



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Part 8
Date:	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: 01:48:18

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:22 - 00:00:08:15

Could you all please take your seats now?

00:00:16:03 - 00:00:19:06

Okay. We're going to restart the hearing now.

00:00:24:00 - 00:00:50:10

Okay. So we're still on item ten C and its outline construction traffic management plan. Uh, so the next question is on section 1.3.3 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management plan, which sets out the proposed controls with regard to the timing of HGV movements to site. So paragraph 1.3,

00:00:51:27 - 00:01:23:05

1.3.3.4 suggests that the specific locations where HGVs would wait pending the arrival on site. A permitted times would be agreed with the highway authorities immediately prior to the start of construction. Lancashire County Council in its response to question 16 .1. 11. Rep 3084. Suggested agreement in principle to these locations is required now at this stage of the project.

00:01:23:22 - 00:01:55:14

In addition, in accordance with paragraph five point 14.14 of NPS n one, the Tsar needs to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State on whether additional requirements should be attached to any consent, to make sufficient provision for HGV parking and associated high quality facilities, either on the site or at dedicated facilities elsewhere to support driver welfare. Avoid overspill parking on public roads.

00:01:55:18 - 00:02:12:07

Prolonged Prolonged queuing on approach roads and uncontrolled on street. HGV parking in normal operating conditions. Would the applicants therefore like to comment on whether they believe they satisfy the requirements of the National Policy Statement in this regard?

00:02:29:21 - 00:02:48:21

Thank you, Sir Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicants. Um, we will be providing more details on the location of, uh, truck stops, um, for, uh, probably appended to the construction traffic management plan for deadline for.

00:02:52:28 - 00:02:54:01

Okay. Thank you.

00:02:56:18 - 00:02:59:03

Would Lancashire like to comment on that?

00:03:02:12 - 00:03:14:20

Lancashire County Council more than happy to consider locations that they propose. But from my perspective, they've got to be fit for purpose and being a suitable location not to impede upon, um, highway safety or highway operation.

00:03:15:10 - 00:03:19:25

Okay. Thank you for that. Sure. You sure you're going to take that on board?

00:03:20:20 - 00:03:33:21

Just just very quickly on that point, we are identifying established, um, truck stop facilities. So there will be adequate welfare parking facilities there.

00:03:34:06 - 00:03:55:03

Okay. Thank you for that. Um, moving on then. Paragraph 1.3.3.5 suggests that HGVs will be able to arrive on site at any time of the day or night for certain specific works. Can you please briefly explain exactly what works other than emergency works. This includes

00:03:57:01 - 00:04:08:16

and what this would mean in practice at each access. Um, with regards and can you quantify the time each access would be subject to 24 hour HGV movements.

00:04:17:02 - 00:04:24:20

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. Sorry, I think were you asking for an example of what sort of works would require that?

00:04:26:08 - 00:04:30:25

Yeah. So other than emergency works, what what those works would include.

00:04:31:02 - 00:04:33:13

Yeah. Um, so, um, requirements,

00:04:35:03 - 00:05:06:14

I think it's requirement 14, um, of the draft DCO, um, gives us some examples in terms of what, what activities could constitute 24 hour working, which include trench installation techniques or concrete paws. So heavy goods vehicle um movements over that 24 hour period could include those. And there is a process outlined within the requirement 14 in relation to those 24 hour working activities and the notification periods required for that discharge of that requirement.

00:05:09:10 - 00:05:21:15

Is it possible for you to quantify the time? Each access would be subject to 24 hour HGV movements, and trying to get some idea of the quantum and the impact?

00:05:25:21 - 00:05:56:02

Sometime on behalf of that. So I'll just sort of add to what Mr. Williamson said. Just to to note also, we picked up El-Sisi and sort of raised that as a point, and I think we, um, noted, um, that we'll just

update the outline construction traffic management plan to refer to that requirement. The kind of point I would make, though, is that those types of deliveries would typically happen during the day, and the majority of the supply chain equally would be provided at those deliveries in the days of practice.

00:05:56:04 - 00:06:16:26

Practically, the deliveries outside of the normal working hours would be would be limited. And it's more about sort of maintaining that level of progress throughout the night. That's not to say there wouldn't be deliberate. Those won't. Don't get into the impression that it's sort of it's similar to the daytime. It's not. It's limited just to allow those activities to continue.

00:06:19:26 - 00:06:32:12

So I think what I'm trying to get at is, um, there won't be an access where there'll be sustained 24 access over a number of days, for instance. It'll be much more short lived than that.

