



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 7
<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: 01:37:23

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:09:20 - 00:00:12:16

Okay. Thank you. Can everybody take their seats, please?

00:00:18:28 - 00:00:34:09

So we got up to, uh, obviously noise and vibration. Item on the agenda. And we heard the, uh, representations and filed by our counsel in that regard. Uh.

00:00:38:09 - 00:01:11:18

I think given the situation that where Fylde Borough Council are clearly not represented in terms of noise today and wouldn't be able to take reasonable part in that discussion. And obviously they are key to this discussion, particularly around the substations. Uh, We are of the view that we're not going to be able to proceed with the noise and vibration item, which is frustrating and it is disappointing that we've got into this situation.

00:01:12:03 - 00:01:51:00

Particularly given that parties have prepared for this item, we prepared for this item and to get late notices as well that we can't. We're into this situation clearly is is is frustrating, but I don't see how we can proceed. When Fylde is so central to the discussions. We will be able to ask written questions, including some of the questions we might have asked today. There will still be an opportunity for further written submissions and aware that positions are evolving between the parties in any case, so there'll be opportunities for written submissions in the usual way at the relevant deadlines.

00:01:51:15 - 00:02:04:08

And obviously, if necessary, there can be a noise and vibration item at a To subsequent issue specific hearing. In October. Um.

00:02:08:16 - 00:02:42:26

It would, I think, be helpful just to get an understanding of where this is, how we got into the situation. If a note could be prepared for deadline for. As to waters, I don't really want to get into the whys and why nots of it this afternoon at all, but it'd be quite just useful, just so we know as to why we got ourselves into this. Why why this situation has has been allowed to happen. Take into account, you know, the conflicts process. It's something we're dealing with on a sort of weekly basis as to why just before lunch, before we were hearing this item, this issue came up.

00:02:43:09 - 00:02:53:24

Um, so it would be helpful to get an explanation at deadline for perhaps from you both in that as to why we got to this situation. Um.

00:02:54:15 - 00:03:40:07

So, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants. With due respect, I'm not sure. Us both putting in how we think we got into this situation is necessarily particularly helpful. I'm happy to have a conversation

with Council to work out how we might do that. I'm not sure having different views of because there will be different views as to how we how this situation has arisen. Can I suggest what we try and focus on is how we get to the next bit, which is how we ensure that, um, whatever support the council needs is, is, is there an in place how we move forward with this? Um, one thing I had considered, um, and it may be appropriate, it may not be appropriate.

00:03:40:12 - 00:04:11:29

I am very aware that the hearings are October, which is very late. The last next set of hearings are scheduled for October, which is very late in terms of considering this as an issue. Yeah. The the applicants are obviously very keen to progress this with the councils as far as possible and far as far as possible. I was just surmising whether it might be possible to put in, say, a virtual single hearing on noise with the appropriate notice, perhaps sometime around early September.

00:04:12:01 - 00:04:47:23

I'd suggest virtual, just because the mechanics of getting everybody here in the cost for it might not be a feasible consideration, but that it might be an opportunity for the parties to kind of resolve the position in terms of where we are now, ensure that there is some consideration of that. I just October does feel very late in terms of of it being considered at a hearing. I haven't looked at it from a procedural perspective in terms of kind of notices and those sorts of things, but I think, um, I think it's important that there is some discussion around this.

00:04:47:25 - 00:04:59:26

It's clearly important we resolve the situation, and it's clearly important that the the applicant and the council can work together to to move forward with these. Understand where the points of dispute are and and work towards those.

00:05:00:15 - 00:05:36:16

Thank you. I understand that I was going to come on to that issue about how it would be resolved, because what we want from want from the as an examining authority is the information before us, from the parties enabled to us to, to a carry out our examination and be come to a recommendation. And obviously the parties that seemingly need a separate discussion, not just about what's happened here, but also as equally importantly about what is your respective positions in terms of a hearing in early September? I could probably say now that I think for us would be quite difficult because we've got written questions, schedule of changes to the development consent order.

00:05:36:22 - 00:06:11:09

Without giving too much away, I think several of us are going to be on holiday in parts of August as well. So I think we will give we'll give some thought to it's necessary. The other point is that this this process, as we've said before, is primarily by written representations. And and you know, I would propose that that process continues. I think there does need to be direct discussions between the council and the applicant on, on matters of noise. And I think it's worth saying that quite a few items are at a situation where things are obviously evolving, and we're sort of asking questions when things are still evolving, which is, you know, not an entirely perfect situation in some respects.

00:06:11:19 - 00:06:24:19

If the parties can continue to negotiate and get your final position in advance of the hearing in October, then we would ask questions at a hearing as necessary to get to the bottom of any bits of final disagreement. If any disagreement.

00:06:25:03 - 00:06:36:16

Remains done on behalf of the applicant, we have also got the Statement of Common ground process. Obviously, working with files at the moment in terms of being able to use that as a vehicle to progress those discussions.

00:06:37:00 - 00:07:08:04

And I'd also like to be and coming to Mr. Shake in a minute, that obviously that the council is in a position itself, obviously, to be able to provide the representations that it needs to provide as well. I mean, we've still got three months left in the examination. So there is still actually time to resolve any matters. But obviously there is that separate issue that has the council got what it needs to be able to to, to make its representations on, on noise? Um, I note too, that the Council on Noise didn't say an awful lot of noise.

00:07:08:06 - 00:07:17:24

I don't think in the local impact report. So it's probably, uh, we've not got the benefit of, of that too. But clearly we want we want the council's position. Mr. Shaikh, did you want to say something.

00:07:18:09 - 00:07:55:18

For borough council? Yes, sir. Firstly, thank you for the decision. I think it's one that we appreciate. And I think it's probably the fairest decision in light of what's happened. Um, in terms of not dealing with noise today. Um, the second point in respect of the note, a note that we provide will essentially set out the facts that I indicated earlier, which are we know when we alerted the applicants, we know when we were told, i.e. yesterday, there was a problem. That's about as much as we know, unfortunately. So if there was going to be any note, we would certainly find it helpful because it's one, um, that we still don't understand what's happened behind the scenes in terms of the relevant companies.

00:07:55:20 - 00:08:26:29

I think it probably would need to come from the applicant. More specifically, it would need to come from Tetra Tech because they are the ones that have made the decision, um, rather than the applicants themselves. So I, we would we would welcome a note because we would like to know what's happened and why we've ended up where we have, especially because from our noise consultant, it seemed to be that he was unaware of the decision until this morning, when he was told that he could no longer act for the council. So we would we would appreciate that, um, in terms of picking up any points in writing, we can certainly do that.

00:08:27:01 - 00:09:01:15

Our local impact report does set out our high level concerns about noise, the points that we were going to make today on the back of the noise consultant's advice were more technical points, um, some of which reflected the British standards, some of which reflected construction hours, for example. Um, they are things that we are slightly concerned about making now so we wouldn't be able to engage in the issue in that respect or noise, because that relies on advice that we are now told

is conflicted, etc. so we're certainly happy to deal with it in writing. And then if it would assist you to have a further issue on the topic in due course, we can do so.

00:09:02:07 - 00:09:02:23

Okay.

00:09:02:29 - 00:09:06:03

Mr. Galston yeah, I think that makes sense.

00:09:06:05 - 00:09:39:06

There's not much point in involved putting in a note, but I think we do want to note from the parent company via the of the applicants because, um, there's a lot of people that are that have turned up. We've advertised the agenda, um, and a lot of work has gone into preparing for that. And to to see it disappear at the last minute is is frustrating. And more than anything, as professionals, everyone is a basic requirement. You have these conflict checks in place. So how this has arisen so late in the day is really frustrating.

00:09:39:11 - 00:10:12:12

And why we need a note is that they tighten up their conflict checks so it doesn't happen in a future. DCO. You know, the idea that this could have happened, now they need to make sure that they've got their subsidiaries in order with the conflict checks to make sure that, you know, there isn't a repetition. So I think our feeling is a note really would be is needed and would be helpful. So I, I think we would ask again, not from files but from the applicant or from the parent company effectively if this can be provided.

00:10:13:29 - 00:10:39:00

So can I just add before the applicant comes back to Borough council? Um, obviously the point I raised earlier was that if Tetra Tech consider our noise consultant is now conflicted, then Tetra Tech, as a company who have been providing advice for both sides of the table, are then potentially conflicted as a whole company and therefore the noise consultants that's been advising the applicant may be conflicted. So I think the note ought to deal with that. To assist you to.

00:10:40:15 - 00:10:42:06

Fair comment, please go on.

00:10:42:18 - 00:10:52:29

Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants. Clearly, it's not my note or the applicant's note. It's tech or tech note. But we take the point and it's something that will need to be considered within it.

00:10:54:06 - 00:11:12:00

Thank you. Are there any. Does anybody else want to. Because I'm also conscious that there are other parties that may have prepared, uh, for this hearing and want to speak today. So there's a hand up for the gentleman in the. Can we wait for the microphone, please? And just give your name before you speak in the normal way, please.

00:11:12:17 - 00:11:29:03

My name is Ralph Cairns. I represent facts in relation to the to the pipelines, and I have some questions for the applicant in relation to the vibration, uh, discussion that took place this morning on, um, in relation to vibrations, if that is okay.

00:11:29:17 - 00:11:39:10

What I suggest you do, because I don't want to open up a discussion on noise in terms of people asking questions, etc., because that might then involve the council needed to give a response. But what I suggest you do.

00:11:39:12 - 00:11:40:09

Is really.

