement for us to need to, um, construct to consult each other, as applicants. Um, unless, you know, for example, there is infrastructure, uh, already installed for the first project, and there is a temporary compound in overlapping works area.

00:24:26:17 - 00:24:59:27

So there is a bit of that taking place on the landfill, for example. So, um, because of the high number of constraints in that area, there will still be remaining overlap areas. But by and large, if project De comes forward, as in and is constructed and in the ground, there'll be very little reason. But as you can imagine, if the projects, um, end up constructing within a closer time frame, there will be a need for us to need to speak, to speak to each other and consult more closely on those outline management plans or data management plans, I should say.

00:25:03:19 - 00:25:04:28

On behalf of the applicants.

00:25:05:11 - 00:25:24:03

Uh, further to the point that my colleague Mr.. Made in the situation of a, a sequential scenario, The project coming second would, of course, take cognizance of the content of those outline plans that the first project had developed to ensure alignment with that approach, which would have been developed with the relevant local planning authorities already.

00:25:26:06 - 00:25:32:26

Thank you for that clarification. Okay. At this point, I'm going to invite interested parties to speak.

00:25:33:01 - 00:25:33:16

So

00:25:35:08 - 00:26:07:13

thank you very much. Um, as the issue of consultation has been raised by the applicant, I just want to explain in further detail to the panel exactly what it felt like being consulted on this. Um, the initial consultation events weren't held in the areas of Newton, Freckleton or Kirkham at all. As a parish council, we asked for one to be held by the applicant. They refused to do so. The information that was given out to local residents was inadequate, and it's only because we as a parish.

00:26:07:15 - 00:26:40:06

Sorry Phil Morgan, Newton and Clifton Parish Council. It's only because we and others, like the Newton Residents Association, starts to tell people what's going on. That people started to understand what's happening. When the section 42 consultation was held. The village hall was used by the applicant. So many people turned up, they had to be turned away. That was the depth of feeling concern in our community about what was happening. At no point should that consultation be used to justify the decision to put the substations where they were.

00:26:40:20 - 00:27:13:14

The decision wasn't taken because of the feedback from people. The consultation would have clearly showed opposition to this, as you've seen from the large number of representations, and the opposition would have been to the root and to the location of the substation from people in my community and local communities of Freckleton and Kirkham. So that's clearly the case where we've not been consulted properly. The case, the substation that was chosen is, from our point of view, the worst of the four options that were presented to us originally.

00:27:14:08 - 00:27:46:05

You know, we all overlook that area now, and in our cases will come on into a moment. It's combined with new sub substations. So it's the worst for our three communities. No substations that would be perfect for us. But this is particularly bad and impactful. And to claim the section 42 consultation supports that is utterly and completely wrong. There have been no evidence to support that. And the other thing is, in that consultation, it wasn't made clear to us that this could be a period of construction up to ten years.

00:27:46:16 - 00:28:07:28

We have always assumed it be together or thereabouts. We'd always assume that it would be painful, but that would be a limited time. And it's frustrating to hear the applicant deny your request for information about what the impact will be over ten years, because that will be the impact faced by myself and my neighbors and our local communities. Thank you.

00:28:09:22 - 00:28:10:14

Thank you.

00:28:12:28 - 00:28:13:23

Mr. Smith.

00:28:21:00 - 00:28:23:27

Is there a microphone for Mr. Smith? Please. There's one coming. Thank you.

00:28:31:06 - 00:28:31:23

Um.

00:28:31:25 - 00:28:32:10

Thank.

00:28:32:12 - 00:29:05:12

Thank you. Um, I just want to pick up on some of the, uh, references that Miss Dunn has made. Um. Excuse me. Uh, it's clearly been a choice to submit one DCO application. Um, just also raising about a matter of, uh, joint shareholding at the company Tepco. Tepco is a shareholder in the companies in both projects. That's BP and Flotation Energy. Um, BP has put all its offshore wind, uh, investments into, uh, Jaron XRP.

00:29:06:09 - 00:29:35:13

There are clearly a whole range of organizational arrangements that could be adopted to lead, coordinate and implement multifaceted projects, particularly in the construction sector. Given the complexities set out by Miss Dunn, could we understand why the applicants have decided to submit one DCO application and why that has less environmental community impact than the other, more established approaches that would be more familiar to the construction sector. Thank you.

00:29:37:16 - 00:29:51:28

Thank you. I'm going to move on to, um, Miss Lewis Staples online. I know there's someone, uh, a lady at the back that wants to speak. So first Miss Staples, then we'll. So Miss staples.

00:29:53:18 - 00:30:16:06

Thank you. Louis Staples for the NFU. Uh, yes. It's just a follow up. Um, to say that it it it does seem that. Yeah, completely understand that they've put one one DCO application in and that both projects are now being examined within one examination. So I understand the coordination there completely,

00:30:17:21 - 00:31:00:24

but it's not coming across that there's any coordination, uh, going to happen really for the construction at all. So I think that does need to be looked at more as to why there can't be more coordination when we go forward for the construction to make sure that if it's possible that both projects start at the same time and get built at the same time. And yeah, and as I said earlier this morning, that there then is only if there's a significant reason, should flexibility be given that one of the projects could start later just due to the amount of impact that is going to happen on the landowners and farmers? Thank you.

00:31:02:17 - 00:31:06:03

Thank you. Could we move on to the, um.

00:31:09:05 - 00:31:12:15

Could you please introduce yourself when you start speaking?

00:31:13:11 - 00:31:45:21

Hello, I'm Ross Forsey. I'm from the Squires Gate Residents Association. I just wanted to comment on some of the things, um, Liz Dunn was saying. Uh, and I find as a layperson, I find it staggering that at this stage in the game with a project that is so has so much funding behind it and so many people involved. Has this lack of joined up, aligned approach? I'm staggered.

00:31:45:23 - 00:32:23:14

I've run lots of small projects in my life, and I'd be fired if this was the kind of thing I'd be overseeing. So I find it embarrassing, and it doesn't fill me with any hope for this being a project who listens to

the local community. I'd like to add as well. Just on to the comments Phil Morgan just made. Um, about the meeting and the consultation and all the people who turned up. This venue is hugely inaccessible, and I know many, many of my neighbors who haven't come here today because it's too far away from the construction site.