00:06:40:00 - 00:07:15:11

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, um, in terms of activity specific detail, that is down to the contractor's detailed design of how that activity will be carried out, in terms of how it's assessed that there are vehicle movements attributed to particular activities. For example, those 24 activities within the appendix to the Traffic and Transport chapter and which does attribute construction vehicle movements across the the construction programme and therefore the peaks are assessed on that basis.

00:07:15:14 - 00:07:53:15

I do want to reiterate what my colleague, Mr. Taylor said, that in practice it is not over. It is not over that 24 hour window as a constant or even an average. It is more weighted towards the daytime deliveries. And it is it is just about maintaining progress overnight either, for example via um water tanker deliveries, um, overnight or potentially for concrete pour. But it's about maintenance of that time and again these types of activities would be agreed with, with Lancashire County as the acting highway authority as part of the discharge of the construction traffic management plan for that stage of the works.

00:07:55:07 - 00:07:58:24

Okay. Thank you for that. Lancashire would like to comment on that.

00:07:58:27 - 00:08:31:14

Yeah. Neil. Steve Lancashire County Council, um don't disagree. However, there are concerns. Whilst I accept and support the idea of those works being approved in advance. However, what I would also expect to see is supporting evidence that would indicate those works cannot be undertaken during a typical day. Otherwise, it's a bit of a free for all when it wants to deliver their pause to deliver all the pause overnight. Therefore, they can then use it for the next day and their saving on programme. Not having regard to the environment where they actually delivering these pulls.

00:08:31:18 - 00:08:44:12

So it's got to be supported by evidence that due to the poor, maybe over a 15 hour period, that would then make sense. But I would say approval is going to be supported by evidence.

00:08:45:06 - 00:08:47:25

Okay. Thank you. Do you want to just come back on that?

00:08:49:11 - 00:09:30:03

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, I referenced requirement 14 two A, which explicitly states where continuous periods of construction are required for work, such as concrete pouring and finishing, electrical circuit pulling and jointing and testing, trench installation techniques and alternative trench installation technique works and dewatering pumps. Um, the applicant has been explicit about those activities, and we agree that there is an appropriate notification period and also agree that we can demonstrate at the point of discharge that those activities can't be why they could not be undertaken within the core construction working hours.

00:09:30:06 - 00:09:49:18

It is in the interests of the contractor to deliver those, um, within the core construction working hours, not not least the fact that it's safer and it is more efficient, um, in terms of cost. So um, cost and delivery of the, of the construction. Um, so I think I'm just agreeing with what Mr. Stevens is saying.

00:09:49:23 - 00:09:50:19

Okay. Thank you.

00:09:52:11 - 00:09:59:13

Um, paragraph 1.3.3.6 states that consideration will be given to the timing of

00:10:01:03 - 00:10:29:15

movements through locations with sensitive receptors. And the applicants have already committed to HGV movements through Rye Green being scheduled to being scheduled to occur outside of the school drop off and pick up times. So my question to Lancashire. Are there any other locations that you'd like included in the document at this stage, or are you content that further locations will be agreed? Uh, if the project were to be granted consent with the construction traffic coordinators.

00:10:30:03 - 00:10:54:03

You'll see in Lancashire County Council, there are the standards, uh, sensitive receptors, education and example or nurseries, outdoor play areas. There is a long list. I'm more than happy to find that long list, um, of what I consider to be a sensitive receptor. Um, that could also be done, um,

00:10:55:22 - 00:11:15:00

post any decision, uh, because obviously nursing homes, nursing homes, for example, or nurseries, they can change over time anyway. So I think it's important to a moment in time. There is a review of those receptors to make sure all the receptors are being picked up, rather than those receptors which are around in 2025.

00:11:16:13 - 00:11:20:19

So so basically you're content with the wording of the plan. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

00:11:23:15 - 00:11:38:10

Moving on to paragraph 1.3.4.6 uh, which states where practical local suppliers will be used to minimise the distance travelled by HGVs. How will you actually ensure that happens?

00:11:40:00 - 00:11:42:05

What's the mechanism for ensuring that happens?

00:11:47:11 - 00:12:32:23

Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicant. Um, in essence, it's market driven. Um, logistics is uh, is a market that runs to very fine margins. There's a sweet spot whereby the cost of transporting goods starts to increase above and beyond that of the actual goods. Um, there, uh, the, the the application considers the worst case scenario of HGVs originating from the motorway network, but there may be local supply chains who can, uh, competitively offer their services to the main contractor.

00:12:34:22 - 00:12:42:06

Okay, so you won't be building anything into any construction contract that mandates the use of local suppliers, for instance?

00:12:57:21 - 00:13:27:24

Yeah, it's difficult to to, uh, mandate it. There are a number of aggregate facilities, uh, in from a regional, uh, perspective that most likely will be sourced in and aggregate is the bulk of, uh, the material. I think it's a wider project, um, a matter of promoting, uh, local, local suppliers.

