



Planning Inspectorate  
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Part 6
<b>Date:</b>	30 July 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.

File Length: 01:29:51

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:09:00 - 00:00:11:12

If we can ask everyone to be taking your seats, please.

00:00:27:07 - 00:00:30:08

Okay. If we can settle down so we can kick off again, please.

00:00:34:03 - 00:00:34:18

All.

00:00:41:19 - 00:01:12:11

Right. So we're now on to item seven, land use and recreation. Um, and we're going to start off talking about the, um, Blackpool Road Recreation Ground and the extent of the impacts. Um, so the applicant's, um, said the impacts on the recreation ground, a minor adverse and filed borough council put in their response to the SSC. One response to question 12. 119 didn't agree.

00:01:13:02 - 00:01:21:05

Um, I don't know if you want to, um, Fylde Council say any more about, um, what you thought about the assessment of minor adverse.

00:01:24:15 - 00:01:56:09

Uh, good morning, John Coats, borough council. Um, I think we've set out, um, our position. So I don't want to go over points that we've already made, but I think the main point to make is that, uh, Blackpool Road Playing fields, um, provides a number of important functions for a large number of people within Fylde. So there are obvious recreation and health benefits. Um, the football club supports, um, a large number of teams of all ages, different demographics.

00:01:56:23 - 00:02:51:03

Um, and I think serves about 7 or 800 players. They operate throughout the year. So the potential for impacts is significant. Um, we also note that in discussions yesterday, um, about the request for, um, changes to, um, the, the project that would have a potential impact on Blackpool Road playing field. Um, we're just interested in, uh, why if those issues, those options were available to the applicant, were they not considered in response to the concerns that we've raised about these impacts on the football grounds? Um, and but I would caveat that by saying, um, that the overview provided by the applicant that the, uh, changes would remove the, the 11 a side football pitch from the works, um, and thereby would deliver some benefit.

00:02:51:05 - 00:03:15:17

We would question that from an operational point of view, because those changes might not enable the pitch to be used. For example, if there are works still being carried out close to that football pitch, um, it might not be safe for its use. So yes. Um, that's just a, um, a summary of our position. Um, as otherwise represented in our local impact report in response to questions.

00:03:16:15 - 00:03:46:18

All right. Thank you for that, mister. Um, I'll ask the applicants to respond in a moment. Um, but if they could also, um, come back on on at this point, uh, commitment one, two, four, uh, says that alternative locations will be explored where mitigation is required. Um, this is quite vague. Uh, when the extent and length of works, uh, make it almost inevitable that part of the ground will be unusable for a considerable period of time.

00:03:47:08 - 00:03:57:21

Uh, you say five months, but, um, that may well overlap the football season. So can this be reviewed? Um, about the possibility of alternative locations.

00:03:58:17 - 00:04:10:05

Uh. Sorry, sir. It's done. On behalf of the applicant. I'm really apologize, but I was trying to work out how we were going to respond to Fylde Council when you started speaking, so I missed that. I do apologize, I missed the first bit.

00:04:10:07 - 00:04:52:21

Yeah. That's okay. It's, um. Uh, I apologize for moving on too quickly. That that was my fault. But in a way, it was building on something Mr. Cope said. Uh, or part of the comment that he said, um, and it was commitment. 1 to 4 talks about alternative locations will be explored when the mitigation is required, where mitigation is required. Um, and the point I was making is that this is somewhat vague, uh, when you're saying the works will only be take five months, but the extent and length of the works seem to make it almost inevitable that part of the ground will be unusable for a considerable period of time, which may well overlap the football seasons.

00:04:53:11 - 00:05:07:05

Um, so can you review whether or not alternative locations can be offered? Because, um, you know, that seems to be quite important, bearing in mind the impact on any number of football football pitches. Thank you.

00:05:07:21 - 00:05:51:21

Thank you sir. That was very helpful. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant. I wonder if it might be helpful if we, um, were to, uh, in response to the questions raised by Fylde and in respect to your, uh, questions around mitigation, effectively for, for impacts, if we just, um, step back and explain why we've come up with a, um, the minor adverse impacts on, uh, on the, uh, Blackpool Road Recreation Ground, how that conclusion has been reached in terms of, um, the environmental impact assessment, then, um, the regard that's been taken to, um, to the use of the football ground at the moment, which I think were the points that that the council was making.

00:05:52:01 - 00:06:24:19

Um, and the point around the change request, which actually I can probably deal with quite quickly. Um, the change in respect of the Recreation ground and the reduction of the order limits in there is directly as a result of the changes of the agreement that's been reached with Blackpool Airport. And the fact that it is now, uh, it isn't going to be necessary to take, um, a HDD across a wide sweep when, when the application comes in, this will be clear.

00:06:24:21 - 00:06:55:02

But that bulge in the recreation ground or the limit was directly as a result of the potential need to do effectively a wide arc to drill to the top, uh, into into the airport. And by removing that need for that drill, uh, or the potential for that drill, um, into the airport, it removes the need for the bulge. So it's only something that's been worked through following discussions with the airport, which is why it wasn't in the original order limits. So hopefully we can pause that one there.

00:06:55:04 - 00:07:02:18

We'll also. Sorry. Well, could someone be bringing up that plan on in the change request? That'd be quite useful. Thank you.

00:07:06:04 - 00:07:47:24

Uh, and then finally, um, we'll come on to explain where we are in terms of the mitigation that is being considered and being proposed for the temporary impacts. And we must remember these are temporary. Appreciate they may be over a period of time, but they are temporary impacts on the recreation ground, uh, during the period of those works. So, um, if I can ask Mr. Tindale, can you just set out how we've assessed the impacts on the recreation ground in terms of apologies, reaching that conclusion of minor, uh, adverse? And then we'll go into the point around, um, uh, how we've considered those uses and mitigation.

00:07:49:07 - 00:08:32:05

Thank you. Julia Tindale, on behalf of the applicants. Yes. Within the environmental statement, we, um, clearly, uh, have assessed that, um, the, uh, pavers are obviously a high sensitivity receptor. Um, because of the nature of the uses, we know we've got the football club. We've got people just using it for recreational use. Um, there's the playing, um, playground as well there. And the clubhouse, uh, facility. Um, we have, um, assessed it's a high sensitivity receptor, but obviously, uh, through the discussions with Fylde and the football club, and we've been looking at a range of, um, comprehensive mitigation measures.

00:08:32:17 - 00:09:04:13

Um, looking at the nature of the club in some detail, how they function, the, the types of events they have. Um, and, um, so we have worked through we're working through that with them. And obviously we're still in active discussions with, with Fylde and the football club about how those uses can be maintained. We've reduced as far as possible the length, duration of the works. We're using trenches techniques through most of it to ensure that basically we don't have to restore that ground at the end of the day, and that area can go straight back into the club.

00:09:05:10 - 00:09:35:18

We're then looking at support measures, depending on the time of the year of the works, as to what the football club are actually doing at that time as well. So we're looking at all of that package of mitigation measures, and with those in place and the correct ones in place by agreement with files and um, obviously the football club themselves, we believe that that would reduce the overall effect to minor adverse. So there will be a short term loss, but it would be mitigated through the package of measures that we're seeking to implement.

00:09:36:09 - 00:09:44:13

Can I just pause for a second a moment. I think we might need to close these doors, because I think there's some pitch maintenance going on and it's getting a bit cold. So sorry. Yeah,

00:09:46:09 - 00:09:50:12

yeah. We can always open it again if it gets too warm. It's just I think they're doing some.

00:09:53:03 - 00:09:56:03

There we go. That's probably okay.

00:09:57:18 - 00:10:02:06

Is that one causing. Are you getting a. Is that okay? Okay. Sorry. Sorry.

00:10:03:07 - 00:10:07:16

Any idea when we might hear it from you about what you've got to with those measures?

00:10:09:12 - 00:10:11:14

I'll hand over to my colleague. Yeah.

00:10:11:16 - 00:10:36:15

Laura Martin, on behalf of both the applicants. Um, the applicant submitted a draft section 106 to file. Borough council. And let them trust, um, on Friday the 25th of July. We are waiting for comments on that draft, section 106. But we have prepared an explanatory memorandum to accompany that and are happy to submit that deadline for if that's helpful.

00:10:37:19 - 00:10:40:04

Yeah, that that would be helpful. We'd like to see that. Thank you.

00:10:43:21 - 00:10:48:16

Um, Is it any more? To add on that, I'll go back to file for their comments.

00:10:49:10 - 00:10:51:06

I can go through the measures in it if you want.

00:10:51:08 - 00:10:55:15

No, no. If you just submitted it for that, that would be great. Mr. cope.