00:11:40:11 - 00:12:04:01

Of noise and vibration. Yes. Sorry. If you could. If you could. If it's possible to give those directly to the applicant after this meeting, and I'm sure that they'll be able to provide a response to those, or certainly discuss those with you. And if anything falls out of that, you want to provide a deadline for them, please do so. If we open up a discussion involving questions without, again, without Fylde Borough Council here.

00:12:04:09 - 00:12:13:25

It was really only my intention to have these questions recorded and to to to let the applicant record, uh, to have these done for deadline five really or deadline.

00:12:13:27 - 00:12:15:21

For how many questions have you got, Mr.. Cairns?

00:12:15:25 - 00:12:16:12

Three.

00:12:16:14 - 00:12:17:19

Three if there are quick questions.

00:12:17:21 - 00:12:18:26

Yeah, there are quick questions.

00:12:18:28 - 00:12:23:00

Ask them and the applicant can take those away and respond in writing, please.

00:12:24:12 - 00:12:24:27

Am I.

00:12:24:29 - 00:12:25:14

Right?

00:12:26:03 - 00:12:58:22

Yeah. Okay. What investigations have the applicant made to ensure that the vibration in the fields, not in the on the roads, but in the fields where the pipeline where the ethylene and LPG pipelines cross. Have been accommodated. I the reason for this question is that the the pipelines run by Caden and Sabic are made of a different construction and.

00:12:59:07 - 00:13:02:19

There can be quick questions. Otherwise if they're going to be long questions, I say.

00:13:02:28 - 00:13:03:19

I'll leave the question.

00:13:03:28 - 00:13:08:01

Leave. Leave it. Leave it offline for the applicant. And you can have a short have a separate conversation.

00:13:08:03 - 00:13:45:06

Second question what bridging inquiries have been made to accommodate the other pipelines. So it's allocated to the east. It's linked to the first question what. You know, if some you know, they're made of different materials, how are you going to coordinate the different requirements for the different, you know, vibration or affect on 1st May not be the same as the vibration effect on the other. And finally, uh, what arrangements have been made to ensure coordination between different contractors working on these different pipelines.

00:13:45:08 - 00:13:56:26

I wouldn't necessarily be aware of the depth and construction of another pipeline, you know, if they were working on one pipeline. So how have you coordinated these?

00:13:57:22 - 00:13:58:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:13:58:18 - 00:14:09:19

Mr. Cairns lays down on behalf of the applicants. We'll pick those up if we're able to respond to them at deadline. For you appreciate we have quite a lot to do for deadline for we will do that. Otherwise it'll be deadline five.

00:14:09:21 - 00:14:23:15

Yeah that's fine. And if there is an opportunity for an offline discussion, then obviously that opportunity could be there today as well if the two parties agree. Anybody else who wants to say anything? Okay.

00:14:23:25 - 00:14:45:23

Well done. On behalf of the applicant, um, I completely appreciate if you don't want these updates because otherwise we will make them a deadline for. But within this there were there are going to be some updates to the development consent order that will go in at deadline for the first of those is that Saturday afternoon working is going to be removed from the DCO.

00:14:45:29 - 00:14:47:22

We can deal with that tomorrow as well.

00:14:49:00 - 00:14:49:25

That's fine. We'll deal with.

00:14:49:27 - 00:14:52:04

That. Any disappointment we can deal with tomorrow?

00:14:52:07 - 00:14:58:00

Actually, if we deal with them under the context of the requirements, then we can look at them from a noise perspective. Following on, that's fine.

00:14:58:02 - 00:15:04:16

Obviously we won't have again filed noise consultant, but there are some matters that relate to noise that I'm sure will probably come up tomorrow.

00:15:04:18 - 00:15:15:19

And and I think the point is done on behalf of the applicant. The point was we just wanted to get that out before deadline for so parties were aware of it in terms of their submissions for deadline for and then following on from that.

00:15:15:23 - 00:15:29:04

Yeah. Okay. No thank you I understand. Okay. Thank you everybody. We will now move on to the next item which is socioeconomics. And over to my colleague Mr. Gorst.

00:15:59:20 - 00:16:22:03

Thank you. Kicking off with, um, tourism, uh, applicants found at paragraph 212, six seven of the socio economic chapter. That's app. App 141 that within the context of the Northwest England visitor economy, the magnitude of impact on visual receptors is considered to be negligible.

00:16:23:21 - 00:17:02:09

Um councils at both Fylde and Blackpool countered the claims from the applicants, and Fylde specifically refute the assertion. Um at paragraph one 3115, in in their submission at rep one oh 46 um, now that the um, the applicants have said they're going to be putting in a further note at deadline four, that's in response to the, uh exc one um, uh, question that was put um, but I don't know if, uh, at this stage the council's want to say anything before the applicants respond further.

00:17:10:06 - 00:17:16:17

Associate with borough council. So I don't think there's anything else we wish to add already beyond what we've put in writing. Thank you.

00:17:16:19 - 00:17:17:09

Blackpool.

00:17:20:08 - 00:17:37:16

Circus tonight. Blackpool Council. Um, the council do have some comments in respect of tourism, which are over and above what is currently in the, uh, LA. Uh, we can make those statements now or we can leave them to a later tolerated it. Uh, and we did want to make a comment in respect of the outline employment and skills plan.

00:17:37:18 - 00:17:48:16

So I'll be coming on to the outline skills later. So that's fine. We can cover that. Um, later under this agenda item. Um.

00:17:51:16 - 00:17:59:05

Could you just repeat that point? Because I think people on this side of the room didn't just hear your point. So just if you just repeat your point and if you can again, same rule for.

00:17:59:07 - 00:18:28:04

Everybody, that's fine. So to be honest, I actually didn't we didn't quite hear Mr. Gould either. So I'm guessing at what has been said all around. Catherine night, Blackpool Council. Uh so we Blackpool Council do have some points on tourism which we wish to add which are not in the currently in LA. And miss Sue Parker head of Development management, is going to take that forward. And the other only point in this topic the Blackpool Council wish to make is in respect of the outline Skills and Employment plan, which I assume we will come to later.

00:18:29:22 - 00:18:32:11

Sorry. And those points will come in at D4. Will they?

00:18:34:07 - 00:18:35:19

Uh, whenever it suits you, sir.

00:18:37:03 - 00:18:37:20

Well.

00:18:38:02 - 00:18:40:14

The point. What suits you? Yes.

00:18:43:17 - 00:19:01:02

Um, okay. Turning to to to the applicant. Now, um, as I mentioned, there's going to be a further note coming in at, uh, D4. You've already indicated that, um, at this stage, you're able to say whether you're going to be, um, reconsidering your assessment of the impact.

00:19:04:15 - 00:19:11:14

Yeah. Excuse me. On behalf of the applicant. Yes. Well, we, um, plan to submit a local tourism assessment deadline for

00:19:13:02 - 00:19:17:01

what we're willing to take on. Take on board. Any comments from Blackpool Council that we received before then?

00:19:23:02 - 00:19:23:18

Yeah.

00:19:24:12 - 00:19:26:19

Um, Josh Harding Jones, on behalf of

00:19:28:09 - 00:20:07:04

Josh Jones, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. So just to furnish, um, Mr. Spencer's, uh, comment with a bit more detail. And the most notable update to that submission is going to consider a more localized study area covering what we're terming the filed in South Ribble. And so, um, we feel that assessment of the Fylde, which would consist of Fylde borough, Blackpool borough, Preston City and Wyre borough councils, would capture the feedback that's been received, stating a desire to see a coherent local geography assessed and the inclusion of South Ribble accommodates the reality that the order limits extending to that local authority as well.

00:20:07:12 - 00:20:45:08

So in addition to looking at that more localized geography at the headline study area to accommodate instances where there's potential for the assessment at that level to differ from what might be observed at a more individual local authority level. The assessment will also highlight such instances to ensure that localised tourism sensitivities to the project are captured within the assessment. And so the methodology will consider individual assessment categories as well, which again reflects some of the concerns that have been raised in representations and throughout the examination process, so that with respect to matters such as natural capital, culture and entertainment.

00:20:45:10 - 00:21:21:25

So that would include major events and heritage, recreation, accommodation and hospitality. So each of those categories would be assessed for for impacts on its own merits. And then that would draw on um, other topics within the ES and their findings on matters such as traffic and transport, land use and recreation, visual impacts, historic environment, ecology, noise and vibration. Considering potential direct impacts arising on tourism activities within a one kilometre buffer of the order limits, because that also responds to something that was in files.

00:21:21:27 - 00:21:46:07

Um deadline three submission around looking at a buffer zone. An appropriate buffer zone. And so the updated assessment is going to be submitted as a standalone submission at deadline for as stated. Um, and this has been accelerated accelerated. The program for this has been accelerated to provide as much time as possible for interested parties to properly review the technical matters within that, and consider whether it meets their their expectations.

00:21:49:25 - 00:22:26:18

Thank you. Thank you for that. And that's very, very helpful. Uh, I think what I would say is that, uh, and this is something we discussed at the uh, issue one hearing, um, was that the socioeconomic chapter, which is at AP 141, uh, concentrated on a very wide area within a 60 mile drive time catchment. So, so basically it referred to North Wales and North west England. Uh, however, paragraph 513 two of n one refers to impacts at both regional and local levels.

00:22:27:20 - 00:22:50:27

Um, so I'm not quite sure what. It's good news that you're looking at this now, but why wasn't this contained in the application documents? Because that the the, um, policy, the N1 suggests you should be look at what doesn't suggest it requires that you look at regional and local levels. Um, and yet this has only been done now. So why wasn't it done earlier?