00:13:27:29 - 00:13:32:28

And that's really beyond the traffic and transport topics of. Subject.

00:13:37:02 - 00:13:38:05

Okay. Thank you.

00:13:44:08 - 00:14:18:04

So I think we'll move on to item ten D sustainability. Um, so paragraph 5.14 point seven of the NPS n one states that where appropriate, the applicant should prepare a travel plan, including demand management and monitoring measures to mitigate transport impacts. The NPS requires details and proposed measures to improve access by active, public and shared transport to reduce the need for parking associated with the proposal.

00:14:18:29 - 00:14:27:11

Contribute to the decarbonization of the transport network. Improve user travel options by offering genuine modal choice.

00:14:29:11 - 00:14:47:23

Uh, can you explain how the list of generic measures set out in section 1.7.1 of the latest Outline Construction Traffic management plan, which is rep 2-016 for the construction workforce, constitutes such a plan and meets the requirements of the National Policy Statement.

00:14:53:08 - 00:14:57:12

Andrew Ross on behalf of the applicants. Um.

00:14:59:22 - 00:15:38:03

So the as you pointed out, the the MP serves the purpose of a travel plan. It incorporates elephant elements of a travel plan for employee travel, as well as measures to manage HGV traffic. Um, a single document. This is typical practice for managing construction traffic and is under helps review by both uh Stakeholders, but also understanding from main contractors and the TMP.

00:15:38:05 - 00:16:02:08

And those measures you refer to, sir, are underpinned by the ES assessment, which embeds a car share ratio of 1.33 employees per vehicle to foster demand management of light light vehicles. Um and this.

00:16:02:10 - 00:16:20:02

Sorry to to put in, but I think my point is that, um what you provided is very generic. And what I'm asking is, is, uh, are you confident that actually meets the requirements of the National policy statement?

00:16:21:28 - 00:16:56:02

So this is done on behalf of the applicant, I think, um, it's important. So, it's a it's a should rather than a must. Um, I think I'd flag here. So it's a it's clearly something that is, is uh is indicated as being required rather than a must provide clearly. Um, we have provided a travel plan. Um, and that has um, has provided those details around those measures. We recognise at this stage it is an outline travel outline construction traffic management plan.

00:16:56:04 - 00:17:21:16

Sorry the travel plan is included within that. So we recognise that this stage, it is an outline. Um, and clearly those measures are um are and have the ability of being developed further through that plan in consultation with Lancashire Highways. So it's there as an outline and we consider that, that that provision within the National Policy Statement is met by the provision of that outline.

00:17:22:13 - 00:17:29:18

Okay. Thank you. I wonder if Lancashire has got a view about the suitability of what's been provided to date.

00:17:29:21 - 00:18:04:08

Travel plans on my favourite topics, but I'll keep it short. However, before I start with travel plans historically have always been just a planning hoop to jump through and everybody, as you write said, everybody throws in a generic travel plan with generic targets and then nobody really looks at them. I think what's important with this project, which is quite specific, quite an individual project. I agree with you. The those elements within the travel plan can't be generic because you've got many, many sites within the whole project.

00:18:04:16 - 00:18:32:00

So whilst I support the idea of the car sharing, but that's only one item, one element, and in some ways it's got to be more than just that. It's it can't just be. So what? Okay. They haven't achieved the target in NPF terms. They've got to be seen to be trying their best. And at the moment, whilst that can be kicked down the road, I would rather see a little more detail now of how they're going to achieve it and that they are doing their best in NPF terms.

00:18:32:25 - 00:18:33:10

Okay.

00:18:33:12 - 00:18:43:02

Thank you. And again, sorry to interrupt again as part of that as this, um, might end up being quite a long workshop. I'm happy to discuss travel plan thoughts with them.

00:18:43:04 - 00:18:46:00

Okay. Thank you. Would you like to just briefly come back on that?

00:18:46:06 - 00:19:17:21

Uh, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants. Um, just to note, it's the national policy statements. Clearly, the NPF is relevant here, but we need to be talking about the national policy statements and the policy, and they're very happy to continue that conversation with with Lancashire in terms of, of, uh, how and on what basis that might be developed further. I think it is the we are providing an outline plan here. Um, this is an outline travel plan that is to be developed by the contractor in consultation with the with the Highways Authority post consent.

00:19:17:23 - 00:19:43:22

So the point of the outline is to contain those measures that will, in the later stage, insofar as they are relevant, ensure compliance with those parts. So it isn't this. We have to recognise where we are in the stage of the process, in terms of the amount of detail that there is and the measures that can effectively be then signed off at a later stage by the Highways Authority. But we will take that forward with Lancashire.