00:10:56:16 - 00:11:32:15

Thank you. John Coats, borough council. Um, in terms of how they have, um, reached their conclusion about minor adverse impacts. I would like to point out that in the s chapter on land use and recreation. Excuse me, app 104. Uh, in their assessments. Um, they, they described that the these impacts would be temporary and short term. Um which we would disagree with that with that assessment.

00:11:32:18 - 00:11:52:20

That assessment is supported by their own position that, um, parts of the access to the recreation ground would be limited to two months only. But that that is not reflected in The Commitments. Um, so it appears that the assessment which is presented mainly um.

00:11:55:09 - 00:12:27:14

Uh, presented mainly within chapter six of the as um, um, that their assessment and the conclusions drawn on unjustified and aren't followed through to the commitments. The other point to make is that the applicants will be aware from their discussion with the football club, that alternative provision is a very difficult, um, thing to resource in the local area. Um, there are challenges around that and doubts that it would be possible. And regardless, even where alternative provision is provided.

00:12:28:04 - 00:12:58:24

Um, it does not fully mitigate any impacts arising. Alternative provision um is often um in this case would have to be at some distance from Blackpool Recreation Grounds. at the moment. A lot of the users that go there walk to the grounds. So there is a feeling from the football club that alternative provision, um, would see some people kind of excluded or prevented from continuing to engage with those sports activities.

00:13:01:05 - 00:13:32:09

So let's start on behalf of the applicant. Can I just come back on the commitment point? Um, can I point you to commitment, Scott? One, two, three, please. Which says that this trench technique. So this is the one at Blackpool Road Recreation Ground, is anticipated to last a maximum of five months. Before we get the question as to why anticipated? Uh, it's because we can't guarantee that that will be the case. But that's the that's the expected period, effectively, of that of total active construction within the grounds. Appropriate exclusion.

00:13:32:11 - 00:14:03:00

Exclusion fencing between the entry and exit pits will only be erected for a maximum of two months, within the five months of active To construction. To mitigate potential impacts to users, and also that any effectively, any restoration that's needed will also be within that five month period. So I think the applicants completely appreciate the sensitivity of the grounds and the sensitivity of of there being an impact on these. But the time period we are talking about is a short time period.

00:14:03:02 - 00:14:36:22

So to say that it's not temporary is, is is I would suggest it's probably not correct. Um, because it is a temporary impact. The just reiterate that this is a trench crossing. So there will be no open trenching. There will be no trenches being dug. There is a trench crossing of this section, which is how the applicants have been able to commit to, um, to their being, to being in for such a short period of time effectively, and for the works being limited in the way they are.

00:14:38:08 - 00:14:58:14

Um, thank you for that. Um, initially we were, I think, going to have an entry or exit pit. Uh, although it was all trenches, there was going to be an entry and exit pit, um, within the recreation ground. Now, I'm not sure where that's been moved away with the change application.

00:14:59:05 - 00:15:06:10

Uh, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants. No, that hasn't been moved. So there is an entry in an exit pit. Um, but there isn't trenched working.

00:15:11:03 - 00:15:53:11

Lawfully. On behalf of the applicant. I could probably just slightly clarify. So there's there will be no trench working within, uh, work numbers 15 A, 15 B. So those are the that's the work number that sits in the middle basically between the two ends where the entry and exit pits are identified. I think it's under work numbers uh, 53 A and possibly 52 A at either end. Sorry. 51 A and B, um, and there is provision in those work descriptions for trenching, but that's only, uh, to allow for where if there was open trenching coming from one side to the exit pits before it then becomes trenches

00:15:55:05 - 00:16:08:19

or entry pits. So for example, at the Leach Lane end, in the event open, it was open cut across that road. You would still need to continue open cuts until you reach the entry or exit pit.

00:16:20:01 - 00:16:27:09

So I think it means that there will be some surface disruption there as a result, and that's a better plan. Thank you.

00:16:28:02 - 00:16:32:02

Laura, for the for the applicants just at those very end points.

00:16:38:14 - 00:16:44:23

Are the pitches I can't remember from our site. Visit other pitches located in those locations where there's the entry exit pits.

00:16:47:06 - 00:17:02:22

Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicant. Um, there are pitches where it is 51 A, 51 B, but where there is where it is 53 A, 53 B, that's where the, um, skate park is located.

00:17:05:16 - 00:17:16:21

Thank you for that. Um, just coming back to file, then you're saying that it's going to be different to have alternative locations? Um, there is going to be some disruption. Um,

00:17:18:15 - 00:17:24:08

how else could this be mitigated? Have you any idea how how what else can be done to to improve the situation?

00:17:42:05 - 00:18:12:22

Um Chongqing Borough Council. Um, this is a point that we have discussed with the football club, but we have also, um, we are aware that they are liaising directly with the applicants and have encouraged that discussion. So we are, um, effectively, uh, keeping an interest in that progress. The the response that we've had as part of a range of other issues, um, from the football club, is that kind of alternative provision raises some challenges for them.

00:18:12:24 - 00:18:39:04

So the two things. One is, um, efforts made to minimise those impacts in the first place in terms of firmer commitments, um, around how and when the works will be carried out. Because although activities at the at the sports ground are year round, there are of course peaks and troughs in that. Um, the other is then where alternative provision is to be used. Um.

00:18:41:08 - 00:19:03:09

Commitments and kind of agreements in terms of the, um, ability that the football club will have to influence, where that alternative provision is provided are important. So it's about reducing the need for that alternative provision and where it is required, um, allowing proper input into a decisions made around that.

00:19:08:00 - 00:19:30:16

All right. Thank thank you for that. Um, I think the feeling at the moment is there is some disruption and there needs to be some, um, work further mitigation. So it would be helpful if, if either filed or the applicants could talk further with the football club to explore, um, what else could be done because, um, it's, um,

00:19:32:11 - 00:20:13:11

you know, the time limits, even though it's trenches seem a bit optimistic. And with the entry and exit pits and the and the open cut trenching to get there, um, there is clearly going to be some disruption. And when we, when we looked at the, um, recreation ground, I don't know how many pictures there on there, but clearly it's absolutely chock a block with, um, pictures. So, um, uh, there will be some impact. So it would be helpful if, whether it's filed or the applicants continue talking to the football clubs and, and um, try and come up with some, some, um, uh, further thoughts because, um, uh, at the moment there does seem to be some disruption now, while sorry, Mr.

00:20:13:13 - 00:20:14:08

Cliff's just got a question.

00:20:14:10 - 00:20:27:18

Just one additional point on on to what Mr. Gorsuch has said in terms of the skateboard, uh, park provision. Uh, that will be how would that be restored? What's the proposals for that?

00:20:29:17 - 00:20:51:19

Uh, lays done on behalf of the applicants. Certainly when I went and looked at the site, it was partly there. I believe it's been taken out. Now, I'm not sure what the current position is. Um, I think that's potentially a matter for the council. Was. I thought I'd heard that on the site visit. It had all gone. It was certainly partially demolished when I went, which was some time ago.

00:21:02:23 - 00:21:06:04

Are there any plans for that from the council's perspective as well.

00:21:07:21 - 00:21:20:06

For the borough council? So I think we'll take that one away and respond in writing. I think that's probably the correct factual position, but whether there are plans for reinstatement, I think is another thing. We just need to double check. There may be. And so we'll take that one away.



00:21:21:01 - 00:21:21:16

Okay.

00:21:21:18 - 00:21:54:01

So this is done on behalf of the applicant. I might be able to help on a couple of other points in terms of the sort of, um, alternative provision. I mean, we are considering alternative provision. We are aware of potential alternative sites, and we are talking actively or seeking to talk actively to the, um, to, to and also to the council in respect of those. So, so those discussions are ongoing. Um, and we've certainly, um, acknowledged is probably the best way to put it at this stage.

00:21:54:05 - 00:22:16:23

The skate park, within the provisions that are being proposed for the section 106 agreement, appreciate you haven't got the details in front of you there, but, um, the the intention is that the provisions that are being made are offered through the section 106 deal with all of those matters, but we'll update with the note that goes in at deadline four and then hopefully have some some more progress by deadline.

00:22:17:02 - 00:22:28:12

And on the skateboard park, in much the same way as the Thames Tideway scheme, I think it's been mentioned in representation, I think by the applicants, in terms of sort of legacy improvements, is the right opportunity for something that I don't.

00:22:29:01 - 00:22:32:16

Let us down on behalf of the applicants. Clearly, there is potential. Yeah.