00:22:50:29 - 00:23:33:27

So it was done on behalf of the applicant. Um, Mr. Harding Jones will explain, um, how the EIA assessment process is undertaken for the purposes of socioeconomics and the need for it to be looking at that regional level rather than at the very local level. Um, I would just point out that the approach that was taken on this project, um, and the assessment that's been undertaken is it's been done in exactly the same way as the Mona project. So the Mona offshore wind farm, which was consented, obviously, by the Secretary of state, um, Uh, earlier this month, actually, um, and the approach to it is important in terms of the consideration of that context within for the Moana project.

00:23:33:29 - 00:24:04:23

The consideration was a Wales wide context. Um, and indeed, looking at, uh, reaching out into the northwest of England, it's also important considerations from socioeconomics that, um, the project's not just looking at this at the transmission assets. The transmission assets are connected to the Morgan Offshore wind farm generation assets. Equally, the Morecambe generation assets, the Morgan and Moana projects are being brought forward by the same organisation.

00:24:04:25 - 00:24:47:24

And we may even have the More Vannin project coming forward at some point. So there is a regional context to the delivery of these projects. Um, and it's important that they're seen in that regional context. And we're very happy to, to appoint the examining authority and the examination to the concluding parts of the of the Mona examination report. In terms of how that was considered and its appropriateness in terms of the N1. I completely appreciate that. It's for every examining authority to make their own determination against policy and then the Secretary of State, but I think there is some very clear and helpful guidance from that decision in terms of how that policy should be interpreted.

00:24:48:05 - 00:24:48:24

Thank you.

00:24:49:29 - 00:25:25:15

Thank you. I must I must say, I thought you'd be saying that. Um, and I hear what you say. Uh, of course, Mona is an offshore wind farm, and we're concerned mainly with, uh, onshore impacts here. Uh, firstly and secondly, the paragraph in the N1, um, is something that we're concerned about and that's more directly relevant than, than, than um, other DCO decisions. And it does say regional and local levels. so it should have been looked at before in in in in our view.

00:25:26:00 - 00:25:41:07

Um, but, uh, you know, we'll leave the point. The good news is that something is coming in now, and obviously the councils will wait to see that and will, um, comment accordingly. And Blackpool Council are going to mention something. Now.

00:25:42:18 - 00:26:14:11

Sir, I miss night. Blackpool Council. Uh, sir, Blackpool Council welcome a more localised look at tourism. Um, Miss Parker, I have Blackpool Council sitting beside me and Claire Parker Ashton have both done quite significant work over the past few weeks. Looking at the localised tourism they have, some numbers are all prepared and actually, um, taken quite a bit of work. Perhaps it would be ideal while everyone is in the room for them to get together and have a chat. We can go through it verbally now, um, and have a chat so that we can feed that information into the applicants report.

00:26:14:21 - 00:26:18:21

Uh, rather than having to comment later and do it through written Russian representations.

00:26:20:08 - 00:26:24:16

Josh Allen Jones, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, that would be that would be good for us.

00:26:27:28 - 00:26:31:20

Thank you. Susan Parker for Blackpool Council. Um. What?

00:26:32:20 - 00:26:33:22

Don't you read it out?

00:26:33:24 - 00:26:34:17

Oh, okay.

00:26:34:19 - 00:26:35:04

Okay.

00:26:35:23 - 00:26:40:28

Yeah. Sorry. Uh, Josh Jones, on behalf of the applicant, I'm happy to catch up after. Um, no. That's fine.

00:26:44:14 - 00:26:55:12

That's a really helpful suggestion. And thank you to both of you. Um, and look forward to, um, uh, hearing what you want to say, but in the meantime, your submission is coming in at D4.

00:26:56:17 - 00:26:57:18

Yes. That's correct.

00:26:57:20 - 00:26:59:00

Yeah. Thank you, thank you.

00:27:01:12 - 00:27:01:27

Mr. cope.

00:27:03:06 - 00:27:13:06

Thank you. Uh, John Coates, state borough council. Um, I want to, um, just echo your comments there about how the Moana project is, is

00:27:14:26 - 00:27:51:12

very different. That's for an offshore. Offshore wind farm. We're talking about onshore impacts here. I would like to just go further on that point, though, and say that the the applicant, in responding to our local impact report, um, made reference to a number of other schemes, and we selected the first from the list to have a look at and found again, uh, that that assessment, in fact, had been carried out in a way that was more aligned with what we were requesting and didn't reflect the applicant's assessment. We are frustrated at this continued reference to other schemes that are on on relevance.

00:27:51:15 - 00:28:24:04

And um, whilst we welcome this assessment being carried out, we have concerns about how it can now meaningfully impact these proposals. Um, if it's prepared at this late stage, what kind of impact is it realistically going to going to have? So, um, we're not content with this. Tourism is incredibly important for files. We cannot overstate how important this issue is. We've we've made that clear in our representations throughout this procedure, as have other interested parties.

00:28:24:16 - 00:28:35:23

And this is this is a very serious issue, and it is not one that we think will be satisfactorily addressed by the retrospective submission of this information.

00:28:38:18 - 00:29:08:11

Thank that. Uh, well, let's see what comes in at D4. Um, I mean, the fact that, uh, there is something more coming in, it would have been preferable to have it in earlier stage, but it's coming in now. We've got three months. Um, let let let let's see where, where, where we go. But I think the point has been made, um, that, uh, you know, it does need to be looked at on a local level. And it's, you know, it's good news that, um, that that's now being done.

00:29:09:16 - 00:29:45:09

Anybody listening on behalf the applicant, could I just ask Mr. Cope state to reference the project he's talking about, which he says was done differently because we probably want to go back and check that. And the other point I do just want to correct on, I appreciate that this application is around the transmission assets, but as I've said, it is part of an offshore wind farm and they will be built together. And it's very clear from the employment and skills plan that actually there will be a cohesive approach to the delivery of skills in respect of those. And the Mona project did include onshore cabling as well, um, across North Wales to the connection point at Bollywood.

00:29:45:11 - 00:30:01:10

And so we are in more similar territory. I appreciate this application is focused on the transmission assets, but it needs to be seen in context with those bigger things. If you could provide that reference to the, to the, um, to the, the that you were referring to, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

00:30:01:27 - 00:30:22:16

I can John Borough Council. Um, it is in our written response to the examiner's question. Question 15 .1.4. Um, we've provided our comments at length there. The scheme we're referring to is ramp into

DCO, which is top of the list of the examples you provided. Um, so, um, I would just invite the applicant to read our response.

00:30:24:28 - 00:30:44:01

And Josh Harland Jones, on behalf of the applicant. We have read that response and I appreciate that response. And it has fed into our design of what's going to be submitted at deadline for. So hopefully, um, the the one kilometre buffer that reflects some of what you included in your response. So we are taking on board the comments that are being made in that respect.

00:30:48:09 - 00:31:32:14

All right. Thank you for everyone. If we could move on to the outline skills, um, uh, employment and skills plan, which, uh, you mentioned earlier, uh, Blackpool Council. Um, the this was originally an app. Two, three nine. Um, it has been criticised by both councils and um At the moment, we're not convinced it actually, um, complies with the, uh, uh, the suggested requirement that, um, paragraph five, 13, 12 of, of the N1, um, the planning statement itself states that the transmission assets would have a direct economic benefit, including employment and gross added value.

00:31:33:22 - 00:31:50:19

Um, I don't know if you Blackpool you want to comment further on, on on the outline skills or um, uh, and then I'll come to the applicant and ask them to respond and also to, to comment on the application or otherwise of paragraph five, 13, 12.

00:31:51:00 - 00:31:58:09

So on behalf of the applicant before we do that is the point you're making around five 1312 that the approval by the local authority.

00:31:58:11 - 00:31:58:26

Yes. Sorry.

00:31:58:28 - 00:31:59:13

Yes. The element.

00:31:59:15 - 00:32:00:00

Yes.

00:32:00:02 - 00:32:00:17

Sorry.

00:32:07:00 - 00:32:07:15

Yeah.

00:32:07:17 - 00:32:19:03

Yes. Lays down on behalf of the applicants because there has been, um, there has been or is about to be an update to the, uh, outline employment and skills plan requirement. I might hand over to Miss Fuller.

00:32:19:16 - 00:32:38:12

Laura Fuller, on behalf of the applicants, we updated the Employment and Skills Plan requirements. Uh, 19 at deadline three so that it now reads that there is an approving body which is stated to be Lancashire County Council with all the other local authorities as consultees.

00:32:44:24 - 00:33:24:13

Less than half the applicants. The reason Lancashire County Council is the approval body is because this project covers, obviously, a number of local authority areas, and the precedent that had come down from previous offshore wind farms was in respect of this type of skills and employment plan. It would be the LEP, the local enterprise partnership, who who sit at that sort of county council level. So the applicants consider that it's a Lancashire County Council matter. In order to be that that sort of higher level authority to be looking at this, particularly as it's the county council that obviously has responsibility for education in any in any event.

00:33:24:27 - 00:33:34:27

And that it's the local authorities and the number of local authorities would be consultees to that plan. And as Mr. Fuller has said, that was put in as an update to the DCO at deadline three.

00:33:37:21 - 00:34:02:04

Yeah, I can understand that. You only want to really be in contact with one local authority about this. Um, and that that would make sense rather than trying to to go to 2 or 3. Um, I suppose the question is perhaps for the local authorities to decide between themselves who is the relevant local authority? Uh, Blackpool. I don't know if you want to comment further on this.

00:34:02:15 - 00:34:38:07

Uh, summers night, Blackpool Council, the local authorities and the county council have had a discussion there looking ahead to the local government review, which we all know is coming in and what may be coming along. The county Council do not my understanding you can confirm with them seek to be the relevant approval authority. They seek for it to be an approved local planning authority, which is likely to be a unitary authority, which is actually Blackpool Council. So we're they're happy for that. We're happy to take this offline and have a chat with Miss Fuller. Um, and actually just sort out the wording before tomorrow, which is when the DCO comes in.