00:32:23:27 - 00:32:32:16

It's an intimidating building. It's not a community space that people feel safe in. And I wonder why

00:32:34:02 - 00:32:49:08

this building has been chosen. It's it just feels very out of kilter with something that is claiming to want to connect and communicate with the local people. And that's all I wanted to say. Thank you for your time.

00:32:50:09 - 00:32:56:07

Thank you. Um, I will say that there will be further opportunities to participate in hearings.

00:32:57:27 - 00:33:00:22

And I will move on to file council

00:33:02:11 - 00:33:03:06

for council.

00:33:03:14 - 00:33:21:23

Uh, conversation in the last 20, which was really interesting. Uh, and it effectively it the reason why we've asked for a resilience and risk, uh, session uh, later on is an example of that. Thank you.

00:33:23:06 - 00:33:31:12

Thank you. Um, I can see one more, uh, hand up online. Initials 83. Good. Please.

00:33:31:14 - 00:34:09:15

Yes. Yeah. Um, doctor Andrew Trahan, I'm a resident. Um, I'm just just wanted to comment on the, um, what people have said about the consultation. Um, as somebody who tried to take part in that as much as possible. Um, it's only really today that it's sunk in the the prospect that these, uh, these two projects might actually be run consecutively. Um, I mean, the advantages of doing it as a joint application seem to be entirely for the applicants because, uh, if it's going to mean that they actually end up, uh, putting the cables in consecutively, that obviously is a massive impact.

00:34:09:23 - 00:34:46:14

And my point is that, um, I actually phoned the applicants helpline on December the 12th last year to ask about timescales for HGV traffic and to disruption to the playing fields. Um, I actually followed this up with an email the next day, and it took several reminders before they actually responded at almost 4:00 on January the 27th in respect to the HGV traffic, which of course was the actual deadline for us to make our written submissions. Um, and they referred me to a 439 page document of tables and diagrams regarding traffic movements.

00:34:46:21 - 00:35:09:01

And it's only just dawned on me today that, uh, rather than it being a potential three and a half years of additional HGV traffic along my road. It could be two lots of three and a half years. So I'd just like to emphasize the fact that I don't feel as if we've been properly informed and been able to make adequate representations during this whole process. Thank you.

00:35:10:21 - 00:35:15:09

Thank you for that. Is there anyone else who wishes to make a comment at this point?

00:35:17:06 - 00:35:21:25

I'm going to ask the applicant to, um, respond if you wish.

00:35:23:25 - 00:35:57:01

At least on behalf of the applicant. Um, uh, so in terms of, um, consultation, um, it's disappointing that the, um, the people feel they weren't consulted or that the consultation wasn't, um, accessible. There is a lot of information, obviously, in the consultation report regarding how the consultation was undertaken. There was a period of statutory consultation. There were also non-statutory consultations. And throughout that process and recognize there can be a lot of material that you need to get through as part of that.

00:35:57:15 - 00:36:28:26

Um, uh, the information was and has been available about this project. It was obviously submitted. Um, back in, uh, I think it was October time. It's been on the planning inspection. So this information has been available. Um, uh, there were mail outs, etc., etc.. I'm not going to go over all of that. The application has been accepted for examination. So I think for the purposes of the, um, the, the planning inspector to meeting those, those, uh, necessary hurdles that the project has got through that.

00:36:28:28 - 00:37:00:08

And clearly we're here now discussing it, um, in terms of, uh, of whether that, um, has any influence on what happens going forward. Um, if these projects are consented, then, um, obviously the, um, it becomes the local authority to discharge the requirements. Um, and that will go through the the discharge of the requirements under the development consent order, which is a bit like planning conditions. The details of all of those will be done through the local authority.

00:37:00:20 - 00:37:38:13

Um, and it will go through the process the local authority goes through in terms of normal discharge of requirements. So the ability for people to comment on those matters and those to be dealt with by that dealt with through the local authority. In addition, there are in a number of the um, the outline management plans, which will finally be approved through the local authority. Lots of details of where the applicant will be engaging with various interested parties prior to those details being put forward. So that part of the consultation will, um, that's how that consultation on that part of it will take place.

00:37:38:15 - 00:38:25:27

And it's a it's a standard process that people will be familiar with in terms of the way that that planning permissions are then implemented through the local authority work. Um, I think, uh, we've dealt with, uh, a lot about why we can't commit to concurrent construction. I think I did say it earlier,

and I think I said it yesterday that if concurrent construction can take place, clearly it's something the applicants will want to do. The point is we cannot commit to it. And it would be entirely misleading for us to be sitting here in this examination, uh, or to have carried out an environmental impact assessment on the basis of concurrent construction, when that can't be committed to if it can happen, it, it it will be something that the applicants would be seeking to do and to deliver.

00:38:25:29 - 00:39:02:15

But the point is, it can't be committed to at this point. And we've explained in a lot of detail why that's the case. Uh, in terms of the, um, uh, project company point, we will come back to that. I think we've agreed to put a note together in terms of where the differences are between, uh, the entirely separate joint venture companies that are promoting this and with other projects in terms of where there has been that shared ownership across projects. I think the last point I'd just like to make is, um, uh, people talk about, um, um, the sort of concern about dealing, having to deal with all of these issues together.

00:39:02:28 - 00:39:50:10

Um, I think the residents of, um, the East Coast, um, would perhaps have preferred this to anything that, um, perhaps you can never get it right, but those, uh, those communities on the East Coast, um, where? Through the, um, offshore, uh, round three leasing round where there was a zonal approach to those, uh, to the granting of the Crown Estate lease areas. And there were 3 or 4 projects that came forward through those zones, which were all looking to connect into the same sorts of areas, all looking to connect into the same substations and where the communities on that coast, uh, were either having to face a situation where they had two, uh, development consent order examinations happening concurrently.

00:39:51:07 - 00:40:22:11

So try dealing with that rather than a single set of documentation, a single set of plans, or you have project after project after project. So the applicants have sought to do through this project, and I will say the coordination that's been involved in bringing the environmental impact assessment together in the outline plans is unprecedented. So that actually this can be looked at as a whole rather than through individual examinations or through project after project after project coming through in the same place.