00:22:35:24 - 00:23:09:23

Looking at the plan on screen at the moment, um, you did it. Um, we were talking about the change application yesterday, and, uh, you mentioned five plot numbers, which, um, were going to be reduced in terms of, um, uh, the, the impact. Um, and they were plot numbers. So I looked at the, um, uh, the notification letter, they were plot numbers. 040 15 040 16 and then three further plots which were all around the, uh, the right hand access.

00:23:11:15 - 00:23:22:04

You didn't mention plot 040 14, which I looked it up in the land plans, and I think it's the, the second one in From the Road. Um.

00:23:24:20 - 00:23:26:18

Is, is is there? No. know.

00:23:30:22 - 00:23:33:19

Is there? Is there? Is there any amendment being made to that?

00:23:35:09 - 00:23:38:11

Oh, well that's right, it is. 040 14.

00:23:38:21 - 00:24:17:17

Liz Dunn. On behalf of the applicant. No. So just and it probably comes to the point we were we were talking about earlier in terms of where the change to the order limits will be. And again, apologies. My eyesight is appalling. Um, it 040 13 and 040 14 will remain as they are, as will, uh uh uh, probably about halfway along. Oh four thank you. 040 15. And it's the bulge that comes out, uh, to the, uh, east on 040 14 and 040 15 that will be taken out.

00:24:17:19 - 00:24:35:14

So that's where the potentially the drill would have had to sort of, uh, start at that angle to then take the, the wide angle at the top in the playing field. Um, so it is. Oh, just 040 15 and 040 16 so the rest of those will stay as they are.

00:24:36:17 - 00:25:08:02

Okay. That's how I saw it. Um, and, uh, hopefully the plan you submitted is clear on that, but, um, as far as zero 14 is concerned, um, and possibly 040 16 because I'm not quite sure exactly what the change application is, how that's going to affect it. Um, but you are actually talking about temporary disruption during construction, but also permanent rights.

00:25:09:02 - 00:25:41:01

And in addition to permanent rights, restrictive covenants over plots certainly plot 040 14 possibly 040 16. Um, and the fact that you're taking restrictive covenants as well as permanent rights suggests to me that you're running into difficulties with the testing. Section one three, two. Uh, now, we did ask this in Q1, uh, and you said you didn't think that there was any breach, but bearing in mind there's the imposition of restrictive covenants as well as permanent rights.

00:25:42:01 - 00:25:50:15

Can I ask the question again? Because it seems to me that you are getting pretty close to, to, um, crossing the test in section one, three, two.

00:25:51:12 - 00:26:21:13

So this is done on behalf of the applicants. Um, so the the applicant's position in respect of the section one, three, two tests is that once the, uh, these are underground, obviously underground cables and the land will be restored. And therefore, when the cables are installed and the land is restored, it will go back to the use that it had previously. There will be some restrictions on it, but they are not restrictions that will affect the use of land, of public open space.

00:26:21:15 - 00:26:51:18

They are things like you can't. I'll have to check what the covenants are in respect of those, but it's the same approach as the applicants are taking and is has been, well, precedent in terms of the cables that will be installed at the beach, which is also considered as public open space, which is effectively once that the cables are installed, um, they are beneath the surface. The surface is restored, it goes back to public open space use, and therefore the land is no less. Um, uh, sorry, I can't remember the test.

00:26:51:20 - 00:26:52:10

No less.

00:26:52:12 - 00:26:53:02

Advantageous.

00:26:53:04 - 00:27:11:10

Advantageous. Thank you very much. Um, to, uh, to the users. So certainly the covenants that are imposed will not affect the advantageous nature of it to. And it certainly won't affect the, um, the, um, the use of it by the, um, by the football club.

00:27:12:23 - 00:27:28:04

I hear what you say there. Um, but if there's a restrictive covenant, um, it is going to restrict the landowner on what they could do in the future. Um, and, uh, the mere fact that it does restrict them

00:27:29:20 - 00:28:03:13

grammatically suggests that it is less advantageous. Um, so I think I'd really like you to have a think about this one, because, um, you know, it looks to me as though section one, three, two, the test you're not meeting. Uh, and can I ask that you could come back with a note as to why, with the permanent rights and the restrictive covenants, and certainly. 0040 14 I'm not sure about the changes to zero four at 16, but let's assume it's both plots at the moment.

00:28:04:08 - 00:28:11:18

Uh, why you think the test has not not been breached? Can I ask you to come back with that by default.

00:28:12:07 - 00:28:23:20

Uh, lays down on behalf of the applicant. Uh, yes, we can. I think we've already sketched out that, um. And I think it's important to acknowledge, which we'll put into the note that

00:28:25:14 - 00:28:38:13

there may be restrictions in terms of what the landowner can do with the land, but it's the question about the use of its public open space, which is the key element that we're looking at here. And those are the tests that we will we will address.

00:28:39:10 - 00:28:55:00

Agreed. But the key element I think we also need to look at is the wording of the section. Um, and certainly that's what I've been looking at, the wording, the section. And uh, um, at the moment I'm, I'm, I'm, I'm not sure whether you're actually meeting that test.

00:28:57:08 - 00:29:01:15

Anyway. Thank you that that could be submitted by bye bye bye for.

00:29:12:07 - 00:29:26:07

Um, if I could move on to, um. Best. And actually, we don't need the plan anymore. I'm moving on from the recreation grounds. Thank you. Um, if we move on to, um. Best and most versatile land.

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

You. Sir?

00:29:31:21 - 00:29:39:23

There's a hand up in the room somewhere, apparently. Ah, right. Sorry. You're behind the, uh. Yeah. Sorry. Would you like to make a comment?

00:29:46:04 - 00:29:48:04

Hi. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

00:29:48:06 - 00:29:51:06

Uh, can you introduce. Oh, sorry. Yeah. Introduce yourself please.

00:29:51:08 - 00:30:24:23

My name is, um, Councillor Joanne Gardner. I'm the ward councillor for, um kiln House ward, obviously, which accommodates Blackpool Road North playing fields. Um, I thank Fylde Borough Council for some very detailed questions, which I was also going to bring up on behalf of the residents. Um, and thank you very much to yourselves for, um, asking the questions that you have asked, just for a little bit of, um, Clarification for me in terms of, um, the trench loss and trenched areas.

00:30:25:12 - 00:30:41:04

Uh, both ends of the playing fields. How long will it take for the trench? Less areas to be restored, because that also affects residents as well as usage of the playing fields.

00:30:43:01 - 00:30:43:19

Thank you.

00:30:45:17 - 00:30:48:05

Thank you. If the applicant would want to come back.

00:30:48:12 - 00:31:08:18

Martin, on behalf of the applicants. Um, sorry. Sorry, I don't have the question to hand, but we did confirm this in our response to the questions that the restoration would be within those five months. Um, and we have also committed to a detailed restoration plan as part of the section 106 for Blackpool Road Recreation Ground.

00:31:15:09 - 00:31:36:12

Thank you for that. Um, counsel, I don't know whether you've seen the, um, section 106. You won't do that. You will have seen it yet. Um, but it may be worth having a look at the terms of that when it comes in to pick up on what the applicants have just said. Um, apparently there's some some reference about restoration. Um, so I think that's probably goes as far as we can

00:31:38:02 - 00:32:08:20

today with, um, with answering that. Right. Subject to anybody else hiding behind any pillars, which I don't think there are. Um, moving on to the best and most versatile land. Um, natural England. Uh, they indicated that it, um, failed to meet the policy. Test one. Um, the applicants have said that, uh, there is a permanent loss of best, most and most versatile agricultural land.

00:32:09:16 - 00:32:40:23

Um, but it's mainly sited or where it's permanently being taken, it's sited on subgrade three a land. Uh. And in your reply to question 12 one one uh, in our, um, first set of questions, uh, you confirm that a detailed, um, survey work had confirmed that the substations will not be sited on grade two land. Now, Natural England do not accept the the the surveys undertaken to date establish this position.

00:32:41:10 - 00:32:51:21

Uh, and they still cite the relevant paragraph in Ian one being paragraph five 1134. Um, can the applicants come back on on that, please?

00:32:53:20 - 00:33:32:02

Uh, Julia Tindale, on behalf of the applicants, um, I think Natural England's point that they're making is more in relation to the areas which we haven't surveyed yet along the cable route, um, rather than actually the technical point that they disagree with the detailed classification of the Substations. Um, I carried out those surveys myself. I have over 30 years of experience in land classification, survey work and, um, the, the grading of that site. Um, technically, it has been carried out in accordance with the Ministry of Agriculture ELC guidelines, which are relevant to the state.