00:34:38:21 - 00:34:42:01

So and perhaps you could also speak to Fylde about this.

00:34:42:07 - 00:34:42:22

Um.

00:34:43:15 - 00:34:48:24

Uh, and I think the point is that it's just as long as there's one local authority.

00:34:49:03 - 00:35:01:27

Yeah. Well, the rest of the, um, so if I may, the rest of the requirements that have been through them say, approval of the local planning authority, and they have people. That is my understanding. Um, that's my instructions. We're happy to take this offline and have a chat.

00:35:04:14 - 00:35:05:00

So.

00:35:05:23 - 00:35:37:26

Ladies, on behalf of the applicant, yes, I'm very happy to have the conversation. I think we need a single voice from the local authorities in terms of what their preference would be and where they feel the appropriate, um, level is. I don't think it's for the applicant to decide that. As I say, we've taken it at that at that county level because of the because of the education element and because they have that wider remit, obviously recognising the position with Blackpool becoming unitary. So, um, I think the important thing is, is the applicants have agreed that there should be an approval body, which is the point.

00:35:37:28 - 00:35:56:10

That means it's in accordance with paragraph 5.13 .15, and that there should be input from those other councils, given the projects bands a number of local authority areas. So if we can have guidance or direction from the local authorities as to how they wish that to be done, we'll consider that. Thank you.

00:35:56:26 - 00:36:03:08

That's absolutely fine. Um, and if the authorities could try and resolve that between themselves as soon as possible.

00:36:03:24 - 00:36:08:14

So thank you very much. I think I actually wanted to say something that came over to me earlier.

00:36:08:19 - 00:36:26:17

Shall we say borough council. So I think we can certainly take that one offline. I think how it would currently be dealt with is that there's an Economic Prosperity Board that Fylde Borough Council chair, and that would be the appropriate way to deal with it. Um, but we'll perhaps deal with with that offline and come to an agreement between the authorities.

00:36:27:21 - 00:36:36:21

That sounds fine. I don't think we're too concerned, and I don't think the applicant is too concerned as long as they only have one person making the decision.

00:36:36:23 - 00:36:47:13

Absolutely. On behalf of the applicants and recognizing who can be an approval body for a requirement under a development consent order. So that's the other consideration. Just to take into account.

00:36:48:00 - 00:37:04:12

Sir, if I may, Catherine night, Blackpool Council, exactly what we're after. Um, they came over to me and asked me to make a representation of the wording has changed the relevant planning authority. Then it will naturally fall to exactly where their local authorities are filed in Blackpool and Lancashire, anticipating it will fall. Thank you.

00:37:05:09 - 00:37:07:24

Right. That's fine. Sorry.

00:37:08:15 - 00:37:40:09

Sorry. Just to add something that on a, um, just a consideration, is that, um, each of the applicants is planning to develop their own detailed plan. Um, and those will combine with the generation assets, um, of each project, which will span a larger area than just the transmission as its project can. Is is concerned with. So maybe if that could be noted in those discussions that there's um, there's potential there's potential broader geographic implications.

00:37:41:22 - 00:37:48:22

Yeah. Um, so so not to complicate matters, but it's that's just a note to, um, inform those discussions.

00:37:50:26 - 00:38:26:08

Lays down on behalf of the applicants. Um, we also need to check there is a there is a requirement securing a skills and employment and skills plan or skills and employment plan for the generation element of the DCO as well. So the generation application has the same thing, and clearly if the two are to be combined together, they need to be consistent. Um, we'll report on. I don't have in front of me at the moment as to how that's been structured, but clearly that's another consideration that we'll need to bring into account, particularly when the hopefully the decision on the Morgan generation element comes out later this month.

00:38:27:03 - 00:38:29:21

Yeah, I think we're happy to leave you to sort that one out.

00:38:34:13 - 00:39:06:09

Right. Moving on. Last question. And under this, um, uh, agenda item, um, just referred to the Equitation Center, the Green Equitation Center. We we went around there during our accompanied site inspection. Um, and we saw from their representation, um, uh, that was rep One, three, four. They said they've been in business for 44 years. Um, and they, they confirmed they held 5000.

00:39:07:06 - 00:39:39:23

Sorry, 9500 able bodied sessions and 5250 disabled sessions each year. And they queried whether the business would be able to continue due to the impacts from the proposed development. Uh, I just wonder if the applicants could could, um, respond because, uh, the fact that there were so many disabled sessions didn't seem to be something which was, um, directly considered in the equalities impact assessment that, uh, you submitted at deadline one.

00:39:40:21 - 00:39:50:19

Um, so I just wondered if you could update us on on discussions and negotiations with the Green Equitation Centre. Uh, and also whether the EC

00:39:52:19 - 00:39:54:27

adequately covers the situation. Thank you.

00:39:55:17 - 00:40:43:08

Sir. Lasdun, on behalf of the applicants, I'll pass down to others who've had the engagement with green in terms of the meetings that have taken place and the discussions that are ongoing, um, in respect of the sort of public sector equality duty and the information on the statement of reasons. Um, we can do that today or tomorrow. The applicant's position is this often involves during an examination in terms of the information that comes out, then how it's considered and dealt with. So the applicant's position on this and I'll give you a heads up in terms of it, for for the compulsory acquisition hearing, is that we will be updating the statement of reasons, probably at deadline six, towards the end of the examination, to capture all of these elements that have been brought out and the mitigations and the approach that the applicants have taken to address those points.

00:40:43:13 - 00:41:02:03

So that will cover not only things that obviously were done through the design of the project and the mitigations there, but as these sorts of as these, these representations and how we've responded to these representations as they've come through. An examination will be captured in that. So there's a sort of full picture at the end of examination.

00:41:03:04 - 00:41:33:23

Yeah. That's helpful. And yes, I confess that I'm crossing over a bit to to Friday's hearing, so apologies for that. But I did want to raise as a business. And your colleague can can come back in a moment. But I think it's the point I was also raising and just to, to leap ahead till Friday is whether or not the equalities impact assessment, as well as the statement of reasons, uh, properly reflects the situation as we saw it. So it's the echo. I'm hoping you're going to perhaps review.

00:41:34:17 - 00:41:40:07

Liz down on behalf of the applicant without giving away what's going to happen on Friday. Yes, we will be updating that at the same time.

00:41:40:21 - 00:41:45:11

That's that's great. So just turning to whoever was going to.

00:41:47:05 - 00:42:26:10

Yeah. Good afternoon, Harry Stubbs, on behalf of the applicant, I think, um, just completely practical points around the around the discussions. The discussions continue with Ray green. We we having concluded, had the terms with the landowner of the land at Ray green occupy. But we remain committed to working on mitigation around the impacts on on the business. Um, we've been in discussion recently around, um, in mitigation to sort of suppress noise and dust, uh, especially towards the area that's used for, for, for riding, um, such works been tabled sort of include the noise suppression, using soil, bonding up to three meters high, as we've concluded.

00:42:26:12 - 00:42:57:09

And, uh, very practical matters such as straw walls above that with noise suppression and dust suppression as well, to sort of visibly hide those works. Um, and then therefore really decrease the impact on, on the horses and those riding and hopefully allow for that operation to continue. But those, those discussions will, will continue onwards. Um, no doubt. I think it's a just a point as well, to add a little bit from the discussion earlier today around, around the link boxes that we and it's

something that will be included for within the, um, the voluntary hearing point action that we put forward.

00:42:57:20 - 00:43:29:03

Um, but I think discussions around, around all these impacts are, are ongoing here. Um, the link box in particular was raised before while colleagues set out that the applicants can't commit to the exact locations at the moment. There are a lot of things we can do with the installation of those link boxes that mitigates impacts on businesses, and especially the ability to farm around them. Um, you know, it's often cases that the manual infrastructure itself are either installed following the consultation with landowners at flush ground level to allow sort of mowing operations to continue above unimpeded.

00:43:29:07 - 00:43:47:19

Slightly recessed, although it's not always favorable. Um, or in other areas, such as the allowable impacts and things like that. Often we're asked to raise them slightly above ground, to install market posts with them of certain areas and things like that, to really mitigate those impacts that are going on through through business and agricultural operations. On on a lot of this infrastructure as far as possible.

00:43:50:05 - 00:44:09:08

Thank you for that. And that's helpful. Um, I think I think one of the, um. I mean, this is a business and we'll come on to the end of the farm, so on on Friday. Uh, but this is a business which saying it might have to close. Did you look at a mitigation like, you know, possible alternative fields for for grazing?

00:44:16:23 - 00:44:36:23

Uh, I think I think within the, the application at the moment, as we go forward, these detailed discussions, once we understand the real detailed design implications of what's happening on the land. There may well be discussions we can bring together with landowners that are willing. Um, at the moment. But I suppose we're not providing exchange land at the moment for it. That's not something we've we've directly looked at.

00:44:38:16 - 00:45:08:18

I don't think it was so much exchange land. It was just, um, giving them the opportunity to rent somewhere else whilst, um, uh, works were going up, going on. But anyway, I'll leave that. You know, it is something that, um, uh, a lot of, um, residents raised was about this, this center. You know, they clearly hold a lot of sessions. We've been around there, and it clearly was very active. Um, so it'd be good if the negotiations could continue.

00:45:08:20 - 00:45:09:06

Thank you.

00:45:09:15 - 00:45:21:07

Yeah. Harry Stubbs, on behalf of the applicants, I think given the relationship status with the landowner there, that we've concluded had two terms, I'm sure that's, you know, dialogue that we can certainly continue with that landowner as well. Um, see the options there?

00:45:22:24 - 00:45:24:18

That's excellent. Thank you very much indeed.