00:19:44:02 - 00:20:13:22

Okay. Thank you. As part of the proposed development, the applicants are proposing additional highway infrastructure in the form of accesses. And, um, you know, obviously construction accesses, but permanent operational accesses, um, and in accordance with paragraph five point 14.9 of the NPS in one. Um, are the applicants proposing any new walking or cycling infrastructure or enhancements to existing routes?

00:20:16:10 - 00:20:24:12

And how have you looked at Opportunities to fund such improvements or enhancements. With local authorities.

00:20:31:04 - 00:21:12:28

Is done on behalf of the applicants. I think it's important to have in mind what the new. Well. Sorry. Let's step back in terms of, um, permanent, uh, permanent new accesses, the only permanent new accesses, and somebody is going to correct me if I'm wrong or to the substations. So they are a specific operational access that takes you to the substation. And they must be managed from a safety and a security perspective, uh, in order to keep up effectively, to keep those, keep those areas, um, safe where we have operations and maintenance accesses in general.

00:21:13:00 - 00:21:54:19

Those are being and I think possibly all of them. Again, somebody will correct me if I'm wrong. Our existing accesses that are being used so they're not new accesses. Um, and um, it's not a situation where again, all those accesses will do is take you to the cable corridor. They're not going to take you elsewhere. They're not going to provide an opportunity for, um, for effectively creating new pathways to other places. These are and the applicants, um, uh, the applicant's um, uh, intention has been to kind of minimize the footprint, minimize the impacts on those accesses as far as possible.

00:21:54:21 - 00:22:29:05

So it isn't something that we consider to be appropriate in those circumstances. Um, the only new operational access I've just been reminded, um, is the access from Leach Lane. But again, that's into the airport, which again is a safeguarded area. So I think, um, there is pretty much no opportunity within this project to be. To be doing those things in terms of we're not we're not creating additional transport infrastructure. What we're creating is new private accesses to be able to access those elements of the works.

00:22:29:07 - 00:22:30:13

Okay. I take the point.

00:22:30:20 - 00:22:52:27

Sorry. Laura Martin, on behalf of both applicants. Um, in the outline ecological management plan, we have a number of, um, enhancement measures where we'll be looking to collaborate with third parties. And one of those is around green corridors. And that would look at, um, enhancing public rights of way. Um, and from an ecological and amenity part of it with South Ribble.

00:22:53:03 - 00:22:54:06

Okay. Thank you.

00:22:55:21 - 00:23:18:17

Okay. Um, moving on then. This is my last question in relation to paragraph five point 14.1 of NPS in one. How is the applicants? How have the applicants made appropriate provision for an infrastructure needed to support the use of alternative fuels include charging for vehicles. In relation to the project.

00:23:19:24 - 00:23:48:13

So it is done on behalf of the applicants. Before I before we go on to answer that. I just note that paragraph five point 14.12 starts, if feasible and operationally reasonable. Um, so again, all of these need to be considered in the context of are they appropriate for the project under consideration given its location, given access to various places. So I let others answer in terms of where we've got to, but it's very important that we see it within that, within that caveat.

00:24:06:08 - 00:24:56:13

Um, Sam Taylor, on behalf of the applicants, um, obviously just building on those points, but in terms of operation operationally, we've obviously just. We've talked about that and the sort of limited traffic numbers and the subset has been unmanned. So it wouldn't would be unnecessarily unreasonable to to include include those measures. And in terms of construction, um, the focus of the focus is on, um, measures to reduce the number of vehicles. Um, and I think in terms of bringing power to site for sort of electric vehicles, which is probably the sort of the most, the most obvious option, um, for a

temporary compound that that would likely be unfeasible to sort of bring extra power into, to charge vehicles when, when they can be charged at, uh, origin rather than destination.

00:24:57:06 - 00:25:00:29

Um, so that I think that's how we've considered that.

00:25:01:23 - 00:25:10:16

Okay. Thank you for that. Uh, so that concludes my questions. So I just want to throw it open to the floor. Has anyone got any questions? Yes, please.

00:25:18:10 - 00:25:28:09

Hello. My name is Howard Duckworth. I'm a resident of Newton. I'm speaking on behalf of Tusk. I've got three comments for sections A, B, and C. I hope that's a.

00:25:28:17 - 00:25:29:03

That's fine.

00:25:29:05 - 00:26:01:16

Thank you. I'll take a first. The access. Um, Mr. Stevens referred to, uh, speed limits earlier, and there's no reference at all to any changes in speed limits at any of these accesses. Uh, I'd point out, uh, in particular, access A0 one, which is the A5 83 main entrance to Morgan, which we're guessing is going to be the biggest, uh, amount of traffic in there. Maybe that should be considered for a speed limit.