00:40:22:16 - 00:40:23:04

Thank you.

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

Thank you.

00:40:26:18 - 00:40:30:01

We are now going to move on to, uh, sorry item.

00:40:30:25 - 00:41:01:07

Just make an additional minor point, please. Um, and so for both applicants, I think just in relation to some of the comments around, um, information not being available on construction scenarios and such. So, um. Indeed, we did consult on the construction scenarios as they are in the final application.

Those are still located on our website and their project website in pier volume one, chapter three project description. Um, paragraph 3612. So that information was out in the public realm.

00:41:01:09 - 00:41:10:18

And then subsequently we obviously had those consultation events. Um, so, you know, to give that opportunity for people to come and discuss and ask questions to project members.

00:41:12:22 - 00:41:27:00

Okay. Thank you for the clarification. I think the point here is that there's a lot of documents to go through, and local communities wouldn't necessarily pick on all the details, but yes.

00:41:27:02 - 00:41:59:29

So I'm sorry, Anthony, for the more, um, applicant, I just want to emphasize one of Miss Dunn's points about coordination in the production of the application and the benefits that gives local communities and the planning authorities, Brought in a very simple example. We're living and breathing coordination right now in that. You've not heard much from me speaking because we've agreed a shared set of documents and almost a shared DNA between the outlined plans that both projects have produced. So you're having the benefit of not hearing Miss Dunn speak and then may speak and then passing back.

00:42:00:01 - 00:42:41:08

Similarly, the planning authorities and the communities will have the benefit of us sharing baseline documents to go out with which hopefully no one will be narcissistic about small differences will end up in final documents that are very similar, had we. And again, I know there's a note coming your way on this, but had we done this separately, you would be examining two applications. The community would be looking at two different sets of documents, two different routes, the time and that. So I want to go over the other point because I know what's coming. But I just want to emphasize that we may not be doing a good enough job of showing you the level of coordination happening behind the scenes, which has to take place for this process to work and which is, I hope, benefiting communities.

00:42:43:20 - 00:43:07:14

Okay. Thank you. We are now moving on to item E. So it's a summary and update on cumulative effects and interrelationships with other projects. I just have a general question here. Can the applicants provide any relevant update to their cumulative effects assessment?

00:43:12:06 - 00:43:17:18

And also how is it intended that this will be updated throughout the examination?

00:43:22:18 - 00:43:36:09

At least on on behalf of the applicants. Um, so we're just going to run you through the various steps that we're going through in respect of the cumulative material, um, the steps that are being undertaken and when you can expect to receive that information.

00:43:38:10 - 00:43:40:14

Gain if it can be fairly brief, please, on this.

00:43:46:02 - 00:43:47:08

Katrina Hall on behalf.

00:43:47:10 - 00:44:17:08

Of both the applicants. And so I'll just briefly run through the process that we follow to get to our cumulative effect assessment long list. And so we so this is a stage process. And we start by identifying a zone of influence for each topic and their chosen based on the standard industry guidance. And the second stage is that we then screen those projects which results in a screening matrix which was submitted with the application.

00:44:17:26 - 00:44:48:17

And so this stage identifies whether a project is taken into the cumulative effects assessment or not. Um, and that's based on the data confidence that we have the any conceptual overlap, um, any temporal overlap and or any physical or spatial overlap between that development and the transmission assets. Um, the next stage is, um, data gathering. Um, and so that's gathering information on any of those projects which have been taken forward to that stage.

00:44:48:28 - 00:45:28:27

Um, and then the final stage is the assessment itself. Um, so in terms of the um, cumulative effect assessment, um, the long list and the screening. Um, so as I said, the screening matrix was submitted, um, with the application that's Document App 039. Um, the sci screening, um, that I described under stage two is an iterative process. Um, so that process does continue, um, throughout this examination period, um, to include any new projects, um, or updates to existing projects which are available since the application was submitted in October of last year.

00:45:29:24 - 00:46:04:07

Um, so this update is screening will then be used to confirm whether there is any additional information available and which might change our assessments. So the next stage, um, we will submit a summary document of any changes to the CA. Um, but initially we'll be submitting an updated um c cumulative effect assessment screening matrix. Um at deadline one. Um and also at deadline one, we'll advise then whether any update to the assessment is required to be submitted later in the examination.

00:46:07:13 - 00:46:22:16

And I assume you're liaising with the relevant councils and adjacent councils, of course, in terms of updating that list. And could ask the councils that are here today and perhaps the listening online that they engage with that in order to provide the relevant information where requested on that.

00:46:24:25 - 00:46:48:10

So before we go, yes, I think it's the answer to that. Um, before we go on, um, I understand that there may be somebody who's filming in this room, um. Or has been. Can I just ask? I understand that, um, there's not supposed to be photographs taken, uh, within the. There's obviously the recording and and but there are people filming in the. And I'd understood that wasn't something right.

00:46:48:12 - 00:46:51:23

I wasn't aware of that. Is anybody filming or taking photographs?

00:46:59:21 - 00:47:05:16

Right. Do you speak in the microphone, please? Oh, can we have a roving microphone? Thank you.

00:47:21:23 - 00:47:31:01

I've just taken a couple of personal pictures, but I haven't done anything with them, and I didn't realise we couldn't. I'm certainly not planning to post them anywhere or share nothing.

00:47:31:03 - 00:47:32:17

I mean, there is a recording anyway of.

00:47:32:19 - 00:47:33:04

The.

00:47:33:06 - 00:47:46:13

Okay of proceedings going out to go out on the. I mean, I think generally we say if anybody intends to to film or record or take photographs, they let the case team know there's sort of a privacy element to it as well. Right.

00:47:46:15 - 00:47:54:12

I wasn't aware of that. But like I say, they're just for my benefit. They're not anything I'm sharing or posting or anything like that.

00:47:54:14 - 00:47:54:29

Yes.

00:47:55:08 - 00:48:03:23

Sure. I took some photos and posted them yesterday. I didn't I wasn't aware there was any restriction. I've now deleted all of them. Okay.

00:48:04:15 - 00:48:05:05

Thank you.

00:48:06:23 - 00:48:07:08

Okay.