00:45:24:20 - 00:45:59:00

If I may. Um, Robin Hutchinson for the for the joint applicants just following up on that point and again, sort of slightly thinking ahead to to Friday. Um, we discussed earlier the, um, sort of update hearing action point, which would set out the accommodations that were being taken on a sort of business by business, landowner, by landowner, um, basis, which obviously does include critically that that equestrian center and recognizing that broader public interest. It's not just about our one on one discussions. The broader community needs to see what we're doing to protect each of those businesses.

00:45:59:14 - 00:46:31:09

And that sort of one key piece of the the impact on individual businesses. The other elements, which I think have come up at various points are how long are you going to be on the land and how much notice can you give us. And when you're going to come on the land and we've sort of we've heard that message. Um, and we had our engineer at the previous session and we would suggest if it's, if it's helpful to the panel that, that our engineering expertise attends on Friday, to perhaps just give a bit of an explanation of how in practice, this scheme's, you know, a scheme like this is built.

00:46:31:11 - 00:47:10:04

It was explained that these are sort of constructed, you know, joint Bay to joint Bay. And, you know, he can expand on that and explain that, you know, it's not one end to end piece of work that carries on for the entire potential period of work across the whole corridor. You know, you start with the complex bits and then you move on to the easier bits and you leave when you can. And it's sort of built up in these sections. I mean, I'm not an engineer, so I'm not going to purport to give this evidence, but I would suggest that our engineer could be available on Friday to answer questions and kind of try and unpack a bit of that detail on exactly what happens in practice, how we get onto the land, how we get off of the land and just be available there.

00:47:10:06 - 00:47:15:00

So if that would assist, we could ensure that that, that that expertise was available on Friday.

00:47:22:19 - 00:47:45:01

Yes. Thank you for that. And, and um, yeah, I think that would be quite helpful. Might not be directly on point on compulsory acquisition, but, um, yes, it would be. It would be useful. So thank you for suggesting that. Can I, um, just just ask what is what is the your default submission? What's going to be the title of the paper Just so I know.

00:47:52:16 - 00:47:57:24

On behalf of the applicant, um, we haven't agreed it yet, but we'll make it as obvious as possible as to what it is.

00:47:57:26 - 00:47:58:27

Yeah, it would be nice.

00:47:58:29 - 00:48:05:22

Some of the titles sometimes perhaps aren't quite as, um, obvious as to what's in there. It'll be very obvious what it is.

00:48:05:25 - 00:48:42:12

I would have thought something like, you know, summary of landowner accommodation measures might be the, the obvious thing. And the final point, if I may, was just, um, mentioned. Obviously the accommodation measures is a critical point. The how long will be on the land and practice is a critical point. And the third piece of that is how much notice. And we propose to cover that off as well in our notes. Just a flow chart of explaining when in reality and in practice, a contractor is going to know what is being, um, built exactly where and is able to engage with the affected landowners and how that is done.

00:48:42:14 - 00:49:12:00

There is obviously a process in place secured, and the various outline plans for agricultural liaison officers to be able to communicate that. But we sort of thought, again, you do not want to lose the critical bits for all the documentation that goes in. So just trying to set that out in a flowchart saying, you know, X months, you should know this, try to give that sort of what happens in practice type detail. So again we propose to include that flowchart in the in the what did I call it summary of landowner.

00:49:12:02 - 00:49:19:28

I'm reliably informed it will be uh, the Agricultural holdings indicative mitigation plan and it will all fall under that.

00:49:20:10 - 00:49:21:02

I'm not sure that's.

00:49:21:10 - 00:49:21:26

A snappy.

00:49:21:28 - 00:49:22:13

Title.

00:49:22:28 - 00:49:25:07

I like mine better, but, um.

00:49:25:18 - 00:49:26:03

Yeah, I.

00:49:26:05 - 00:49:29:04

Will include that flowchart along with that, that document as well.

00:49:30:13 - 00:49:43:25

Yeah, that's really helpful and look forward to seeing that. And, um, uh, yes, you can, you can think over the, um, the title, but that as a preview. That's fine. Now, unless anybody are Mr. Cope's take.

00:49:44:29 - 00:50:21:17

Thank you. John. Borough council, just to come back to the, um, equitation, uh, center briefly. Um, I know your comments about the significance of this, this business. And, um, we echo those comments. Um, it it absolutely mustn't be downplayed. And it's worth pointing out that what what is being proposed here is the location of one of the construction compounds very close to the Equitation Center. So the impact that we're talking about here, um, is particularly, um, emphasized for, for a longer period of time.

00:50:21:19 - 00:50:51:21

And there will be a greater degree of impact. Um, we are concerned that, um, some of the things we've just heard now in the discussion about some of the mitigation that's being looked at in terms of three meter high bunds with, you know, No, um, straw bales on top of those. This is a rural landscape, and the compound is in a relatively elevated position in the landscape. So we're concerned that this site has been chosen.

00:50:52:01 - 00:51:23:00

And only now mitigation is being looked at. And the mitigation sounds quite primitive and not appropriate in the location. Um, we would comment that the location of this compound is not inevitable. It's something that the applicant has selected. The work order limits are extensive, and we would ask them again to look at alternative locations. Now, we don't want to downplay the impacts on other parts of the of the countryside. We know there will be impacts wherever these these construction compounds are located.

00:51:23:02 - 00:51:33:06

But this is perhaps one of the most sensitive locations in the Fylde rural area in terms of the location of of a construction compound. Thank you.

00:51:42:27 - 00:51:47:11

Thank you for that. Um, I'm sure, um, the applicants will take that on board.

00:51:50:14 - 00:51:59:25

Is there any further comments for anyone in the room or in the virtual room? Can't see anyone in that case that closes this section. Thank you very much.

00:52:03:19 - 00:52:07:09

And it's over to Doctor Morgan. So the.

00:52:07:11 - 00:52:09:23

Next agenda item is agenda item ten.

00:52:09:26 - 00:52:10:11

Which.

00:52:10:13 - 00:52:14:06

Is traffic and transport. Mr.. Ten, would you like to change your team?

00:53:35:08 - 00:53:35:27

Okay.

00:53:37:17 - 00:54:09:03

Okay. So my first question is actually directed to Lancashire County Council. So in your response, the examining authority's first written questions Rep 303 you indicated you've made a lot of progress with the applicants agreeing the proposed accesses in principle. And then the applicant submitted a revised outline Highways Access Management plan, which is Rep 3024A deadline three. Based on your discussions, are you now content with all accesses in principle?

00:54:10:13 - 00:54:12:03

Neil Stephens, Lancashire County Council

00:54:13:26 - 00:54:20:07

The access is can be delivered to satisfy the highway authority.

00:54:20:15 - 00:54:21:00

Are we.

00:54:21:02 - 00:54:37:23

There yet? No we're not. We're there on most of the access points in detail or the principles of the detail, but there are a few where they need to. We need to have some further dialogue. To get to that point. But I don't have an issue being that they can't be satisfied.

00:54:39:10 - 00:54:42:27

So you think with further discussion you'd be able to reach a conclusion.

00:54:42:29 - 00:54:45:02

And that's it's within that gift? Yes.

00:54:45:24 - 00:55:06:18

Okay. Um, this may be an unfair question, but. Or it may have even come from you. Uh, but have you seen the notification of the change request? Yes, I have. And the proposed changes to access along the B5 104. Yeah. Um, have you any preliminary comments on those changes?

00:55:06:20 - 00:55:31:02

Not at this stage. But if I can just highlight one point though, which is important, whilst it's highlighted under access, it's also highlighted under links being, um, the use of the Guild wheel. There are alternatives that can be used and not using the Guild wheel, which is a very important cycle route for the press and filed Fylde area.

00:55:33:13 - 00:55:36:08

Okay. Thank you for that with the applicant. I'd like to comment.

00:55:41:07 - 00:56:16:15

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I note that the guild wheel is one of the topics in the agenda. Um, just to provide a sort of high level update, we can get into the specifics. Uh, through my colleagues, and we are aware of Lancashire's concerns with the use of the guild wheel. Um, it is a matter that we have said we will be taking internally and we are trying to resolve what we do with that from a project perspective. I think we have some details in terms of context at this time. The project position is maintaining the use of the guild wheel, um, but are seeking to agree measures with Lancashire as how that could be used appropriately.

00:56:17:27 - 00:56:20:19

Okay. Thank you for that. Any comments from Lancashire?

00:56:22:15 - 00:56:32:23

I've made the county's position very clear on the guild wheel. Um, I'm always available to listen to what they have to say, but will my concerns be overcome? Highly unlikely, but I will listen.

00:56:34:22 - 00:56:55:23

Okay. Thank you for that. Uh. Moving on. This is directed at the applicants. Uh, Lancashire County Council has requested that you produce a table that indicates the level of use of each access, rather than to having to work this information out from vehicle movements on adjacent links. Um, have you produced such a table? Do you intend to producing such a table?

00:57:01:25 - 00:57:15:16

Yes. We've, uh, submitted a table. Sorry. Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicant. Um, we've produced a table and shared it with, uh, Lancashire County Council.

00:57:16:16 - 00:57:19:10

Is that going to be submitted into the examination at deadline for.

00:57:24:03 - 00:57:25:16

Yes, that would be possible.

00:57:26:16 - 00:57:28:12

Okay. If you can take that as an action, then,

00:57:29:27 - 00:57:48:09

uh, again, this is directed at the the applicants. If the proposed development is granted consent, how would the number of movements at each access be restricted to the maximum number used in the transport appraisal, and is a requirement needed in the draft DCO to secure this?