00:26:01:18 - 00:26:33:04

It's just after a bend. Um, so that is a difficult one. And also there's a cluster of, uh, again on the eighth. Five. Eight. Three. Down near, uh, uh, the junction with the eight, five eight, four. That, uh, might be relevant there with regard to routes. Uh, there was a big survey last year of, uh, links that were about a hundred links with, uh, traffic analysis on those links and a sensitivity analysis, uh, for putting heavy goods vehicles on those links.

00:26:33:27 - 00:26:50:06

Um, those have been we assume those have been used to inform the choice of the routes that are in appendix A of rep two zero 16. Uh, page 40. Um,

00:26:51:22 - 00:27:25:27

we feel that there's been some other choices, some other criteria than what was contained in those link analysis that have informed the choice of those routes, in particular the yellow route, which goes through the middle of Rio Grande down to the what we heard earlier, the compound at the construction site near the Rio Grande Equestrian Center. Um, so we would like some explanation of why it's going through the center of Rio Grande, which sounds pretty, uh, frightening, really, uh, compared to the alternative.

00:27:26:18 - 00:27:56:22

Uh, similarly, the green route, uh, which, uh, traverses all the way along again from the rare green junction off the A5 83, all the way down Balam Road, with all its intricacies and, uh, ups and downs,

uh, very poor road service down to the accesses, the cluster of accesses there at Peel Road and Balam Road, where there looks to be a very short link from the M55 at the end. Uh, junction four.

00:27:57:19 - 00:28:21:14

Uh, we'd like some clarification of, uh, the choice of those routes. My third point is on the management plan, particularly in reference to damage to the highway or debris on the highway. And in reading the management plan, it seems that the um.

00:28:23:26 - 00:28:54:20

The process is a negotiation between the applicant and the highways. Uh, who's in charge? Whose fault is that pothole? Uh, you might admit to 10% of it. So and so on. So we, the public are not interested in that. The public need that pothole, that debris fixed. And we've already got a very simple, uh, uh, well understood reported situation. Uh, so we support Mr.

00:28:54:22 - 00:29:46:00

Stevens when he mentioned earlier, um, that he wants some money, uh, to be able to fund a single point of contact in a single point, that the public can be assured that any reports of debris, no matter who's made the the fault. Um, so we think it's the wrong way around in the document. It should be fix it and then sort out the liabilities. Unless it's very simple that they've already, uh, the council and the highways have already been given a fund, uh, relevant to the work that they've got, the extra work that they're going to do during the construction plan and at the end of the construction plan to fix and repair the roads, as, uh, Angus was mentioning earlier.

00:29:46:23 - 00:29:47:18

Thanks for your.

00:29:47:20 - 00:29:52:28

Attention. Thank you very much for those points with the applicant. I'd like to briefly, very briefly come back on those.

00:29:54:18 - 00:30:26:14

Sometime on behalf of the applicant. I'll try and, um, pick through the points and obviously if I've missed anything. So please just remind me. But, um, in terms of the first comments on speed limits, um, the axes have been developed based upon the, uh, either the speed limit or the measured 85th percentile speed. So to ensure that, um, from a road safety perspective, they, um, they're safe. Uh, we would, um, obviously in negotiation with El-Sisi.

00:30:26:16 - 00:31:03:17

As we get through to the detailed design phase, I welcome the opportunity to discuss, uh, reductions in speed limit, if that's something that El-Sisi and the local police support. But at the moment, the designs are based upon the existing speeds such that we, um, can demonstrate that the access is a deliverable. And that's not saying that we would we turn our back on, um, temporary speed limit. It's quite the opposite. It's something we would look at, but it's a it's a matter of detail design. Um, in terms of sort of comments on, on route selection, where, where possible, we have sought to use, um, the higher the roads, higher in the road hierarchy and the A and B roads.

00:31:04:16 - 00:31:44:21

Um, but we accept there are, there are roads where they are less than suitable or less suitable. Um, and we have provided providing measures within the outline construction traffic management plan to um to, to facilitate access via those. The other point I would make is there are where there are a number of um crossings provided, um, along the Hall Road. So where where access wasn't considered possible. We've provided crossings and then access would be taken from a more suitable road, with traffic travelling along a temporary haul road that we're committed to providing and crossing over at those locations.

00:31:45:29 - 00:32:18:24

Um, in terms of comments on sort of damage to the highway. Um, and I think the first point is there is, um, we've strengthened the, the text in the outline Construction traffic management plan based on discussions with El-Sisi. One of that those points include um commitments to remedial measures. So before the project starts, if there are roads where in discussion with El-Sisi, we um, it was established that measures may be beneficial to strengthen that road prior to starting that those measures are in place.