00:33:32:17 - 00:33:53:23

Um, therefore, the substation surveys are detailed and um, they are sub three a and I think there's a difference in Natural England commenting on the fact that they would like more survey work, rather than saying that we've not assessed the classification of those areas where we have carried out detailed survey work correctly.

00:34:01:00 - 00:34:22:10

Yes, I think that's helpful. And could you, could you just, um, because because you've just said you have loads of experience. I'll test you on this. Uh. could could you could you could you just very briefly summarize grade A as against grade three A as against grade three B and the implications of that. Thank you.

00:34:22:20 - 00:35:09:24

Yeah. So um, grade three um is subdivided into sub grade three A and three B. Three a land is the lowest quality of best and most versatile land. Um three B is considered to be lower quality land um on this site, which is Salix series. Uh predominantly the main limitation on that area is actually um, soil wetness. Um, and it's determined by um, basically a number of factors, including the duration of field capacity in terms of climate, um, the nature of the soils as topsoil texture as a determinant as well on this site, particularly, um, and then it's the extent of um, or nature of slowly permeable layers within the soil and the depth of those and glade layers associated with that.

00:35:10:08 - 00:35:27:03

So that's the difference. And there are criteria relating particularly in soil wetness, that would determine it to be three A rather than three B. And also you know, would be three A rather than two. And it's mainly topsoil texture that actually determines that it wouldn't be two. It's three a.

00:35:30:07 - 00:35:32:22

Thank you very much. You passed that test very impressively.

00:35:35:17 - 00:35:42:17

Uh, I don't think we've got Natural England here today. No, we weren't expecting them. So, um.

00:35:50:00 - 00:35:57:22

Yes, yes. Could I, could I ask people to put their hands up not to hide behind pillars or camera? Um. Hello there. Sorry.

00:36:00:05 - 00:36:02:01

Yes, Mrs. Mason, I think, isn't it?

00:36:02:07 - 00:36:05:05

Yes. On behalf of the dairy farm that farms.

00:36:05:07 - 00:36:27:15

Oh, stop shouting now. Um, that farms the land where the substation for Morgan will take will be sited. And also we are heavily impacted by the cable corridor. Can I just check the land that you described as three a? Um, Mr. Tindall describes us three. Is that the cable route or the substation?

00:36:28:13 - 00:36:45:15

So for Morgan substation, mainly it's sub grade three A, which is best and most first time the lowest category. There is some land as it drops down towards the stream where it's lower quality because it's slightly heavier and slightly wetter. So you go on to a basically a little corridor of three B alongside that edge.

00:36:46:18 - 00:37:16:11

Okay. Um, can I ask it to be noted that whatever the grade you've assessed it at, it is prime agricultural land in terms of dairy production. Um, we use it for crops as well as silage and grazing, which is all you've noted down for, um, it's Its prime grassland, filled grassland, some of the best in the country. And your assessments, in my opinion, are flawed as a working dairy farm.

00:37:22:13 - 00:37:57:01

Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Mason. So if I, if I can just, um, just sort of double check what, what your prior you gave there, um, where we get to the Morgan substation, which obviously we've been around a couple of times. Um, uh, the site and, and we spent some time talking about the site yesterday. Um, so the top part is three a but as the land falls away, which it does quite steeply, uh, as it gets down towards the, the brook or whatever, um, that then it becomes three B.

00:37:57:22 - 00:38:13:21

That's correct. So the majority of that site is three A and would be best and most versatile, which is higher quality land. Um and, um, the edge along the stream. I think we've, we've defined a subgrade through because it's slightly heavier textured and wetter land.

00:38:20:06 - 00:38:53:16

All right. Thank you for that. Uh, I'll come to you in a moment. Um, just can can the applicant, therefore, um, in the light of that, that discussion, um, if I can come back to paragraph three. Sorry, paragraph five, 1134 of M one and the policy requirement. Um, can can we just hear from the applicant as to whether or not you're still still meeting that policy requirement, specifically where the Morgan substation is being built, um, or where it's being proposed to be built.

00:38:53:18 - 00:38:54:08

Thank you.

00:39:15:16 - 00:39:46:07

Julia Tindale on behalf of the applicants. We did, um, in terms of site selection, look at a number of sites around the vicinity for for the substation location. Based on what we had at that point when we were first doing the site selection work. We looked at the obviously the provisional arc mapping, which I think showed them either as grade two or grade three. Um, but then we also looked at what we knew to be, um, quite good detailed source mapping.

00:39:46:09 - 00:40:23:13

I think I've talked about that before in previous hearing, and that showed that the grade three a land would be likely to contain some best and most versatile land. So of all the sites we were looking at, we knew that probably there would be likely to be some sub grade three within within those. Knows and you know, you couldn't determine. So we we we did look at that within the alternative selection. But obviously that's a number of alongside a number of other factors. Um, but actually as we expected, um, that site and the others we looked at would have all been likely to, to have proportions of sub grade three within them.

00:40:25:02 - 00:40:36:21

Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicants, I'd just like to highlight that our response was provided. Um, at deadline one in rep 1043 in response to how we comply with this policy.

00:40:39:13 - 00:40:43:22

Sorry. Rep 1043 whereabouts was it again?

00:40:44:07 - 00:40:56:16

Annex 5.7 um, which is the applicant's response to hearing point at action points? Ish 145 Agricultural Land Classification Surveys.

00:40:57:08 - 00:40:57:23

Yeah.

00:40:59:07 - 00:41:00:17

Table 1.1.

00:41:01:22 - 00:41:05:17

And that's still the applicant's position. Yes. Correct.

00:41:14:07 - 00:41:17:02

Counsel, do you want to say something at this stage?

00:41:26:09 - 00:41:56:20

I'd just like to make a point. Um, it's just been mentioned about the grading of lands, and we hear variants of graded lands. Um, in my experience, in all my lifetime, grade one lands have been known to be crop, uh, root growing lands. And grade two has referred to grass growing lands. And we are very well known in file to have the best grass growing lands in England are associated with that.

00:41:56:22 - 00:42:04:06

So I'd like the examiners to know that, Um, you know, for their perusal on on this issue. Thank you.

00:42:07:21 - 00:42:08:14

Thank you.

00:42:11:21 - 00:42:17:07

Right. I think. Oh, hang on. There's someone else. Yes, sir. Over there. Thank. Thank you.

00:42:19:24 - 00:42:20:17

Thank you.

00:42:22:13 - 00:42:24:00

Can you introduce yourself, please, sir?

00:42:24:02 - 00:43:03:02

Sure. Mike Wright, Newton residents association. Um, the, uh, substation sites, uh, straddle two working dairy farms. These farms are not only characteristic of the area, uh, but they are currently viable rural enterprises. The scale of the land appropriation, disruption to operations, and restricted access resulting from the development jeopardizes the long term viability and sustainability of these farms in what is already a fragile sector.

00:43:05:07 - 00:43:41:05

These farms may well fail because they are rendered unviable through land appropriation. It's not just a matter of lost livelihoods, it's a direct loss of rural land use that underpins the landscape. The landscape character referred to in planning policy. So Newton Residents Association submits that the siting of the substation represents a significant threat to what are currently viable rural enterprises.

00:43:42:17 - 00:43:44:03

Thank you. Thank you.

00:43:45:00 - 00:43:54:13

Thank you for that. Um, as far as business is concerned, we will of course be exploring this on, on, on Friday if the applicant wants to respond to what they've just heard.

00:43:56:07 - 00:44:15:11

Uh, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants. Not at this stage. We note the comments. We're aware of the dairy farms and the projects are working as closely as they can with them to to understand the



current activities and how the project could work together. So, I mean, yes, we'll talk about it on Thursday. Friday, I think. Thank you.

00:44:19:06 - 00:44:20:07

Hello, Mr. Walker.

00:44:21:11 - 00:44:41:19

Good morning. Um. Good afternoon. Uh, Angus Walker for the parish councils, just to make my cracked record point. If the northern route was chosen, there's no grade two land. It's mostly categorised as urban land and a little bit of grade three, I think. So this issue would be largely avoided. Thank you.

00:44:43:11 - 00:44:51:17

Thank you for for for that. Um, if I can move on to, um, an area we've been talking about the.

00:44:53:09 - 00:44:54:22

Oh, yeah.

00:44:55:15 - 00:45:31:13

Sorry, sir. Shall we wait for borough council? So I just want to set out our point in respect to the best, most versatile land. You'll probably already gather from our local impact report. But our point is a methodological point. And it's about the applicant's approach, which is set out in app Dash 033, which is the selection and refinement of the onshore infrastructure. And we set out in our local impact report that there's no distinction in that approach between grade two and grade three land. And the applicants come back in their response, which is Rep 2038, to say there is a distinction.