00:57:54:27 - 00:58:22:01

Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicant, um, we have an agenda item for the outline comp, which I'm not sure how far, sir is going to go into controls. Um, but maybe if I, I can, uh, give an overview of some of the controls that are in the construction traffic management plan.

00:58:24:15 - 00:58:31:23

For these specifically Typically on restricted numbers the access. So they actually correspond to the transport appraisal.

00:58:31:27 - 00:59:14:16

Indeed, sir. Uh, so the construction traffic management submitted at D2, which is rep to 016 um, can contained a considerable suite of clarifications. Um and in terms of uh managing HGV, there were new measures or additional measures in the to control the timings of HGVs in terms of managing numbers, there was a commitment to a delivery booking system to monitor HGV origin and destination.

00:59:15:23 - 00:59:43:09

Um, so if I could just that in there. So those are sort of general control measures. Um, what what are you gonna actually put into the contract the construction contract that ensures that each access the, you know, the actual movements, that each access doesn't exceed above a small margin for error. What you've actually put into your transport appraisal.

00:59:45:20 - 01:00:07:08

So at the moment the OC tmp has a section that refers to non-compliance of the DCO and exceedance of HGV numbers on a given link is noted as a non compliance. Um

01:00:08:27 - 01:00:32:27

and that in turn will control the numbers go into each access whilst giving an element of flexibility. The danger is if you have an absolute control per access. That really limits the the flexibility of construction. Uh, methods.

01:00:32:29 - 01:01:01:11

Yeah. I understand the need for flexibility of some flexibility. Uh, but what I'm concerned about is, um, when you actually go to contract, the construction contract, the contractor, um, for efficiencies of whatever reason, actually exceeds the numbers of movements that accesses, that then produces different impacts to what's been appraised in the years.

01:01:02:14 - 01:01:35:04

Fillory, Williamson on behalf of the applicants. This is typically measured through the. This is typically controlled through the discharge of requirements and the post consent stage, typically once uh, I mean, when a contractor is appointed, they are charged with ensuring compliance with the outline construction traffic management plan and then the discharge of requirements is in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management plan. As we come forward with stages of construction, obviously each stage will have an accompanying construction traffic management plan, which will in all likelihood present indicative numbers.

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

Those numbers that we intend to use to construct that stage. Those would be, uh, presented to and agreed with the Highway authority. And it obviously is within the charge of the highway authority to ensure that it is within the, um, the numbers that were assessed with the impact assessment and therefore that it would not exceed the potential impacts identified, and therefore that there are appropriate mitigation measures in place that are secured via that CMP.

01:02:03:20 - 01:02:26:27

Okay. So just just unclear. The outline, uh, construction traffic management plan doesn't include figures at this stage, but as it's developed, um, figures will be inserted and that plan will then be approved by the local authority, who will in fact check that movements and accesses are not exceeded. Is that correct?

01:02:29:06 - 01:02:30:17

Um, Sam Taylor, for the applicant.

01:02:30:19 - 01:03:05:12

If I can just sort of add some clarity to to the points that have been made. Um, at paragraph one, three, four, one of the outline construction traffic management plan. Um, we've actually inserted some text that says to ensure compliance with the assessed maximum designs are if HGV trips presented in table 7.21 of the Traffic and Transport chapter, a booking system will be established for deliveries. So the CMP or outline CMP is written already has that link back to the um maximum design scenario within the traffic and transport chapter.

01:03:05:14 - 01:03:37:24

So the contract will effectively be required to comply with the numbers that are presented within the Traffic and Transport chapter, and that is now written into the outline construction traffic management plan. And also what Mr. Ross was talking about in terms of how that's managed through the booking system. So the contractor would be required to look in numbers of HDTVs to ensure they comply with that. And then that is obviously there's then sections within the outline construction traffic management plan in terms of how that's monitored and how that's, um, equally, that's how that's enforced.

01:03:38:18 - 01:03:44:08

And in exceedance of those numbers is defined at the moment as a breach was a non-compliance, I should say.

01:03:45:03 - 01:03:51:18

Okay. Thank you for that. Lancashire would like to comment on the way those numbers are controlled and the proposals.

01:03:52:27 - 01:04:25:07

There's always solutions in managing numbers. I mean, what they've proposed is not, uh, unreasonable. The way I would like to see it moving forward is actually have averages. These are the typical and have absolute maximums. So they can't exceed those that provides what you've suggested. The flexibility, but from my perspective has an absolute number which can't be exceeded for a typical day. Just for the avoidance of any doubt. Whilst I have been presenting, it was very helpful the information regarding the numbers at access points.

01:04:25:09 - 01:04:42:18

But what has not been included are the numbers at the crossing points. That might be a little more difficult to be provided, but I would want to see what those numbers are on the crossing points, i.e. where vehicles going from one field to another. Another field crossing the highway.

01:04:44:03 - 01:04:47:08

Okay. Thank you for that. Would the applicants like to respond to those points?

01:04:52:27 - 01:05:16:00

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, um, in relation to defining an absolute maximum that is defined in the environmental impact assessment by the maximum design envelope approach. Um, and so that being, uh, that being referred to in the construction, the outline construction traffic management plan does effectively set an absolute maximum. Bearing in mind that is based on a realistic worst case.

01:05:17:10 - 01:05:22:22

And the question about numbers at crossing points. Is that something that could be produced?

01:05:25:12 - 01:05:31:24

Some tale for the applicant. That's something we can, um. We can furnish El-Sisi with and then include within the default submission.

01:05:32:12 - 01:06:05:25

Okay. That's great. So an action to provide that at default. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to move on now to routes. And there still appears to be a difference of opinion between Lancashire County Council and the applicants on the suitability of some of the proposed routes through narrow lanes for HGVs, and whether the mitigation proposed in the latest Outline Construction traffic management plan, which is Rep 2-0 16, are sufficient, particularly with regard to maintaining the safety of vulnerable road users such as cyclists and equestrians.

01:06:06:28 - 01:06:14:16

Um, so my question to, uh, Lancashire County Council is, um, can you please outline your remaining concerns on these routes?

01:06:16:12 - 01:06:46:24

The Lancashire County Council has highlighted my concerns on the use of the links hasn't changed. I do have issues with safety of whether it's motorised users or, um, sustainable users, cyclists, equestrians, etc. as a consequence of there being lack of natural footway or natural highway space to allow um users to pass each other. Um, I think we can now agree on the width for HGV. I see that as a positive.

01:06:47:02 - 01:07:19:01

I now have some information on carriageway width, which sort of exacerbates my concern on the number of links where I believe that there are issues. Whilst we've got the construction management plan, which provides, uh, generic um, solutions to problems. However, I could probably discount all those generic measures on every location because I don't have the detail. Therefore, from my perspective as it is at the moment, I see safety being compromised.

01:07:19:03 - 01:07:27:17

Based on that currently submitted, the door is always open. I think we have agreed this morning we are going to have a workshop to discuss these matters a bit further.

01:07:30:00 - 01:07:38:22

So you do you think on on some of the routes, um, they'd only be feasible with location specific traffic management plans?

01:07:40:24 - 01:08:13:03

Thanks. County Council. I think on some of the links there are solutions. There is the highway width, not necessarily the carriageway width. So there have to be local widening. But the importance of any widening has got to be located in a position that is usable. So people can actually make a decision before using a passing point. We've also got to bear in mind all the roads are not straight, and whilst we have regard to um, the swept path or straight swept path, a vehicle in a straight line that just changed significantly going around the bend.

01:08:13:13 - 01:08:15:19

So these are the sorts of issues that we need to discuss.

01:08:16:21 - 01:08:22:20

So this may be premature, but what would you like to see in the construction traffic management plan?

01:08:23:26 - 01:08:41:20

A clear understanding I've got I've got 13 links with issues for each of those links. I would like to see a deliverable solution or options of solutions, rather than a generic list, which I can discount as being not fit for purpose.

01:08:42:13 - 01:08:52:13

I think that's that's what I was really referring to by location specific traffic management plans. Really, I think you're sort of echoing. Uh.

01:08:54:04 - 01:09:37:27

So with regard to that, if you want some sort of examples, what I'm looking at, whilst you may get the widths, um, where we provide passing points, that would be fine. It's going to be a fixed length that can satisfy the needs of those that need to use it. I think also is part of the traffic management plan. They've sort of highlighted escorting vehicles that could work in isolation. However, you've got to have a safe point where you can collect the HGVs to escort them to wherever they need to go to. So they can't just use that as a generic solution without having some sort of layby or park and ride or another piece of land that they can then use with regard to signals, etc.,

01:09:37:29 - 01:10:08:06

we've got to make sure it's not just about the location of the signals, it's about the forward visibility and the advance notification of those signals, notwithstanding maintenance issues that I would have because they would be there on a temporary basis. But it's about the principle of can they work in a

location which is rural, where nobody's really expecting any signals? And don't forget, some of these roads are national speed limits, and that is where some of the roads are 2030, but they also go up to 50 plus miles an hour. And we've got to have regard.

01:10:08:20 - 01:10:15:03

Decisions being made. There is reaction time and availability for people to make a decision.

01:10:16:16 - 01:10:20:03

Okay. Thank you for that. With the applicant I'd like to respond to those points.

01:10:24:16 - 01:10:44:28

Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicants. Um, yeah. I guess first and foremost is to to acknowledge that we're, um, keen to work with Mr. Stevens on this, and we have moved forward quite a long way on access. Um, we're getting there with, um, with routes. Um.

01:10:47:14 - 01:10:49:02

It's good to hear

01:10:50:19 - 01:11:32:27

Lancashire talking about highway width and not carriageway width, because it's really important that we don't get into simple metrics here. Um, of course, we accept the width of a HGV vehicle as submitted by Lancashire in the their response to examiner's questions, but it's notable that that graphic was so sourced from DFT guidance that also illustrates that 5.5m can accommodate two way HGV flows.