00:32:19:08 - 00:32:50:07

There are then measures to ensure that those roads are, um, maintained through construction and upon and any any damages rectified post construction. Um, just picking up on the sort of point about proportionality, obviously there are those it's important to recognize that these roads are also already used by HGV traffic. So there doesn't need to be an element of proportionality in terms of how costs are attributed. And that's why that element is in there. So I think that's the key point you raise.

00:32:50:09 - 00:32:53:01

But if there's anything I've missed, do let me know okay.

00:32:53:09 - 00:32:59:14

Thank you for that. Any other brief comments before we move on? Yeah. Gentleman over there. I've got to.

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

Yeah.

00:33:09:08 - 00:33:12:07

Thank you. I'd be grateful if you could keep it brief, if possible.

00:33:12:09 - 00:33:12:24

Certainly.

00:33:12:26 - 00:33:48:16

Well. Um, Mike Wright, Newton residents association. Um, the applicant, uh, proposes ongoing access to the site via 10th Street, which is a narrow, unlit, unmade single track rural lane without a separate pedestrian footpath. It's currently used primarily by pedestrians, dog walkers, cyclists, and agricultural access. The lane is narrow in places two meters floods regularly.

00:33:49:08 - 00:34:22:00

It's used for recreational amenity, and it's already been judged by Elk Highways as inadequate for use in previous planning applications. No transport statement has been provided to detail traffic volumes, vehicle types or mitigation measures. Nor has there been any credible assessment of the likely safety risks, particularly to non vehicular users.

00:34:23:02 - 00:34:23:21

Thank you.

00:34:24:21 - 00:34:28:19

Okay. Thank you for that. Again very briefly. Would you like to come back on that.

00:34:29:06 - 00:35:05:10

Uh, Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants. Um, I believe in fact, I know that the access at Tem Street is purely for operational access purposes. There will be no heavy goods vehicle usage along that road. The project description, um, outlines that operational usage would only be through the use of 4x4, essentially to access the onshore cable corridor. Um, operational accesses are not subject to environmental impact assessment or the transport assessment for the simple fact that there is no construction activity along Thames Street or through that access.

00:35:06:00 - 00:35:11:21

Okay. Thank you for that. I think the lady sitting at the table there in blue. I think you had a comment.

00:35:12:25 - 00:35:43:10

Uh, yes. My name is Mary Barlow. Um, I did want to talk about the noise levels because it directly affects me. But the traffic situation will also affect us just as much. Um, after hearing the so-called plans for lower lane. All I can say is that it fills me with horror. And I know all I can say now is that I fear for my life. I we are the nearest residents to the proximity of the Morecambe substation.

00:35:43:22 - 00:36:21:07

We are going to be living directly opposite This monstrosity, and the thought of no one has ever considered all this incomprehensible upheaval to our lives will affect us. And the fear of what is to come, and the thought of living with these risks and its eroding our quality of life, and what was meant to be a time of peace and security for our retirement. I should be sat at home today enjoying my retirement, but instead I'm out of my comfort zone and I'm here having to fight for something we strongly oppose.

00:36:22:00 - 00:36:47:15

And what all I can say is that I strongly believe that this proposal shows a complete disregard for the human impacts it brings, and I feel as though these large corporations believe they can impose plans without fully considering the destruction of personal lives, well-being and futures. This is not simply a planning decision. It's a it's a direct assault on the health and happiness.

00:36:47:24 - 00:36:52:09

People stop you there. Yes. This is specifically about the traffic.

00:36:52:11 - 00:37:15:14

The traffic? Yes. And that's what I'm saying, is that I live on Lower Lane. Okay. And this is directly affecting me. I'm not only living opposite the substation, but I'm going to be coming out of my house every day. And I was fearing from, as I've said, I'll be fearing for my life with this traffic. Every day when I go out of my house, those lanes are absolute deathtrap.

00:37:15:16 - 00:37:21:00

Okay, perhaps I could ask the applicants to address traffic on Lower Lane, please.

00:37:22:12 - 00:37:53:11

Sam Taylor for the applicants. Yet, in terms of the comments, just in relation to traffic, um, it is a, um, location we identified. We're not taking construction access from Lower Lane. There'll be no heavy traffic traveling down that road. It is one of those those areas I was sort of talking about earlier to to the other gentlemen in terms of, um, a location where we proposed a crossing. So we take access from Kirkman Road, and then the construction traffic would travel along the Hall Road and cross over Lower Lane.

00:37:53:21 - 00:38:08:02

So in terms of sort of yourself, there would be no HGV traffic travelling down Lower Lane. And that's obviously, uh, obviously apologies that that is um, controlled through the construction traffic management plan. So that's a commitment that the projects have made.

00:38:08:11 - 00:38:08:26

There is.