00:45:32:03 - 00:46:18:23

Um, however, when we look back at at Dash 033 and best and most versatile agricultural land, and the distinction between red, amber and green taken amber is assessed as either grade two in brackets very good and three good to moderate. And then grade four and five are treated under green. So there is no distinction as in terms of the Bragg assessment. Um, so we just make the point that the applicants response in response to our local impact report is not quite right in terms of the assessment undertaken, um, in that document, because there is no distinction to land which is treated as, for example, grade three B, which is not BMV, um, and either three A or two, they're all lumped into the same amber category.

00:46:22:17 - 00:46:24:12

Do you want to respond to that at all?

00:46:24:17 - 00:46:42:24

So in relation to the substations, we did put two and three together as amber because the grade three could have three a within it. So therefore they were categorised, you know, as potentially having two and three A. So they would be categorised those as potentially both both amber. So that was how we did that.

00:46:45:12 - 00:47:07:18

For Farnborough Council. So I think we understand that approach. But obviously there's a difference between grade two and three. A in terms of they're both BMV but grade two is of higher quality. And then there is also a distinction in policy terms and technical terms between three A and three B, where three B is not BMV. So we understand the approach. But I think the the comment from us is that that approach doesn't properly distinguish between the quality of soils.

00:47:11:16 - 00:47:33:04

Acts lays down on behalf of the applicant. So I think we take the point. But for the purposes of site selection, which was what we were seeking to do, which is a reasonably high level process, we consider it was entirely appropriate in terms of the way that those soil classifications were considered and then fed into the assessment. We do not think it undermines the assessment or the identification of the sites.

00:47:38:19 - 00:48:11:01

Okay. Moving on now from um, uh, for, for, from, from, uh, agricultural land, um, and moving on to public rights of way. Um, we've just been talking about the the Green Lane bridleway um bridleway five five, 16 um and uh the, the uh public right of way management plan, which is ret 304 uh says that a diversion of this is required.

00:48:11:22 - 00:48:31:23

Uh, and indeed the plans shown. Um, uh, the latest public public rights of way management plan, which is a oh 48, uh, shows where this diversion bit will be. Um, can I ask the applicants what what powers are you relying upon to achieve this diversion?

00:48:38:12 - 00:49:13:11

Uh, sir, list on on behalf of the applicants. Um, so this is a temporary, um, diversion. So effectively, it is a temporary, um, uh, Suspension of rights over a over part of the bridleway and an extension into land that's adjacent to it. So this isn't a sorry, I'm moving my hands all over the place. This isn't a diversion in terms of a new route. It's effectively part of the bridleway being out of use and the adjacent section of the bridleway being in use.

00:49:13:17 - 00:49:43:18

Uh, whilst the section that's out of use is being used. So the bridleway will stay where it is. It's just people will be moved slightly further across. The powers that are set out are within article 12 of the Draft Development Consent Order. The land within which the, uh, let's call it a diversion will take place or within the order limits and therefore, uh, and the details are set out in the relevant, uh, public rights of way plans.

00:49:43:20 - 00:50:02:15

The details are all there in terms of setting out, uh, where that will be. And the powers that are necessary in order to effectively temporarily stop up a part of that bridleway and allow another part of land to be used for that purpose. And then it will be post construction. It will be reinstated.

00:50:05:24 - 00:50:11:24

Yeah, I think I think I follow that. Um, shouldn't shouldn't you have been seeking the powers in the statement of reasons as well?

00:50:17:01 - 00:50:38:20

Uh, Lasdun, on behalf of the applicants. Um, we can certainly look at how it's referred to in the statement of reasons. Um, uh, if it's not picked out in terms of of, uh, reference to it, it's clearly part of the application. Um, we'll check the statement of reasons to see if there is reference in there and if it needs to be, it needs to be drawn out more.

00:50:39:23 - 00:51:01:14

The statement of reasons doesn't include, um, the fact that you might need this the this land, uh, for the temporary diversion. And clearly, if that's not, um, included, you're then reliant on the landowner's consent, um, which is probably not a position you want to be in. So I suggest you do look at the statement of reasons.

00:51:04:22 - 00:51:37:00

List done on behalf of the applicant. So I think the the as I said before, this is land that's within the order limits already. Um, and so it isn't. Um, and and we'll need to check the plans, but I understand it's part of potentially part of where the cable corridor is anyway. So it's effectively part of part of the, the, the red line. It's part of where there are rights being sought. And we just need to check. And I'm sure it has to be done appropriately, that the appropriate rights are being sought in respect of that, of that temporary diversion.

00:51:37:02 - 00:51:47:07

Yeah. Absolutely. Right. It's within the order limits. So it's not not not a huge issue. But but I say I think the statement of reasons needs to be looked at. So if you if you could do that by default I'd be grateful. Thank you.

00:51:58:13 - 00:51:59:04

Um.

00:52:01:13 - 00:52:30:21

If I could move on as, um, uh, the next point to the issue of, um, link boxes. Um, you provided some, some drawings, um, in your replies to to to our first set of questions. Um, or sorry, a drawing showing the the substantial area below the ground. Uh, and then the link box on the on at ground level. Um.

00:52:33:01 - 00:52:34:11

It's, um,

00:52:36:00 - 00:53:03:00

the, the we've heard from the, um, I think it was the NFU and a number of agents asking that could, could there be a commitment to put the link boxes at the edge of fields. Bearing in mind the order limits for the cable width are quite considerable. Um, can you go a bit further with, with actually providing a commitment to that? Because, um, if they're in the center of fields, it is going to be quite an impact for, for for farmers.

00:53:07:20 - 00:53:47:09

So Paul Olsen, on behalf of the applicants, um, the issue that we have around that is, whilst it's in everybody's interest to have the link boxes at the field boundaries wherever possible is the the link box, there are the link boxes are associated with the position of the joint bay. And for various electrical reasons, the link boxes have to be kept in close proximity to the joint by itself. When you're looking at the the lengths of cable that can be installed, which will determine where the joint base will be.

00:53:48:06 - 00:54:20:17

There are electrical and other physical mechanical considerations that have to be made which determine the or define the length of the cable that you can install, which in turn defines where your joint base will be. So what that what that translates down to is what you might be able to have a link box at a particular foundry boundary. It doesn't necessarily equate that you can give the same commitment on the next joint base along in the series.

00:54:21:08 - 00:54:57:19

You have limited control as to where that can or cannot be placed for electrical and physical reasons. Um, I'm not electrically biased. I'm more civil mechanical bias. Um, there there are, there is there's there is electrical balancing to be done between the lengths of the cable that you install which which has an impact on the length of the cable that can be installed. But from a from a physical installation point of view, you can only put so much force on the end of the cable that you are pulling in.

00:54:57:21 - 00:55:34:02

And if it's a if it's of a substantial length, you can actually physically damage the cable by trying to pull in a overly long length. Um, also, if you picture it in your head, if you, if you were installing a cable from a joint base or a joint base further downhill, the cable is physically trying to come with you. It's an easier installation. Conversely, if you are trying to pull a cable from a giant bay uphill and throw in a couple of sharp bends into that uphill pull and your cable length is, is is reduced so that that the long and short of it is.

00:55:34:04 - 00:55:51:09

That's what boils down to you. You can look to put the thing at the field boundary, but it doesn't necessarily equate to. Given the variation in the size of the fields and what I've just outlined. You can you can hit that mark for every single joint Bayer along the route.

00:55:54:08 - 00:56:25:05

Yeah, I hear that. Um, I think I think that the that everyone, um, needs to take into account the impact that this is having on farmers. Um, the applicants have chosen the, the cable route. Uh, the or the width of the cable route is, is quite considerable. I mean, that's what's happened in past DCO applications and that's, um, uh, expected. But, you know, bearing in mind you have chosen the cable route.

00:56:26:00 - 00:57:03:09

Um, and bearing in mind there could be two cables in most cases. So the impact on farmers will be quite considerable. Um, I think the applicants, you know, should be trying to to minimize that impact as far as possible and making a commitment to, to put the link boxes at field edges. Um, you know, is something which I think would appease them to some extent. Um, so, you know, I would ask you

again, you know, could this be reconsidered because, uh, you know, you've chosen the route, you've got the, um, the order width.

00:57:03:19 - 00:57:09:20

Um, surely you can do more to, to actually, um, make life easier in the future for the farmers.

00:57:11:21 - 00:57:45:17

I hear what you're saying. But, you know, I refer back to what I said. It's it's not something that you could commit to, to say without fail, you will install a joint bait out of field boundary and is associated link box. Um, I think whilst I understand it's the impacts, uh, to farmers to agricultural use. Um, what we're actually talking about here by way of, uh, physical visibility at, uh, at surface level is the links box itself.