00:48:07:10 - 00:48:08:03

Very very happy.

00:48:11:17 - 00:48:14:17

Thank you for that. I think we're finished on.

00:48:15:12 - 00:48:42:06

Just one more question on cumulative effects. And I think I'd also say that what we've dealing with here, item J of the next item may not be needed later on, depending on how far we get this afternoon.

That might be a nice to have, but can we not deal with it at this stage? But I was going to ask about it was mentioned yesterday morning was mentioned yesterday more particularly the uh, the onshore connection.

00:48:44:06 - 00:49:21:01

Can you just update on what level of information is known in the public domain on that at the moment? Uh, yes. I think you have indicated a potential. I think I've read more of the response to the relevant reps. Was a date you potentially gave for when that might come forward. Can you just provide an update on that? Because obviously that is quite in terms of cumulative effects are concerned. That is potentially something which will have a bearing on the cumulative effects assessment, obviously, depending on when it takes place, I suppose to a to a degree, uh, but also given that the search area is obviously includes the coastline around limits and towns as well might not come in there.

00:49:21:03 - 00:49:28:10

I don't know, I don't think anybody knows that at the moment. I don't know that's part of the question. Is there any more information that's known on that at the moment? Obviously in the public domain.

00:49:28:21 - 00:50:00:22

It's done on behalf of the applicant. Uh, I can uh, so the more than in a grey area. So the wind farm itself, the application for that, um, has been submitted to the Isle of Man government. Uh, that was done sometime in March. It has not yet been accepted for, uh, for examination or consideration. Um, and, uh, there's no indication yet as to when that might be. The Isle of Man government have a newish process for sort of considering this type of project.

00:50:01:02 - 00:50:34:03

It's not a it's not run within the planning Act. So it doesn't follow the Planning Act process because they have their own separate processes. So, um, there's no application as yet to be considered for the more than in a grey area. Um, in respect of the, uh, transmission element. Sorry, I can't remember what the project's called. Um, uh, Anyway. Anyway. Connection. Thank you. The transmission project, which connects into. Which we understand will be connecting into Penwortham.

00:50:34:20 - 00:51:06:22

Um, again, there is nothing, uh, concrete or, uh, or or, um, in the public domain in respect of that project. There's clearly some search areas that have gone out. As I understand it, I just I don't think it's gone to EIA scoping yet. So, um, so there is a section 35 direction which brings that transmission element into the Planning Act regime. It has not. But that's all there is. Um, and that is very high level in terms of what may or may not come forward.

00:51:07:00 - 00:51:36:13

Uh, there is no environmental impact scoping yet. So there is no information of um, of consideration of um, uh, potential routes or likely effects or those sorts of things. So at the moment, there is insufficient information for us to consider in any way in terms of that cumulative assessment. Clearly, the project the applicants are going to keep an eye on where that goes because, um, as soon as, um, the

00:51:38:09 - 00:52:09:01

once it becomes a scoping project, potentially it's a tier two project. Um, in accordance with the uh, Planning Act's guidance on a cumulative impact assessment. The only caveat, I'd say there is that's entirely dependent on the scoping information that's available, insofar as you can assess something or you can't based on how much information has gone into the scoping report. Uh, I don't know the timings potentially for the scoping report or when that might come forward, but obviously it's something we need to we need to keep an eye on.

00:52:09:03 - 00:52:09:18

Yeah.

00:52:10:11 - 00:52:27:27

You don't see a date of 2037 in a response to a relevant rep. I'm sure I did as an indicative date of when it might come forward. I think the the representation was saying it's probably going to be coming forward sort of after the I think the argument was be made. It's probably going to be coming forward after the construction process of this project.

00:52:28:24 - 00:52:44:01

Is done on behalf of the applicant. Um, I understand that the 2037 is the tech register connection date for more than in on the National Grid tech or VSO tech register? That's where that information came from.

00:52:47:09 - 00:53:10:12

And just before I go to Mr. Smith on this, um, obviously they provided a representation as well. East received transmission project to provide a representation which you've responded to. I just want to note that don't expect you to go into detail on that. Now. We may need to do later in the examination. Uh, but I know your response on that in writing. Uh, Mr. Smith, I'll go do that.

00:53:12:29 - 00:53:13:17

Oh, yes, I can.

00:53:13:21 - 00:53:49:11

Just to clarify, um, I think the project's name is East Irish Sea transmission project. And obviously it's a status from October. Uh, it does it does include a, uh, project introduction and obviously the search area on the, uh, Orsted website. It does make it clear that the operational date is expected by 2031 to 33. And it makes it very clear that it's been directed to are expected to go to PEM with them. So and given the comments earlier about the tech register and the stability of the dates.

00:53:49:15 - 00:54:06:19

So uncertainty about that. Obviously we've talked about the construction schedules and the flexibility of those, the DCO seven and eight years. Uh, I would say that as things stand, there's a high degree of overlap and therefore risk and complexity that has yet been addressed. Thank you.

00:54:08:17 - 00:54:09:17

Thank you, Mr. Smith.

00:54:11:02 - 00:54:29:13

So thank you, Miss Night DWF, on behalf of Blackpool Council. So just let you know that we will include within our ally a number of list of projects Blackpool Council are intending to bring forward, which are located within the vicinity. And during the construction period. We can are more than happy to discuss these with the council with the applicants.

00:54:29:19 - 00:54:53:13

Thank you for that confirmation. I think that's probably all that needs to be said on this. I mean, I would reiterate what Mr. Smith Smith said, that there is potential, isn't there, for overlap. So the issue is probably as well. It's not a scoping so it doesn't get too far into your cumulative effects assessment. Clearly there is potential that it might have cumulative effects given that construction potentially could be at the same time and in a similar location.

00:54:54:25 - 00:55:15:22

List on behalf of the applicant. Potentially it could be potentially it could not be. And it just it's not for us to guess what that project may or may not do. Um, so until there is firm information, um, in the public domain that we can consider for the purposes of the cumulative assessment, um, that's the point that we would be looking at that.

00:55:16:06 - 00:55:16:21

Okay.

00:55:16:23 - 00:55:17:08

Thank you.

00:55:18:06 - 00:55:19:09

There's another point. Yes.