00:38:10:21 - 00:38:13:07

An access just down the lane.

00:38:16:14 - 00:38:17:14

From my house.

00:38:17:16 - 00:38:18:27

I think that's an operational.

00:38:19:08 - 00:38:19:23

With a little.

00:38:19:25 - 00:38:21:29

Bit more information on the traffic.

00:38:22:01 - 00:38:26:15

If it's if it's very, very brief. If it's very, very brief, please.

00:38:31:00 - 00:38:51:24

No. Not right. Uh, yeah. Thanks for letting me speak. So, David Barlow, the relationships between the applicants, uh, And my wife and I have irreparably broken down. Uh, so, uh, uh, on the back of that, could I ask my behalf, could you ask the applicants,

00:38:53:13 - 00:39:05:17

uh, how they intend to mitigate the traffic outside our house? Uh, they intend to put the main entrance to the Morgan substation 50 yards down from my house.

00:39:07:03 - 00:39:07:24

Um,

00:39:09:11 - 00:39:44:28

so, uh, the I have brought this subject up before. It is a very, very dangerous road. I've lived there for 60 years, I know it. They don't. Uh, the previous owner of my house and his sister both lost their lives on the lower lane junction. And I have a photograph there that I took from my van only four weeks ago of a car upside down at that very junction, which I'm quite happy to leave with you. Yeah. So I invested £500,000 in an equestrian.

00:39:45:03 - 00:40:14:17

State of the art equestrian facilities at the back of the house. Okay, this is relevant. Sorry. So my application from Marlborough Council, 13 060 clearly states that I cannot use my land or the property for business purposes or commercial purposes due to the dangerous nature of the road. So how can it be safely used for this commercial project? And who's going to be responsible for our safety? Um.

00:40:16:18 - 00:40:19:17

Could I suggest something that I think would be possible?

00:40:19:25 - 00:40:22:03

Can I? Can I just finish off this last point?

00:40:22:05 - 00:40:23:07

Yeah. Just thinking of.

00:40:23:11 - 00:40:24:06

Why does the main.

00:40:24:11 - 00:40:25:05

Response.

00:40:25:16 - 00:40:52:21

Why does the main entrance to the substation have to be on Lower Lane? They are building a separate road of the A5, A4 to carry the HGV vehicles. Why can't that stay after the construction? Why do they have to you use the entrance 50 yards from. From my house. When I'm not even allowed to rent one stable out.

00:40:53:18 - 00:40:54:05

Okay.

00:40:54:12 - 00:40:57:16

Because I think it's a dangerous road that's in black and white.

00:40:57:25 - 00:40:59:05

Answer to that. Brexit.

00:40:59:07 - 00:41:01:27

Parish council and Fylde Borough Council.

00:41:01:29 - 00:41:21:00

So could I suggest you've got some written material. You've got some pictures. Could you submit that into the examination for deadline for. Yeah. If you ask one of the case team, they'll explain how to do that. And then he'll have a substantive response, a detailed response, which we can't do in this hearing today.

00:41:21:02 - 00:41:23:21

And that's what my wife is worried about.

00:41:23:23 - 00:41:24:22

Yeah. Okay.

00:41:24:29 - 00:41:33:23

They they they have openly admitted they're going to use vans four by fours and cars. Yeah. And they're going to open that main entrance from day one. Yeah. No.

00:41:33:25 - 00:41:48:23

So I understand stand totally, and I'm just concerned that you get a full response to your concerns. So I think that's the best way for you to actually do it. If you ask from the case team, if you're not sure how to do that, and then you'll have a full response to your concerns. Okay.

00:41:48:25 - 00:41:49:21

So if I.

00:41:49:23 - 00:41:50:08

Make.

00:41:50:10 - 00:42:14:12

A very brief point. So just to provide some sort of immediate assurance, yes, we'll provide a more detailed response. But the operational access for Morcom of Lower Lane will be in essence and frequently used. So obviously unmanned substations, there will be, say, routine inspections on a monthly basis by a man effectively in a 4x4. We are not going to be putting large volumes of traffic through that operational access.

00:42:14:27 - 00:42:24:01

Okay. Thank you for that. I think we need to move on now. Um, so I'm going to hand over to Mr. Cliffe for agenda item 11, Historic environment.

00:42:28:25 - 00:42:56:15

Thank you, Doctor Morgan. Uh, the questions I've got on this. The points I want to raise are in relation to archaeological matters. Not that there are not other matters in relation to designated and non designated or other non designated heritage assets, but those are being covered in, in writing. So my questions in relation to archaeology this afternoon. Is there a representative from Lancashire County Council.

00:42:57:11 - 00:43:03:21

Douglas Moya Lancashire County Council and also the four planning authorities, by virtue of a service level agreement they have with the county council?