00:57:46:04 - 00:57:53:22

The access point to that link box is effectively like a, a street manhole cover type, size. Um, and.

00:57:56:05 - 00:57:57:01

I'm sorry.

00:58:01:14 - 00:58:02:15

How much did you hear?

00:58:04:15 - 00:58:36:13

Yeah. No worries. Um, so I was referring back to what I was saying previously. It's not possible to give a commitment that without fail, all link boxes and joint base would be put at field boundaries. Because of these electrical and physical installation considerations that have to be made. Um, and as I previously said, the the electrical system has to be electrically balanced. I'm not the competent person to explain how that is done, but in electrically balancing it.

00:58:36:15 - 00:58:53:08

It means that you can't have two joint bays, say, 200m apart from each other, and then the next pair may be two kilometres apart from each other. It doesn't work electrically. There has to be some proportionality between it. Um,

00:58:54:24 - 00:59:13:17

I'm well aware of the impact to joint bays, uh, to agricultural use. From my experience on previous projects, and yes, it's in everybody's interest to put them at the field boundaries for maintenance issues and reducing the impact, um, to the landowners concerned, etc.. Um.

00:59:16:05 - 00:59:41:23

My own personal point of view would be that, yes, best endeavours will be made to put those link boxes at the field boundaries wherever practicable. Um, which I appreciate, isn't the ticking the box that you are asking me to tick, but it's it has to be a recognition that there is. There is literally only so much we can do with the placement of these link boxes.

00:59:43:19 - 01:00:31:22

So before you come in, let us down on behalf of the applicants. I think just to kind of draw this together. It's clearly in both the applicants and the landowners best interest to get those joint boxes as close to field boundaries as they can. And Mr. Olsen's explained, I think very well what the constraints are. It's also important to consider that when the cable is procured, it's procured typically in sort of standard sections and to to to have to survey every single field and, and then basically base your electrical design on where field boundaries are to then set where your junction boxes are, creates a system and a design which is overly complicated, far more expensive.

01:00:32:05 - 01:01:07:12

And therefore we've been talking about sort of overall cost of this project and isn't actually needed in terms of the impact of those link boxes on the agricultural land. So I think the key point is we recognise it. It's something that comes up on many, many projects. Um, it is something that will be taken into consideration. And we can look at how that is referenced within the documents in terms of seeking to cite those. But I think what Mr. Olsen is saying, and I think is very clear from other projects, is that it's not a commitment that can be made by the applicant at this stage, given the other constraints and costing issue.

01:01:09:01 - 01:01:13:14

Mrs. Mason, do you want to set? Yeah. Go ahead.

01:01:14:10 - 01:01:49:20

Thank you. I managed that on crutches and everything else. Um, thank you for your responses. Um, I'd like to pick you up from the point of the manhole covers. Um, my understanding is they will stand proud of the ground, which will make it impossible for us to plough Silage or generally maneuver farm equipment round. And I would like a commitment from yourselves that you will finance. Any damage to the machinery would be one thing. And the second thing I'd like to ask, please, is I disagree that you can't put it in field boundaries, but obviously you're the experts here.

01:01:49:23 - 01:02:13:15

But can you at least change the wording in your document regarding the land use? Um, .6. 11 .2.6. Therefore, the magnitude of the temporary impact on the quality of agricultural land following restoration is assessed to be negligible. Because I don't consider this negligible or temporary.

01:02:16:17 - 01:02:17:11

Thank you.

01:02:21:14 - 01:02:23:16

Does the applicant want to come back on that at all?

01:02:24:09 - 01:02:55:02

Uh, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, I think we note both of those points. Um, in respect of the, um, the reference. Apologies. I'm trying to look at two things and speaking to the microphone at the same time in paragraph 6.1, 1.2.6 of the environmental, uh, statement, the reference there to um, the impact being negligible is in respect to the temporary land take it is not in respect of where there are obviously the cables are installed and there will be potentially permanent.

01:02:55:04 - 01:03:35:16

So just, just, um, correcting uh, at that point, um, and um, we note the, the point around, uh, around the joint base, we note that there are, you know, there are effects. Those are matters that are compensated. And there are, um, these these works and the joint base and the manhole covers are, are in place across, you know, across the country in terms of, of the installation of cables. And they are managed from an agricultural position in terms of, both ploughing and using the fields, and there's no reason to consider that things would be different on this project.

01:03:37:09 - 01:04:13:24

Say, say that there has been an analysis that this is the best and most versatile land in in many instances. Um, and we have heard any number of representations from, from farmers and their land agents. So, um, we'll have a, have a have, have another look here. What natural got to say, um, uh, about uh, uh, the policy issue. Um, but, uh, if, if the impact on farmers can be mitigated in any further way, then clearly that would help the, uh, the consideration.

01:04:18:12 - 01:04:20:12

Mayor. Council.

01:04:21:20 - 01:05:09:15

Thank you. Good afternoon, John Cope, state council. Um, I just want to observe that, um, we've heard they're about the kind of physical limitations and restrictions from the applicant that comes with the decisions about where the link boxes can be placed. So we'd comment that if those limitations and requirements are so well understood, then it should be possible to look at those limitations and come up with a strategy to minimize those impacts, even if even if the A commitment as, um, a simple commitment of having all of them next to field boundaries can't be met, perhaps a more informed, uh, and more detailed commitment can instead be made about principles that will be taken.

01:05:09:23 - 01:05:43:21

And also not to add to the burden that the applicant kind of seems to be struggling with at the moment. But from reading the submissions from, um, farmers in the local area, it's also not just about the location of link boxes next to field boundaries, but also away from existing points of access between those boundaries and other important features within the farms. So I think what we're asking for is a more detailed, intelligent commitment to be made.

01:05:44:03 - 01:05:52:15

The, the physical, um, you know, technical limitations are clearly understood. So it should be possible to make a proposal on that basis.

01:05:53:19 - 01:06:03:07

Thank you. Mr. Coates. Take, um, I mean, it's one thing the applicants could do is at least consult and agree with the landowners as to where these link boxes are going to go.

01:06:06:06 - 01:06:09:11

So, Paul Olsen, on behalf of the applicant, um.

01:06:12:13 - 01:06:43:07

Through me, I've forgot. I've got the point that you were making. Sorry. Um, yes. So so we won't we won't have better visibility of where these, link boxes and joint posts are going to be placed into a much rather long and detailed design. Um, bearing in mind detailed design will be, uh, sorry. Getting into detailed design will involve us engaging with a with a principal contractor, the principal contractor or principal.

01:06:43:14 - 01:07:18:00

At tender stage, the principal contractors will propose different types of cables that potentially could be used. Those the use of different types of cables and sizes of cables, be it aluminium or copper, will have a direct impact on what that detailed design looks like. We need to go through that process, uh, with the chosen principal contractor to let them develop their design, to have that visibility, to have the information for which we could go back to landowners and have that conversation with regards to putting, um, link boxes, etc..

01:07:18:09 - 01:07:49:08

Um, on um, uh, existing uh, access tracks, agricultural access tracks, etc. that there is, there is the ability to do a small amount of micro siting, but it's it it needs to be clear that that's within a few meters. It's not within tens of meters, which is what you're potentially looking at to get from the middle of a field to a field boundary. But the long and short is it comes out of of detailed design, and we are quite aware of that yet.

01:07:50:16 - 01:07:53:00

But can you consult and agree with landowners?

01:07:53:12 - 01:07:54:02

We can.

01:07:54:04 - 01:07:54:19

Certainly.

01:07:54:21 - 01:07:56:12

Consult with landowners. Um,

01:07:58:10 - 01:08:07:19

I would be hesitant to say that you will always be in a position to be able to agree with landowners, but you can certainly consult, um, and do what you can to mitigate.

01:08:11:21 - 01:08:44:17

Right. Thank you. Um, just just one final point, and Lankershim might want to mention about this. It was the period of notice, uh, for any. PR pro closure. I think you'd ask for eight weeks. And sorry, you'd ask. You'd ask for seven days. And Lancashire says their period is normally eight weeks notice. Um, seven days does seem very short. I don't know if that's the discussion about that, but, um, if you have an idea if Lancashire want to say anything on that deal.

01:08:44:19 - 01:08:56:14



Stephens, Lancashire County Council. Obviously we have standards. We try to keep those standards. If we can improve upon those standards, we will do, but we are limited in resource. So I think what we've asked for is reasonable.