00:55:20:15 - 00:55:31:05

Thank you. Uh, Paul McCann for council. Uh, just to advise that we have a, uh, a provisional date for a meeting with the promoters, uh, towards the end of May. Okay.

00:55:31:23 - 00:55:32:12

Thank you.

00:55:34:27 - 00:55:35:14

Okay.

00:55:43:02 - 00:55:56:22

Are there any further comments on this, uh, item from anyone? Okay. In that case, we'll move on, and I'm going to hand over to my colleague, Doctor Morgan. Now.

00:55:57:20 - 00:56:29:09

Thank you. So we're on item five. So we've just got a few questions on proposed construction, working hours and mobilization period. So, uh, we've noted that the applicants have committed to, uh, the following core working hours starts Monday to Saturday, 7 to 700 to 1900 hours, and up to a

further hour of mobilization before and after the core hours, which in effect increases the working hours to between 600 and 2000 hours.

00:56:29:23 - 00:56:50:08

So my first question is, um, basically on similar projects, looking at ramping to a more, for instance, applicants have only proposed working half the day on Saturday, uh, to provide some respite to residents. Uh, I'd be grateful for your comments on why that should not be the case on this project as well.

00:56:51:10 - 00:57:26:16

Uh, so it's done on behalf of the applicants just before I pass on to Mr. McNamee, who, um, it isn't correct to say that the hourly more project proposed, uh, only working on Saturday morning. The hourly more project sought consent to work on all day on Saturday and it was the examining authority and then the Secretary of State's recommendation. That that wasn't, uh, permitted. Um, the hourly mall project. Uh, from the examination website, you'll see there was a justification given, which will be a very similar justification, I think, to you here from Mr.

00:57:26:18 - 00:57:36:19

McNamee, as to why a whole day working on Saturday was required. So it isn't correct that the applicant sought a half day. The applicant sought a full day on Saturday.

00:57:36:21 - 00:57:37:06

Thank you.

00:57:37:08 - 00:57:38:22

Yes, that is noted.

00:57:41:09 - 00:58:14:12

Sir. Pardon me, sir Anthony might be for the applicants. Um, just to clarify as well. Um, all current officer one from applications are seeking the Monday to Saturday, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. core hours with a shoulder either side for site prep and site and cleaning operations. Now, the reason for a full day on a Saturday is one of efficiency and actually reducing community impacts. Because when you lose that half a day in one week, it doesn't seem like a lot. But over the course of a construction period, if you add up half day's loss, it does actually mean the construction will take longer.

00:58:14:20 - 00:58:22:12

So we're going for this six days at 7 p.m. 7 p.m. approach to actually reduce the impact on communities.

00:58:23:23 - 00:58:34:09

Sorry. So just for clarity, you're saying that overall construction period would be increased. Um, if that if that full day working was restricted to half a day?

00:58:34:11 - 00:58:47:12

Yeah, that's my understanding because of the cumulative not in the environmental cumulative sense, but the of losing a half day over a long period and still have to work out that time would extend a construction period.

00:58:49:03 - 00:58:49:23

Okay.

00:58:50:29 - 00:59:01:01

Um, with this this shoulder mobilization hour, could you explain what works would actually take place within that? The shorter period.

00:59:01:09 - 00:59:27:24

And the shorter period is designed for workers to arrive on site to begin light preparation activities. Safety briefings. And at the end of the day, it would be shut down. Worked. Basic things like make sure the equipment is turned off and boots are cleaned and so on. It's not intended that any noise activities would take place. There would be no HGV deliveries coming at that time. It's purely to get site ready. Um.

00:59:28:17 - 00:59:53:07

So activities with a very low noise level. Um, and you say HDTVs will not be arriving within that period? What about the scenario where HDTVs are coming towards the site? Um, where would they be held? Do you propose a location to hold them? Um, um, so they don't appear next to residences? Or how do you how do you propose actually managing that scenario.

00:59:53:09 - 01:00:09:09

With a construction trap? So we have an outline construction traffic management plan submitted as part of the application. And that's also sorry, it's also governed by requirement Nine and eight, which deal with traffic and transport and code of construction practice.

01:00:11:01 - 01:00:15:19

And that will obviously be agreed in consultation and approval of the planning authorities and Highways Authority.

01:00:15:25 - 01:00:25:19

Okay. So what do you envisage practically? Um, the measures will be to avoid those HGVs arriving at the site at the appropriate time.

01:00:25:21 - 01:00:27:28

And that's slightly out of my depth.

01:00:30:25 - 01:00:31:16

To my colleague.

01:00:36:22 - 01:00:44:15

Thank you sir. Andrew Ross, transport consultant, on behalf of the applicant. Um. So in.

01:00:44:19 - 01:00:45:04

Yeah.

01:00:45:20 - 01:00:48:00

Yeah. Typically it would.

01:00:48:02 - 01:00:48:17

Be.

01:00:48:24 - 01:01:21:00

Written into, uh, the construction traffic management plan that, um, arrival and departures are not permitted during that Mobilization period, and there is a clear commitment in the construction traffic management plan to that end. Uh para 133. Timing of HDTVs. Um, which is let me suck

01:01:22:16 - 01:02:06:15

uh, up 211 and that's, uh, secured by, um, requirement nine of the draft DCO. Um, and that kind of, um, steers the market and the supply chain, if you, if you like, because, uh, once there's that clear commitment in there, they will gear their operations around that. There's also further commitments there to, uh, not permit waiting on the public highway, not permit unloading on the highway, not permit idling of engines while waiting.

01:02:07:12 - 01:02:16:21

Um, so the controls are in there, and, uh, that will give a clear steer to, uh, the supply chain.

01:02:18:12 - 01:02:59:00

A majority of bulk materials are likely to be coming from quarry suppliers, who will have a fleet of vehicles and will be able to time their deliveries. It wouldn't be efficient for them to be either turning up all at once, or having vehicles waiting around, so that it would be quite a precise operation. Vehicles coming from further afield, maybe from ports, will have as part of their journey log will will know the designated permitted areas to wait to time their journey Appropriately.

01:02:59:28 - 01:03:00:17

Okay.