01:11:34:12 - 01:12:11:03

In other words, over sailing into highway space, wing mirrors is complicit in that document, and which is why it's really important that we don't end up with an arbitrary number that indicate in terms of width, that indicates whether a route is suitable or not. That same guidance goes on to know that it's. And Mr. Stephens has picked up on some of these points. It's down to the volume of traffic, Pedestrian activity, traffic composition, parking configuration, and design speed.

01:12:12:05 - 01:12:12:23

Um.

01:12:15:10 - 01:12:50:08

We set out quite an extensive response to how, uh, to contextualize the functional road hierarchy and our response to examination. Question one. So I won't won't go into that. But in summary, it's it's not unusual for large linear projects to require temporary HGV access via narrow roads. And their established industry tried and tested measures to address the effects of HGVs in this circumstances.

01:12:50:10 - 01:12:53:26

And those are the matters under discussion. Um.

01:12:56:20 - 01:13:46:07

And roads can be observed right across the UK and um and in Lancashire that have that attracting varying levels of HGV traffic, some of those quite high up on the uh, uh road hierarchy B roads for example. Um so by definition constraints do not necessarily lead to functionality or road safety concerns. On this premise, we've already mentioned that the the applicants have shared clarification on the, uh, total number of HGVs that will be accessing, uh, the access points a lot along the these narrow routes.

01:13:47:05 - 01:14:27:06

And um, we've provided further context on originally it was 15 links that Lancashire identified as a concern in their local impact report. We're now it sounds like we're down to 13 because a couple have dropped out as being being suitable. Um, and furthermore, the applicants have commissioned a non-motorized user survey, a sample survey to try and get an indication of the level of non-motorized user use on some of these, uh, narrower, narrow routes.

01:14:27:08 - 01:14:39:16

And really just to check that the assumptions and proxies we used in the, in the environmental statement are are true.

01:14:40:17 - 01:15:21:24

Uh, sorry to interrupt, but what this is indicating to me is that, um, just a generic suite of measures within the outline construction management plan probably isn't going to fit the bill, and that for certain routes, Um, it's going to have to be routes. Route specific bespoke traffic management plan. Uh, which at this stage, obviously, um, we're not in detailed design, but it's how you, you move to something like that and, uh, demonstrate that's feasible to, to Lancashire.

01:15:35:27 - 01:16:20:15

Um, so I had a brief discussion with Mr. Stevens, uh, this morning. What what we're looking to do is to produce a note that pulls together all these these factors and background traffic, uh, demand to each access Temporal nature is. It's important to know that some of the, um, we're working on. Uh, maximum design scenario, which for traffic and transport is, is based on the maximum demand of both Morgan and Morgan happening at the same, same time.

01:16:21:19 - 01:16:30:06

But notwithstanding, that's only for a temporary period of time for each section being constructed. It's between one 1 to 3 months. We've also.

01:16:30:08 - 01:17:05:16

Got interrupted. But what I'm strongly getting is that, you know, that sounds like a generic approach still. And and what I'm understanding from Lancashire basically is, uh, it needs to be more bespoke to the individual routes, you know, because each route is going to be unique in its equestrian and cyclists use in its, uh, topography and alignment. And so each, each. Each of those 13 routes, I assume, is going to set up unique problems that need to be overcome by, by measures that need to be agreed.

01:17:05:24 - 01:17:08:26

So how are you going to move this forward with Lancashire?

01:17:09:18 - 01:17:27:19

Apologies, sir. I'll try and be a bit more succinct. The note we're producing will be link specific and it will pull in the factors relating to non-motorized users. The information we've it's still wet on the page. We've just just received it whips. We're doing more

01:17:29:10 - 01:17:50:02

uh, work to quantify uh, the extent of the width restraints, constraints I should say. And we'll pull that all together. And I know that his link specific and we'll look to share that with Mr. Stevens. Uh.

01:17:50:16 - 01:17:53:27

Okay. What sort of timescale are you looking at for that, that note.

01:17:54:27 - 01:18:28:14

Sorry. Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. I think the point that isn't being drawn out for Mr. Ross is saying here is that essentially what we're being asked to do is, is detailed design, and that in order to do detailed design, we need to undertake a number of surveys and create an understanding between ourselves and Lancashire about how this can be undertaken. So this kind of work isn't typically done pre consent. This is typically done part of the post consent discharge of requirements. We are working with Lancashire to produce that level of information. What I what I refer to as detailed design to provide that assurance.

01:18:28:21 - 01:18:34:15

So there are a few steps we need to go to in order to get there. But that is essentially the work stream that we're trying to progress.

01:18:35:08 - 01:19:02:03

Yeah, I understand totally your point about detailed design, but I think it's a bit of a balance here. I mean, at this stage, you need to be able to demonstrate that with with certain mitigation measures, a route is going to be feasible. So there is an element of Having to do that work at this stage to ensure that when you get to detail design, you can actually design something that meets Lancashire's requirements.

01:19:03:18 - 01:19:36:15

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, that is the point that Mr. Stephens has been making to us, and that is why we have commissioned these surveys to undertake that point. As as Mr. Ross said, it will be on a link by link basis to demonstrate that. So it's a hearing action point, but obviously there is sorry, it will be a hearing action point. But I, I think we probably need to take it away and see when it's possible to deliver that there is there is a need, as we said, to to feed back some of the survey information, ensure that Lancashire are comfortable with the results of that survey information.

01:19:36:17 - 01:19:57:27

Then, as mentioned, we need to have a workshop on some of these matters. So it is a it is a work stream. I don't think it can be done quickly, particularly if we're going to essentially satisfy Lancashire at this point in the examination. So deadline five is more reasonable to do that, but we can certainly outline the steps to get us to that point. Probably by deadline four.

01:19:59:15 - 01:20:04:13

Okay. Thank you for that language. Did you want to come back briefly on on that particular point?

01:20:04:20 - 01:20:42:08

Yeah. I don't think there's too much to say. Obviously I support the methodology. We've had those discussions on that methodology, I suppose. For the avoidance of doubt. I don't want construction designs. That's that's true detailed design. But what I want are the principal details that there is a solution that is deliverable. Goes back to your point being, I don't want to be at the end point and realize something can't be delivered that's going to have an impact upon safety in some ways, trying to support the process. I think what would also be useful when we look at those individual corridors and links, it also include swept paths, swept path analysis.

01:20:42:10 - 01:21:07:17

Heavy is going in both directions at the same time. That will highlight the very particular areas where we've got those constraints and the significance of the constraint that will then be between us. And it is a joint piece of work I would like to want to participate is the level of change that is necessary. Then the question is can that change be delivered? Obviously that's my that's my biggest concern. Thank you.

01:21:07:19 - 01:21:08:23

Okay. Thank you for that.

01:21:14:15 - 01:22:00:02

So I feel very Williamson on behalf of the applicant I do just need to I don't want to get into an argument on what constitutes detailed design. The point I'm trying to make is that this is typically more than would be expected at this stage of a development, in terms of the point raised by Mr. Stephens and swept path analysis. In order to do that to the level of what we're talking about, that requires topographic survey in each of these locations, because we're talking about millimeters. Essentially, this is where we start to roll into what would typically constitute detailed design if we're commissioning topographic surveys along links of roads I think we can have a conversation about what constitutes assurance to Lancashire and obviously trying to meet those expectations, but this is the point of the engagement from from this point onwards.

01:22:00:17 - 01:22:11:17

Okay. Thank you. Hello. I don't think sweatpants analysis is too uncommon at this stage in such a project to demonstrate the feasibility of a route or access. In my experience.

01:22:15:24 - 01:22:42:11

Moving on now to abnormal invisible loads. And this is a question to the applicants. The proposed abnormal invisible load routes set out in the abnormal invisible load studies. That's rep 2059 and Rep 20660 indicate that there is potential need for works to the highway to facilitate movements, such as removal of street furniture outside the order limits.

01:22:43:26 - 01:22:47:17

Will the applicant explain and to what powers these works will be carried out.

01:22:53:22 - 01:23:28:28

The, um, the Andrew Ross on behalf of the applicants. Uh, the interventions you refer to, sir, are all within the public highway. So it would be via some, uh, agreement under the highways section 27A or similar, um, mechanisms. If there's a two, seven, eight light or, um, or some more agile mechanism, shall I say that a local authority, uh, has to, to be able to be used?

01:23:29:23 - 01:23:35:27

Okay. Thank you. That's that's what I thought. Can I just ask Lancashire thoughts on that?

01:23:37:19 - 01:23:55:13

Section 278 of the Highways Act is very powerful and we can we are in Lancashire using that even for highway maintenance for significant projects. I would expect a bespoke section 278 to be drafted for this project, and to incorporate everything that is required for this project.

01:23:58:14 - 01:23:59:22

Okay, thank you for that.

01:24:04:18 - 01:24:10:20

I'm going to move on now to item ten C. And that's the outline construction traffic management plan.

01:24:12:09 - 01:24:43:21

So this is directed towards the applicant's um paragraph 1.1.5.7 of the latest outline construction traffic Management plan. Rep 2016 sets out the key responsibilities of the Construction Traffic Management coordinator, but it's not apparent from the list what their remit would be in initiating any remedial measures to address any emerging issues with the traffic management plan. So can you please explain their role in that regard.

01:24:55:29 - 01:25:01:04

So can you please clarify that that that question, please?

01:25:01:06 - 01:25:19:27

Yes. Basically, I'm saying that the outlying construction traffic management plan sets out the key responsibilities of of this construction traffic management coordinator role. But if you read down it, it's not apparent that within their remit, they'd have any powers to actually do anything about an emerging issue.