01:09:01:21 - 01:09:37:05

Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicant, we've had good discussions with Lancashire County Council on this and will progress matters further. The one point I'd like to raise is the the detailed public rights of way management plans will be discharged by Lancashire County Council, which would have the detail about closures, about temporary diversions, and they would have eight weeks to discharge that requirement. The seven days is just to notify them to say once the plan is discharged, we will be diverting this on these days for this amount of time.

01:09:40:14 - 01:09:52:17

Thank you. And Lancashire can come back if, if, if they want to query that at all. Um, does anybody want else in the room or are there is someone online with a virtual hand up.

01:09:56:00 - 01:09:57:12

Somewhere in the room as well. So.

01:09:59:19 - 01:10:02:15

Sorry. Is it Councillor Threlfall again.

01:10:06:02 - 01:10:10:23

And then I'll come to the virtual hand. Um, after Councillor Threlfall. Thank you.

01:10:11:22 - 01:10:17:06

Thank you. Councillor Threlfall file Council uh, whilst this cable corridor.

01:10:19:01 - 01:10:20:15

Just move the needle.

01:10:21:06 - 01:10:53:13

Hello? Yeah. We're on whilst this cable corridor largely runs right through. Agricultural file. The financial impacts on largely the whole cable corridor going through farms. Um, the the joint boxes which we've earlier mentioned by Mister Coke stake, um, can be measured in electrical terms. And the positions of these boxes, um, by electrical terms, in eddy currents so that they don't transact with each other.

01:10:54:03 - 01:11:27:16

And, uh, it was mentioned that the expense of, of doing that. But the financial impacts on these boxes will render land nearly impotent in terms of being efficient as farming land for the whole of the future, uh, for generations to come. And, and I feel that, uh, in this early day that, uh, those that work needs to be done before so that these boxes can be appropriately put. To allow farming to engage in its efficient progress through time.

01:11:27:23 - 01:11:28:14

Thank you.

01:11:30:02 - 01:11:39:24

Thank you. And before I offer, ask the applicant to respond. Can we have the virtual hand, please, if you'd like to introduce yourself.

01:11:40:14 - 01:12:00:03

Yes. I'm Julie Devil from county council. Public rights of way. The eight weeks notice is a legal process. And therefore the deed advertising for seven days is not sufficient time. It does need to be the eight days notice. Eight weeks. Sorry. Apologies, eight weeks notice.

01:12:00:22 - 01:12:07:15

Right. Thank thank you for, um, uh, contributing to that. I don't know if the applicants want to come back to on either of those points.

01:12:07:22 - 01:12:38:23

Uh, les done on behalf of the applicant. So I think on the second point, around the eight weeks notice, clearly bringing the provisions in respect to public rights of way into the DCO means that that the legal requirements outside of that don't apply. Um, and um, the, um, the, the whole purpose of the development consent order is, as we talked about earlier on, in the context of of offshore matters and unexploded Ordnance Ordinance Ordinance is that you bring the consents that are needed within that.

01:12:39:00 - 01:13:32:04

So we'll continue to talk to Lancashire County Council about those in the appropriate notice periods. Um, the other thing that I, I'm going to offer up as a voluntary hearing action point from the applicants and write it down, um, is that we are pulling together, um, some information or we have pulled together information regarding how, um, the applicants will engage with, uh, landowners, uh, and particularly the farming landowners prior to access of land to do the cable works, how those discussions will take place during installation of the cable and those sorts of measures, because we we appreciate that there are a lot of there's a lot of detail and lot of controls that are set out within different documents that haven't necessarily been brought together and actually how it works in practice not necessarily set out.

01:13:32:06 - 01:14:08:19

So. So there are um, we appreciate that that that information perhaps hasn't been, hasn't been collated in a way that is most useful. So we we will take as a hearing action point and it will deal with matters like location of, you know, that discussion around location of link boxes. It'll deal with matters regarding drainage. So we talked about drainage earlier in terms of the consideration of drainage plans and temporary drainage. I just think that might help to bring all of this together, to understand how that engagement will take place, when activities will be happening, and how it all fits together.

01:14:08:21 - 01:14:13:17

So we will take that as a, as I say, a voluntary hearing action point for deadline four.

01:14:14:20 - 01:14:29:24

Thank you very much indeed for that. And yes, that is helpful for for landowners and also for the Acsa. Um, and a voluntary action point is much appreciated. Um, any idea when when you might hit that with that.

01:14:30:05 - 01:14:31:02

A deadline for set.

01:14:31:04 - 01:14:37:11

A deadline for. Excellent. Thank you very much indeed. All right. Unless. Oh, Mr. Cope's take last, last chance.

01:14:37:13 - 01:14:57:19

Thank you, John Cope, Borough council. Just just in response to that commitment, um, we we welcome that. We would, uh, request that it also includes, um, specific consideration of where certain landowners will be impacted twice, uh, where both cable routes may impact similar areas. So if there could be discussion around that, that would be welcomed.

01:14:58:15 - 01:14:59:05

Yeah.

01:14:59:07 - 01:15:47:12

Robin Hutchison, partner at CMS for both applicants. Just to add little color to that, that's that's exactly the intention. So obviously this is primarily an EIA session. We've got the detailed um compulsory acquisition land session on Friday. And so what we have in mind is a document that sort of bridges the necessarily high level i's assessment with the detailed individual discussions that are sometimes happening on a sort of 1 to 1 basis with the individual landowners. So the the the document was done refers to the idea is it will go landholding by landholding identifying the use of that land and the accommodations which are, as done explained, sort of um, secured at various points throughout the documentation.

01:15:47:15 - 01:16:29:00

But the idea is that we'll pick out which accommodations are secured and relevant to that particular landholding against each each landowner, and set that out in a sort of one stop shop to go landowner by landowner, and try and bridge that high level easement with the more granular with with a more granular detail which might be actually being taken forward in kind of voluntary 1 to 1 discussions, but getting all that into the public domain so that they, you know, the legitimate community concerns about farming practices as a whole, beyond just those of the individual landowners, can be sort of understood in the mitigations and accommodations that the applicants are committing to are all there and easily identifiable against each particular land use.

01:16:29:02 - 01:16:33:03

So it's a sort of bring it all together in one place type document. That's the idea.

01:16:33:10 - 01:16:41:07

And I'm sure it will. But could it also make sure that it includes where things are secured in the DCO and obviously the relevant management plans? Thank you.

01:16:46:03 - 01:16:48:10

One final final point on my left.

01:16:59:21 - 01:17:51:07

Okay. Um, I'm going to go back. Um, yes. Um, I'm Councillor Richard Ratcliffe. Um, I'm chairman of planning at Fowl full council. I'm also deputy leader of fall Council, and I thought it was rather remiss of me not to contribute to the first item. So I'm just going to mention, very briefly, Blackpool Road playing Fields. Um, again, my theme yesterday was terminology that the sort of terms we use in planning and we use in this context are temporary and permanent, but we should be under no illusions that any even temporary, uh, usage or lack of usage of a community asset such as Blackpool Road Playing Fields will have a massive effect on our local community.

01:17:51:22 - 01:18:41:17

At seven to 700 to 800 players are involved in this particular activity. And as a result, and some of these things have been picked up in the impact statement. So I won't go through all of the arguments, But I do want to absolutely emphasize the massive impact that restricting and putting constraints on use of this huge public community space will have, because although we've discussed potential mitigation where alternative facilities for perhaps five months to months, if you're talking about five months, that's going to affect two seasons where they play a lot of football on those fields.

01:18:41:21 - 01:19:14:10

So we're two seasons directly affected. And you're talking about all age ranges from five six years of age, right up to. I wouldn't like to describe some of the ages of the players that I've seen. So it is a real blow to the local community if that is withdrawn. And we really do need tangible evidence of justifiable and credible alternatives. So please do take that into account as well.

01:19:14:12 - 01:19:15:14

Thank you very much.

01:19:17:07 - 01:19:35:08

Thank you counselor. I don't think the applicants know they won't need to respond. Um, right. Um, I think we've run over a bit on, on on this section, so I think we'll now take a break. Sorry. Blackpool council.

01:19:35:24 - 01:19:36:15

Sorry.

01:19:36:17 - 01:19:38:15

There was a final, final point on my left.

01:19:39:16 - 01:20:06:02

So sorry. Catherine. Night, Blackpool council. I'd just a quick point in respect to public right of ways. Uh, I miss Sue Parker, head of development management. There's a slight concern from the council, and we're going to put in written reports that deadline for. And Miss Parker's going to summarize.

Summarize, I promise, are briefly the council's concern. And it only arises if there is any closure of the Stargate access.