01:03:01:12 - 01:03:24:16

But in the best world in the world, you know, um, things happen. Um, vehicles will arrive too early. Um, what monitoring proposals have you got? What proactive measures do you have in place to address those sorts of situations and make sure they don't don't get worse or continue.

01:03:27:16 - 01:04:09:27

Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, so the OC tmp um, contains a suite of monitoring measures and intervention measures. Uh, including, um, having access to G.P.S. monitoring of vehicles, which will give the applicant the tools to intervene, intervene and enforce the requirements of the DCO and the compliance with the DCO.

01:04:11:03 - 01:04:16:27

Um, and this this is pretty, pretty typical post DCO.

01:04:17:21 - 01:04:37:23

Okay. Thank you for that. Just going back. My final question to the Saturday post Saturday working. Um, if you are working on Saturday, do you think 7:00 is appropriate? Start time works on Saturday. Given people would have been exposed right throughout the week to that work.

01:04:39:17 - 01:04:41:09

But thoughts on that? Please.

01:04:41:11 - 01:04:54:01

Let's done on behalf of the applicant, um, uh, the applicant, um, are seeking to, um, deliver this project as or deliver the projects, um, as, um,

01:04:55:19 - 01:05:27:22

If I say to be in and out as quickly as possible, that's the purpose of these construction hours. So, um, the, the working hours on a Saturday, um, are, uh, as we've said, they are, um, they're the basis on which, um, the applicant considers it can most efficiently, effectively carry out those works within that area. Um, 7:00 is a reasonable period to do that. Um, and, um, that's the basis on which the applicants are seeking, are seeking the requirement.

01:05:27:24 - 01:06:04:08

There was something I just did want to clarify, um, where I think there was a question as to whether, um, if Saturday afternoon working wasn't permitted, whether it would extend the overall duration of the, of the 36 months. Um, uh, the point is, it would extend the duration in any one particular area rather than the duration across the whole of the assessment. Does that make sense? So the 36 months would remain, but you would just have longer periods of working in particular areas because it would take longer to do those elements of the project.

01:06:04:14 - 01:06:19:26

That's just because it is. There will not that because of the nature of the way these projects are delivered, there will not be a working along the whole of the corridor at the whole of the time. There'll be a focus on each of the areas along the cable corridor as the cables put in.

01:06:20:09 - 01:06:33:18

I don't quite follow that because if the area is on the critical path in the programme, then it will inevitably extend the length of the overall programme. So if you can just clarify that please.

01:07:06:02 - 01:07:39:05

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. And the points about the 36 months and kind of ties back into the the definition of the stages. As we were talking about earlier, the onshore cable route is it's an overarching construction period of 36 months. It is not a case that you work start to finish, and that takes 36 months. The staging of the project, in all likelihood, will be that you focus on particular areas and particular work fronts, and that does not take 36 months, but the completion of the overarching onshore cable route would.

01:07:39:08 - 01:07:57:05

So when we break it down into those periods of Saturday afternoons, the removal of that would mean that those individual stages would take longer and would and therefore it puts additional pressure on trying to fit that within the 36 month window that's been identified for the impact assessment, potentially extending.

01:07:57:07 - 01:07:57:22

It.

01:07:58:13 - 01:08:01:27

Okay. Perhaps you could provide it. It's just a very brief note on that for me.

01:08:06:23 - 01:08:12:19

Okay. I'm going to open it up to IPPs now to actually comment on that. Please file council.

01:08:12:21 - 01:08:42:00

Paul Kim file council. Uh, just a note that in the draft construction management plan, as it is, uh, responsibility for managing the CMC is passed to the principal contractor, not the applicants. And this side of the tables were all a bit long in the tooth in dealing with, uh, breaches of, uh, construction and management plans. Uh, so we fully expect that will happen.

01:08:43:12 - 01:08:47:21

Okay. Thank you. Any other comments before I go back to Mr.. To respond.

01:08:49:15 - 01:09:23:28

Councillor Neil Stephens, Lancashire County Council Exactly the same with the construction management plan to support them in principle. What's really critical? I haven't actually seen it yet. They've got to be achievable and realistic. All the other organisations who have involved in this project have got their own timeline and their own other projects that they're dealing with. So the reality is, will they be arriving before. Yes, they will unfortunately. Will they be having impact upon the local built environment? Yes they will. Including sensitive receptors that could include schools for drop off clubs, etc..

01:09:24:00 - 01:09:52:19

So it is a massive issue. In some ways I think. Trying to be supportive. I think there's got to be something with regard to penalties. If somebody does stop and wait on the highway, if there is the point that there will be no waiting, that's going to be what, within a catchment of many miles. In reality, I think what would be preferable if they had somewhere offsite where they could store these vehicles in advance of them going to the individual compounds. Thank you.

01:09:53:00 - 01:09:57:04

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevens. This time, we'd like to respond to any of those points.

01:09:57:24 - 01:10:30:17

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. I'd firstly like to say that on on traffic Matters, we've been in regular conversation with Lancashire County Council and also National Highways in relation

to the outline construction traffic management plan. Um, it has been flagged to us both through relevant representation and that consultation that some of the wording within the construction traffic management plan does need tightening. And we are taking that away and seeking to agree that with Lancashire County Council and broadly, the applicants are in agreement that we can tighten the wording in relation to, to penalties.

01:10:31:02 - 01:10:55:06

Um, perhaps not in that, that, that wording, but um, how we enforce essentially the arrival and delivery of heavy goods vehicles from afar so that they do not breach the, um, the construction, working hours or mobilisation hours as they are currently drafted in the DCO. Um, finally, I think it's I think it's just worth saying that. Um, sorry, I've lost the thread there, so I'm just going to stop because I forgot.

01:10:56:15 - 01:11:31:21

Um, les down on behalf of the applicants, I think it was just a point to stress that whilst the, the, uh, outline construction traffic management plan and other plans potentially talk about the principal contractor, um, that is explaining who will be the kind of person that's doing the day to day of it. But the ultimate responsibility for complying with those management plans rested with the Undertaker. It doesn't pass to the principal contractor. It stays with The Undertaker as the named person who is required, uh, who is, uh, committed under the requirements to comply with the details within that.