01:25:23:22 - 01:25:25:13

So there's a lot a lot of monitoring

01:25:27:04 - 01:25:39:22

of, um, issues. But no, they don't seem to have any executive power to actually do anything about it. Whereas that seems to be a key role that needs needs to be able to get things done.

01:25:40:28 - 01:26:13:00

Sam Taylor, on behalf of the applicants, refer you to section 1.31.6, which is enforcement and corrective measures. Um, and that sort of details, um, areas of non-compliance, which I believe is

what you're asking about. And then it specifically lists the CMP coordinator and their sort of roles and responsibilities in that. So if they are made aware of issues, how they would, how they would address that. And um, so that sort of that is set out within later within the document.

01:26:13:09 - 01:26:20:15

The initial paragraphs are just sort of outlining high level roles and responsibilities of the construction traffic management planning coordinator.

01:26:21:27 - 01:26:30:13

So yeah, I've actually read that. Um, but to me it didn't, um, sort of shout out that they had any power to actually address any issues.

01:26:33:02 - 01:26:37:21

It seemed seemed a lot of the role was all about monitoring and reporting back.

01:26:43:07 - 01:27:02:12

Paragraph 113 .6.3 says if found material, the CMP Co's would take appropriate action within the jurisdiction of the contract and report back to the relevant highway authority. For me, they they have that role is defined. But this is this is an outline document.

01:27:03:25 - 01:27:11:26

So yeah, I think the point I'm making is they seem to have a monitoring and reporting role, but no, no power to actually do anything about it.

01:27:13:19 - 01:27:16:03

I don't think it's that explicit actually.

01:27:16:08 - 01:27:51:29

Hilary Williamson on behalf of the of the applicants, the first bullet point is that it's the CMP Co's key responsibility to manage the implementation of the detailed CMP, and therefore, they are part of the drafting and discharge of the CMP, essentially ensuring that they are monitoring the delivery of the contractor in line with the measures that have been discharged under the CMP. They are. Then, as Mr. Taylor went on to say, they have the powers. For as part of that management of the implementation of the CMP to monitor and provide

01:27:53:17 - 01:28:13:16

the correct word and enforcement measures, if for corrective measures, sorry in relation to any breaches or non-compliance. So I think the simple fact that they are managing the implementation of the CMP makes it explicit that they have the powers to enforce what is happening under the CMP.

01:28:14:09 - 01:28:42:01

Okay. Thanks for that clarification. In addition, paragraph 1.3.4.3 suggests that in the case of concurrent construction of of the of the two projects, construction traffic management coordinators should liaise one a single coordinator for both projects. In that scenario be much more efficient and effective And demonstrate this partnership ethos for the two projects.

01:28:43:21 - 01:29:18:23

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. And I think it's important to remember that the projects may not start at the same time, and therefore the timing of that overlap may not be apparent and might mean that it's not appropriate in terms of how that management occurs. Um, there obviously we've talked about construction scenarios, but I think as each project comes forward, they are required to discharge their own requirements for that project. And therefore each project needs to produce a CMP for their stages of work whenever they come forward. And that means that that coordination role needs to be in place when that is discharged.

01:29:19:08 - 01:29:34:23

Any overlap those two coordinators would need to speak. And that's why we've written into the construction traffic management plan. That requirement for that working arrangement to be in place to make sure that they're managed as a whole, in coordination with Lancashire's as highway authority.

01:29:35:14 - 01:29:39:18

Okay. Thank you for that. We'd like if you'd like to comment on that role.

01:29:41:28 - 01:30:16:08

We'll see if Lancashire County Council coordination is going to be critical for this project, whether it's by the developers or whether it's by the highway authority. Um, I think what's critical, again, is having a network that is usable by all these HGVs and don't forget, a high proportion of the network are rural roads, not the roads, the rural road. And I do have concerns about them being serviceable for the for the whole duration of this project, with huge numbers of HGVs using it.

01:30:16:10 - 01:30:40:13

Whilst it may not be the most appropriate time, but it's because we're talking about construction management plan and the the site operation, um, to deliver this project. What I have asked for, whether it's going to be supported, is a different matter that there is a developer funded Aid coordinator role at the county end. What's critical about that? If there's a pothole or there's many potholes

01:30:42:03 - 01:31:30:05

on the network, they need to be filled in. If there are structures and there's damage to those structures, someone's got to be able to react rather rapidly to do something about it. What I don't want to do, and I suppose the worst case I could do as a highway authority, if I'm got such concerns about the highway being serviceable, I might need to close the road off. And that is not uncommon on the Fylde coast because the Almos Road. So with that, I think as part of that coordination is having that direct link with the highway authority and having that extra resource in place that the counties end, so that I can work with the developers delivering that project so that I can react much faster than I would normally be able to, because if I can't react, I close the road.

01:31:30:11 - 01:31:46:24

So in some ways, while talking about coordination. Coordination at the developers end is critical, but it's also critical that it might end as well. And the county can't afford to provide a resource to support development. That's why the developers got to fund that resource that are required for the duration of the project. Thank you.

01:31:47:06 - 01:31:50:11

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevens. Would you like to comment on that?

01:31:51:19 - 01:32:24:16

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, we're well aware of Lancashire's importance in this, in this matter. And it has been raised that statements of common ground meetings regularly. The applicants have communicated to Lancashire that we will we are committed to providing post consent planning performance agreement with them in order to provide that funding mechanism that they are seeking. Um, we see that as wholly appropriate method. I think within the construction traffic management plan, we have outlined how that coordination will work with them. Um, but yes, we have communicated it regularly that we would seek that to be in place.

01:32:24:23 - 01:32:49:15

And we recognise that, um, with all of the local authorities, there are obviously resource constraints and there will be resource constraints in the discharge of requirements process. And then it is incumbent upon the applicants, if we wish to move forward, that we provide that appropriate resourcing through a PPA agreement. And so that I think the risk belongs to the applicant in terms of pulling that together to ensure we can implement the CMP as it is secured by the requirement.

01:32:50:26 - 01:32:54:00

Okay. Thank you. Uh. Moving on.

01:32:56:01 - 01:32:58:02

Oh, sorry, Mr. Walker.

01:32:58:20 - 01:33:31:28

Thank you sir. Angus Walker for the parish councils. I just had a point on the outline construction traffic management plan, since that's current item. Um, requirement 16 of the DCO, um, of both schedules requires any land used for temporary construction purposes to be reinstated within a year of completion. Whereas the equivalent paragraph of the outline construction traffic management plan, which is paragraph 1.1.2.4,

01:33:33:15 - 01:34:05:25

just requires reinstatement with no time limit. We would like there to be an equivalent time limit of a year or less even. Um, we're particularly concerned if the projects are separated, but in time that after the first one's been, they'll say, oh, there's no point in reinstating it because we're just about to build the second one, then it'll drag on for ages, and then after the second one, they'll have a big argument between the two applicants as to who caused the damage and who's going to pay for it, and that will make it drag out even longer.

01:34:06:05 - 01:34:11:04

So we would like a similar commitment to requirement 16 to be added. Thank you.

01:34:12:05 - 01:34:15:01

Okay. Thank you for that. Would you like to respond to that?

01:34:17:10 - 01:34:42:08

Laura, for the on behalf of the applicants. Um, the requirement 16 will apply in any event. So any that the reference to restoration under the Outline Construction traffic management plan is also subject to needing to comply with requirements 16. So we feel that that commitment is already delivered on the face of the DCO in terms of the timings for restoration.

01:34:44:08 - 01:35:31:19

So I just feel Roy Williamson on behalf of the applicants. Whilst we recognise that the um, development consent order essentially, you know, is the is the control, um, the reason why the construction traffic management plan has been drafted in that manner is because we would like to have a common sense approach to, if there is a staggering of the coming forward of the projects, for example, and I don't want to be held to certain timescales. But if one project was finishing and then a month later, the next was to come in, it's it doesn't seem like a common sense approach to rip out an access potentially, and then come back and reinstate it a few weeks later, which is why we would like to have that conversation with what is appropriate with the highway authority, notwithstanding the fact that we don't want to be in breach of development consent order.

01:35:31:26 - 01:35:38:08

So the reason it is written in that way in the CMP is to cover that possibility or scenario.

01:35:40:08 - 01:35:41:17

Okay. Thank you for that.

01:35:43:03 - 01:36:07:12

For what it's worth, sir Angus Walker for the parish councils. Those two conflicting contributions from the applicants. And I don't think requirement 16 does necessarily apply because it's really talking about land temporarily possessed for the works, which I don't think the highways would count as, um, they're just being trundled down separately. So.

01:36:09:05 - 01:36:29:20

But I like the sentiment of that comment, but I'm not sure it's actually correct. But then it was undone by the following comment, which is precisely the situation where, oh, it's just about the second one's just about to start, and so there's no point on it. And then it drags on for ages is exactly what we're trying to avoid. So I would still like that commitment. Thank you.

01:36:30:15 - 01:36:32:08

Okay. Would you like to come back on that?

01:36:34:05 - 01:36:39:14

Thank you. Liz. On behalf of the applicants, I think we note those comments and will take them away and have a look at them. Thank you.

01:36:41:02 - 01:36:45:16

Okay. Thank you. Uh, when you come back by deadline for.

01:36:47:23 - 01:36:48:08

Uh.

01:36:48:28 - 01:36:58:26

Liz, down on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. We'll we'll pick them up in our, um, hearing notes, I suspect.

01:36:59:08 - 01:37:11:06

Okay. Thank you. Just noting the time. I think probably now is a good time to take a break. Um, and if we come back at 10 to 4.

01:37:12:22 - 01:37:13:11

Thank you.