01:20:09:09 - 01:20:23:10

Thank you for that. For that. All right. Um, we're now going to adjourn for lunch. Oh. Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't. I thought it was going to be a written, um, submission. I didn't realize it was going to be. Um. Uh, come in now. Uh, how long is this going to take?

01:20:23:13 - 01:20:24:05

Very, very.

01:20:24:07 - 01:20:24:22

Brief.

01:20:24:24 - 01:20:25:14

All right.

01:20:25:16 - 01:20:26:06

Far away then.

01:20:26:08 - 01:20:57:20

Susan Parker, Blackpool Council. Um, the Lancashire Coastal Way Cycle route is an established route that currently runs along the seaward side of the promenade, around the headland and then down Clifton Road North, Clifton Drive north, and any closure of the Stargate Junction would preclude use of this route. Um, also, any closure of the area around the Stargate slipway would require diversion, and for users to cross the operational tramlines further to the north, and there would therefore be an impact on recreation and potentially on the safety of users based on the routes as they are currently sought.

01:20:57:24 - 01:21:01:16

And so we are asking the applicant to take these matters into consideration. Thank you.

01:21:04:04 - 01:21:06:13

Thanks for that. I don't know if the applicant wants to come back.

01:21:06:15 - 01:21:36:18

Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant. This is a matter that the council has raised with us previously, and we have notified that we will be removing the street works powers that currently exist over Stargate. Um, there was never any tension for closure of Stargate. Um, but we accept that perhaps the powers that were broadly put there were too broad effectively for Stargate. So those will be removed from the development consent order. Uh, I think we'd communicated that to the council.

01:21:36:20 - 01:21:50:02

So, um, so they will be removed from the development consent order at deadline four. So this concern should be addressed because there will be no powers for the applicant to do anything to Stargate. Save. Use it.

01:21:53:15 - 01:22:01:15

Yes, sir. Night. Blackpool Council. Is the applicant able to also confirm that the temporary possession rights will be removed from the order?

01:22:04:10 - 01:22:12:21

List done on behalf of the applicants, we need to retain the temporary possession powers because we need to be able to use that land. We're not seeking to take.

01:22:16:20 - 01:22:17:11

That day.

01:22:19:17 - 01:22:20:08

To save.

01:22:20:22 - 01:22:33:00

Lives. On behalf of the applicants, I suggest we we take these offline. Um, we are making those changes. We think that the necessary changes to address the council's concerns will pick those up separately with them.

01:22:33:04 - 01:22:38:22

Yeah. Thank you for that. And please do continue to discuss that offline. Um.

01:22:46:03 - 01:22:49:22

Yeah. Sorry. I think we've decided we're going to close now. So, uh.

01:22:50:12 - 01:23:21:00

Sorry. So far, Borough council is not on this item. It's a procedural matter that I think we need to raise in advance of the next item. Yeah. Fair enough. I raise it before the lunch. Chairman. I think it probably helped my due date. So the next item on the agenda is noise and vibration. And, um, we think that on behalf of the council and the examining authority should just be aware of our position. Um, we had last week been told by our environmental protection officers that they were, for medical reasons, unavailable to attend and therefore instructed noise consultant.

01:23:21:13 - 01:24:04:13

Um, our noise consultant is the associate director of Horley, which is a Tetra Tech company. That's relevant, um, for the reason that I'll go on to. And we checked this with the applicant on Friday and we're told that there was no problem. Now, the reason I say that the Tetra Tech is relevant is because the applicant's noise consultant is from PSE, which is also a Tetra Tech company. So we were told that there weren't any problems. However, we received an email last night, um, to say that there was a potential conflict of interest and that Tetra Tech had asked for our noise consultant, despite having already provided us with written evidence and advice to essentially deconstruct themselves.

01:24:04:24 - 01:24:53:22

Um ah, noise consultant who was Matthew and didn't have any particular concerns. I understand it's come from higher ups, but the problem we're now in is that we have been told from the applicant that

our noise consultant is conflicted. If our noise consultant is conflicted, it would raise questions about their noise consultant, given that RPS is also owned by Tetra Tech, and that given we have advised, we have received advice. So if there are problems with conflict, we would just like to make the point that it's not right to ask our consultant not to attend this hearing and no longer to advise us, but for the applicant noise consultant to continue advising because we have already received advice in written form, and it should be for us to decide whether we want to rely on that or not.

01:24:54:11 - 01:25:30:22

Um, the summary position is it's a little bit messy. Um, and I think our position is that we would, we would like to have the opportunity to have a noise consultant to address the issues that are going to arise in the next item. There are potential considerations in terms of conflicts more generally for the applicants to consider. Um, and so I think our request would be that item eight is not considered next on the agenda and perhaps is pushed back to a separate issue. Um, of course, that's that's in your discretion, but I think it should be aware of the discussions that have gone on behind the scenes.

01:25:31:12 - 01:25:51:23

Um, so that that's why I raise it before lunch, because we were aware of it only yesterday night. It would have been helpful, obviously, to have heard from the applicants about any concerns before then. Um, and our understanding, as I say, from a meeting that we have with the applicants on Friday, was that there was no problem. Um, so there's there's some confusion on our side, but also some general concern.

01:25:53:10 - 01:25:56:05

So you've got no noise consultant representing you today.

01:25:56:15 - 01:26:31:12

So our noise consultant, I had a discussion with our noise consultant this morning, um, who was lined up and ready, but who has since, in the last hour or two been instructed by higher ups in Tetra Tech, which is the problem. So despite the fact that he has provided us with written advice, um, we're in the position whereby he's been told by others, really through communications with the applicants of noise consultants, um, to no longer act for us. So we were in the position to have a noise consultant join us remotely, and we are now no longer in that position.

01:26:36:18 - 01:26:42:05

Do you want to respond to what's been said? And we might then have to go and just think about it over the lunchtime.

01:26:42:08 - 01:27:15:21

Um, on behalf of the applicant, I'd just like to make clear this isn't the applicants that are taking a position. It's Tetra Tech as the organisation that, um, has both, uh, both consultants within it. This isn't this isn't an applicant position. It's a Tetra Tech position. So I think it's probably best if Tetra Tech explain where the situation is. Um, we can it. My understanding of it is, um, is it's a matter that's come to light very late, but I think probably Mr.

01:27:16:01 - 01:27:21:00

Doctor Lennon is the right person to respond to that in terms of the Tetra Tech position.

01:27:21:24 - 01:27:23:13

If you can do it very quickly.

01:27:23:20 - 01:27:59:01

Yeah, absolutely. Uh, doctor, Kevin Annan, I'm a senior associate director with Tetra Tech. Uh, so tetra were made aware of the potential conflict. Um, that was referred to on Friday last week. Um, so this has been discussed with our management over the past couple of days as to whether there was indeed a potential conflict of interest. Uh, yesterday was concluded that the conflict wasn't something that could be worked around with staff from the same company, representing both the applicant and the key stakeholder at examination hearing. So that's um, that's, that's, that's basically where we're at with that and where that conflict lies.

01:27:59:21 - 01:28:01:19

Um, I think.

01:28:05:23 - 01:28:06:13

So.

01:28:09:03 - 01:28:41:22

So if I'm, if I might just demonstrate for borough council, just, just make the point. Obviously we're aware that the parent company is Tetra Tech. Um, when we've had offline discussions, Doctor Lan has indicated that he is he works for PPS. Our consultant worked for Horley. So we know that Tetra Tech is the parent company, I think. I don't know quite how the how the companies are structured, nor what their relationship is with Tetra Tech. Don't need to get into that detail. Um, but but I think I think the point is we're not in a particularly satisfactory position in terms of either of the noise consultants.

01:28:41:24 - 01:29:18:12

Yeah. I mean, the bottom line from our perspective is obviously it would be helpful for relative for authorities. And obviously you're being one of the key authorities to be to be represented by a noise consultant in terms of the information that we're going to get back from you, it sounds like you're not in a position to be able to do that. There are still other parties, other councils that might have comments to make on noise or Lancashire. You wouldn't comment on noise necessarily, would you? But obviously other parties might want to do. We'll have to have a think about it over the, uh, lunch break as to whether or not we slimmed down the item, whether or not we actually defer it for written questions or refer the hearing.

01:29:18:23 - 01:29:28:14

But obviously other people here might want to make comments about noise as well, and there might be an opportunity for that to happen. So we'll have a think about it over the lunch break as to how we will proceed.

01:29:28:19 - 01:29:29:18

Understood. Thank you sir.

01:29:30:01 - 01:29:40:08



Okay, we will break now for lunch and we will return at 155. Okay.