01:11:33:03 - 01:11:36:28

Okay. Thank you, Miss Dunn. Um, yes. Blackpool.

01:11:37:07 - 01:11:58:29

So, Miss Knight, Blackpool Council. Uh, I firstly want to thank the applicant yesterday for coming over to see us. Are the traffic management people. Blackpool Council or unitary authority, the the local highway authority and would like to be involved in further discussions. We look forward to these being productive and we will be setting out measures in our local impact report.

01:11:59:15 - 01:12:02:28

Okay. Thank you for that. Mr.. Do you want to say anything on that at all?

01:12:03:28 - 01:12:09:06

Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants, knows that we welcome the engagement with Blackpool Council. Thank you.

01:12:09:15 - 01:12:19:26

Okay. So I think that concludes that agenda item. So I'm now going to pass over to my colleague Mr. Gorst for our item agenda item five, which is community benefits.

01:12:21:19 - 01:12:28:11

Thank you. Thank you Doctor Morgan. So moving on to item five G. Uh, community benefits. Um.

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

So I'll just give you a moment.

01:12:40:15 - 01:13:11:00

Thank you. Um. Could the applicants explain? Uh, as far as practical and as far as practical, estimate the predicted social and economic benefits such as employment, local spending, support for community services, etc., that would arise from the proposed development for the various rural villages between Livingston towns and Preston. Uh, and I want the applicant to clearly set out the local benefits of the proposed development. Thank you.

01:13:11:18 - 01:13:43:03

Sir. Listen, on behalf of the applicants, can I suggest we pick this up in the EIA section on. Um. Uh, sorry, I, uh, in the next section, in terms of community benefits, I've prepared something to give an update on community benefits, i.e. community benefits, which are the things that are now being proposed under the um linear project's, um, guidance. But we have There is an item on EIA, consideration of, of benefits etc.

01:13:43:13 - 01:13:48:03

um, which is under local businesses and tourism and I suspect we're probably better to pick that up there.

01:13:49:19 - 01:14:26:06

Uh, well we, we might touch well touch on it again later. Um, I think the point we want to make here is that, um, uh, the planning statement, which is, um, up two, three, three pages on the national benefits of the scheme, uh, statement of reasons as 009 does very much the same, uh, and is very, very light on direct benefits for, uh, the local area. It was mentioned by biodiversity benefit at Lee Marsh fields and the possibility of some job creation.

01:14:27:00 - 01:14:49:13

Um, but I think we'd like to hear about the direct benefits for the Fylde area, um, for that to be collated. It. Um, and and um, some information given. So yes, we might well come back to it later, but um, uh, it's on the agenda here. And, uh, I think I'm looking for, uh, for some indication of what local benefits might arise.

01:14:52:06 - 01:15:26:19

But list down on behalf of the applicants. I think this is something we need to take away and respond to in writing. I'm not in a position to, um, to the the assessments been undertaken. Uh, and it's clear as to the basis on which the assessment has been undertaken. Um, and there is an item on this, uh, this afternoon in respect of socio in respect of, of impacts on, uh, local businesses and tourism. Um, the applicants have proposed, um, a, uh, an outline skills and employment plan, which is secured through the draft development consent order.

01:15:27:07 - 01:15:58:09

Um, and somebody will very kindly give me the reference number for that document, which sets out the applicant's approach to, um, securing um, uh, local benefits. So it's um, app two, three, nine, um, and that is set up to support the delivery of the wider benefits associated with the transmission assets. That outlines the principles that will be applied, ranging from engagement with all stages of the education system to recruitment, ongoing training, etc..

01:15:58:11 - 01:16:16:24

That's something that will be worked up. Um, if consent is granted with uh, in conjunction with um Lancashire Council and input from others as set out in the Outline Skills and Employment plan. Um, and that's the vehicle by which, um, those elements of the project would be brought forward.

01:16:17:25 - 01:16:49:03

I hear what you say. Um, and we may well have a discussion about the outline employment and skills plan later. I'm sure council will want to have, um, uh, contribute on that. Uh, but my point is that some of your overarching documents and I mentioned the planning statement and sound reasons are very light in terms of local benefits, and particularly when it comes to the statement of reasons. Uh, the fact that this does major on national benefits.

01:16:49:07 - 01:17:08:28

I think this is a very, very important, um, point and an important consideration. So, um, I think I'm asking you to consider those documents and whether they should be updated to actually emphasize the local benefit, certainly the benefits for the local community.

01:17:14:09 - 01:17:20:04

On behalf of the applicants, will take that point away and come back to you on it. We'll we'll respond at deadline one.

01:17:21:24 - 01:17:22:14

Thank you.

01:17:25:07 - 01:17:31:18

I can see we've got some some hands up and Blackpool Council, would you like to uh, to to to comment.

01:17:31:28 - 01:18:10:20

Summer's night Blackpool council. The council's have had a discussion this morning and we've reviewed the employment plan. We welcome the inclusion of the employment and Skills Plan within the DCO. However, we we seek firmer, uh, commitments from the applicants, uh, and a joint 106 agreement, which sets timeframes and is able to be readily enforced by the local authorities. So, if I may add, we are all, I think, around this table, aware of the local government reorganisation that is currently ongoing and will occur throughout the lifetime of this project.

01:18:10:22 - 01:18:20:21

The councils therefore request a joint section 106 agreement with all authorities in order for all local councils to be able to enforce, should they become one authority.

01:18:22:10 - 01:18:22:28

Thank you.

01:18:24:00 - 01:18:45:29

Thank you for that. Um, this is for the at the back of the room. Did you want to say something? You're okay. Thank you very much. Um, Mr. McKim. Uh. You will. We will be talking about socio economic this afternoon, so you have a second chance. So don't worry about it. This isn't your only option, but please come in now.

01:18:46:04 - 01:18:58:14

Uh, thank you, sir. I just wanted to confirm, uh, that his position in relation to a joint session 106 and schedules, uh, within the DCO to enforce those measures.

01:19:03:18 - 01:19:07:10

Mr.. Do you want to respond to to that from the council's.

01:19:07:14 - 01:19:20:10

List done on behalf of the applicant? Um, I have to say we're not entirely clear on the basis for section 106, but we'll pick that up separately with the councils in terms of, um, what it is they are referring to.

01:19:21:18 - 01:19:22:09

Thank you.

01:19:30:05 - 01:19:31:16

Sorry. Thank you very much.

01:19:33:01 - 01:20:03:13

Thank you. First of all, a slight bit of indulgence. Sorry. Phil Morgan Newton with Clifton Parish Council. I made that mistake before as well. So, um, just a little bit of indulgence, if I may. Um, there certainly is a reference, um, in the main, uh, consultation document that was issued about the landfill construction periods. Uh, the fast facts are indicative. The maximum duration of landfill construction. 36 months, Morgan, and 36 months Morecambe.

01:20:03:22 - 01:20:40:25

And there's no reference to a four year separation period. There may be another documents, but this is meant to be the main one that people saw. So thank you for your indulgence on that. On community benefits. Um, I think it's, um, frustrating that having explained what I did earlier in the, the sessions and that there'd been a refusal to engage with us as Tammany Parish councils on how community benefits might work, particularly as there is now consultation, the resulting in guidance from the Department of Energy Security and net zero that was updated on the 9th of April, 2025.

01:20:41:00 - 01:21:11:23

That clearly sets out a series of requirements for community funds for transmission infrastructure, including large sums of money relating particularly to substations of £530,000 per substation. One of the things that happened on Tuesday after we'd finished, was a member of the team opposite came and approached me and said they were very pleased that we'd formed this group. The Transmission Assets Steering Group that's made up of a number of town and parish councils and resident organisations.

01:21:12:08 - 01:21:41:19

She would like to have more contact with us and so on. Um, if there is an intent to do something on community benefits, we as a group would be happy to engage with the applicants on that, and find ways in which these community benefits can be used for the use of our communities. That doesn't stop us opposing the scheme, which we will do. So it doesn't stop us seeking to make changes to the scheme, which we will continue to do. But we would be prepared to have those discussions and it fills a gap that's currently there in the applicants proposals. Thank you.

01:21:43:22 - 01:22:05:04

Thank you very much for that. Um, yes. I think we've all been following the planning infrastructure bill. Um, and I think the benefits might be relatively limited. Um, as far as that's concerned. But, um, uh, we'll all wait and see what, um, comes through in the meantime, is there anybody else, either in the room or online who wants to

01:22:06:26 - 01:22:12:20

make a point? Um, we will be picking it up again later under socio economic, uh, matters.

01:22:12:26 - 01:22:55:04

So it's done on behalf of the applicants, can I just respond to a couple of those points, please? Um, I would have gone on to talk about community benefits in the sense that Mr. Morgan is talking about them. Um, which is, um, and we're very aware of the guidance. Um, and, um, I'm delighted that the team have come over and started to talk to you about that. The reason the applicants haven't engaged at this stage is community benefits can be quite a sensitive area, and there can be allegations if the discussion starts too early, that the applicants are seeking to buy their planning permission or somehow persuade local authorities, local residents, um, through some sort of, um, uh, community benefit fund.

01:22:55:08 - 01:23:29:15

So the applicants have also been waiting for the guidance to be issued by the government, which, as we know, only came out in March. So it's pretty, pretty new. Um, that guidance is now in place. Uh, the applicants will start a consultation later this year. But again, just to put down a marker. And it's very much there in the guidance that community benefits in this sense are not a material consideration for for the Secretary of State. Um or uh indeed are material to the determination of whether or not consent should or shouldn't be granted.

01:23:29:21 - 01:23:58:04

So those discussions will carry on on that basis. Uh, if the examining authority are interested in how that progresses, we're very happy to tell you. But there isn't actually anything in terms of the materiality of those of those discussions. That relates to the to the matters that are being considered here in terms of whether or not consent should be granted. I just wanted to make that clear and clear that those discussions will start later that later this year, in terms of engagement with relevant parties.

01:23:58:22 - 01:24:16:14

Thank you for that. Um, obviously, if the legislation is passed, then then it could become material and relevant for us to, to, to, to consider, although not part of the policy consideration. Can I just come back and ask you. Can you just repeat who your organisation was for the for the discussion.

01:24:16:25 - 01:24:47:03

Yes, it's called the Transmission Assets Steering Committee. It's made up of eight, um, town parish councils. That's Newton with Clifton Freckleton Kirkham, Ray green, Ruby with Ray green, um Wheaton, Westby with Plumpton, Saint Anne's Town Council and if it didn't say Kirkham Town Council, they're a town council as well. It also includes the Hornby's Foundation Who, a grant giving organization, uh Charity and the Newton Residents Association.

01:24:48:07 - 01:24:49:25

Sorry, the last one again.

01:24:49:27 - 01:24:52:21

The whole the Newton residents.

01:24:53:03 - 01:24:56:25

The whole Danes, you say sorry. The one before the, um.

01:24:57:12 - 01:24:58:15

The Hornby Foundation.

01:24:58:17 - 01:25:01:09

Hornby, who are a landowner, I think, aren't they?

01:25:01:11 - 01:25:20:13

They are. And they're, I think, separate relevant representative in their own right. Probably tomorrow. Um, but they have been part of our group and they are, amongst other things, a grant giving charity, uh, designed to support Abort what was originally young women and girls in schools. It's a slightly wider definition, right?

01:25:20:15 - 01:25:29:28

And so it's just chance transmission assets steering committee. You haven't got a sort of filed doesn't refer to filed or any particular area.

01:25:30:04 - 01:25:32:16

All the members are in filed.

01:25:33:01 - 01:25:33:18

Um, right.

01:25:33:20 - 01:25:38:07

Obviously our main focus is around this and the commissioning of Angus Walker as well.

01:25:38:12 - 01:25:39:22

All right. Thank you very much indeed.

01:25:39:27 - 01:25:40:15

Thank you.

01:25:42:07 - 01:25:43:27

Final chance for anyone else.

01:25:45:28 - 01:25:47:10

To say something.

01:25:49:01 - 01:25:57:05

No thank you for that. Well it's now 1250 so I think we'll now break for lunch. Um.

01:25:59:13 - 01:26:07:06

And we'll come back in exactly an hour at 150. Um, so the meeting's adjourned until 150. Thank you very much.