00:43:03:23 - 00:43:06:04

Thank you. Can you just say your name again? A bit closer to the microphone.

00:43:06:06 - 00:43:07:01

So Douglas Moyle.

00:43:07:06 - 00:43:08:13

Right. Mr. Moya?

00:43:14:07 - 00:43:52:28

Okay. Is everybody from the applicant team in situ? Good. The first point in relation to the onshore archaeological evaluation, including the amount of trial trenching that has taken place so far at deadline. Three Lancashire Council Lancashire County Council expressed some concerns in this regard in terms of the proportion of trial trenching and the implications of that. Has there been any is that still your concern? Is the first question, or has there been any movement or any discussion with the applicants that has moved that along in any in any way?

00:43:53:04 - 00:44:27:08

It is still a concern. I had a conversation with Mr. Rawlings, the the consultant for the applicant, on Monday. Um, he told me that, um, we basing this on 139.7 being excavated, that in the future, the future works are envisaged to be 400 to 450 trenches, which means we've currently seen about 30 to 35% of the total number expected to be excavated actually currently opened up. That's not considered a percentage sufficient to characterize the whole of the archaeological resource across the whole of the development.

00:44:28:02 - 00:44:59:06

Um, Mr. Rawlins also confirmed that despite the fact they left site ten months ago, none of the programme of scientific dating of the features that were encountered in 139 trenches has been undertaken now, without that dating information. We have no idea whether we're dealing with just something more recent of very little importance, or whether we are dealing with something much older of some great significance. And until that dating is done, those features remain well unknown.

00:44:59:11 - 00:45:16:28

This remains unknown, and so we're currently left in a position where the actual report is merely a description of what's been done. It doesn't take us any further forwards to determining where further works might be required, what they might be. That sort of thing.

00:45:19:02 - 00:45:32:29

And in terms of the level of evaluation that you would expect to be carried out, what what what what would that entail? And is there any sort of policy or guidance that backs backs that up in terms of what you're seeking?

00:45:33:28 - 00:46:10:27

Well, on a long linear project like this, it's hard to come up with a standard sort of number. Invariably, archaeological sites are evaluated to a 4% stroke, 5% of the total area of the development. I don't think we'll be doing that here. Otherwise we'd be here forever just doing evaluation. But, um, the 450 trenches that Mr., uh, Rawlings has suggested was considered to be a sufficient number. And indeed, the first phase of the works was initially intended to be 222 trenches, not 139.

00:46:11:03 - 00:46:26:06

That would have been nearly 50%. And I remember stating to him on site at one point that 50% might be something that I could live with as a percentage, which would be whereby I would be able to have to characterize the general, uh, amount of archaeology across the site as a whole.

00:46:34:24 - 00:46:59:05

Okay. Thank you. So effectively, your position is that the extent of archaeological evaluation so far, including the trial trenching, isn't sufficient in order to come to conclusions on on the environmental statement. Is that what your position or. Well, in terms of the conclusions of the environmental statement, are you saying more should be done in order to get to those conclusions at this stage, a pre consenting stage.

00:46:59:07 - 00:47:32:16

Where no, I could I could have told you before they started they were likely to find things. But the thing we need to know about the the features they found is their date. And that needs to be done through the scientific dating. We are not likely to be able to date features by virtue of fines. In fact, I think they found in the trenches that they excavated only one, uh, context that had some prehistoric stuff in it in the way of footage, which is from flint knapping. So the only way to date features of this date is through carbon 14 dating the material that's inside those features.

00:47:32:28 - 00:47:44:03

Um, and I think Mr. Rollins told me that none of the bulk samples that have been taken for this purpose have been processed yet, so we're not going to get a date for any of the features within the period of the examination.

00:47:47:04 - 00:47:54:00

Okay. Thank you. Is it who wants to respond? Is it Mr. Moyer?

00:47:55:25 - 00:47:56:13

Sorry.

00:47:58:14 - 00:48:22:14

Yeah, thanks. Uh, Mick Rollings for the applicant. Yes. We appreciate those comments about the quantum of trial trenching. Um, when we undertook the trial trenching last year, we did as much as we could in terms of ground conditions and land that we could access through negotiation with landowners, which is where we reached that total of 139 that Mr. Moyer was just referring to.

00:48:22:22 - 00:48:24:06

Is that the 35%?

00:48:26:16 - 00:48:57:09

It's hard to say, because we haven't fully drawn out the full number of trial trenches will need. We've drawn up some draft plans, but we haven't yet shared them with Mr. Moyer to agree them. So the full number is probably going to be in the region of Mr. Moyer's suggestion of about 450. But we've got yet to agree that. So we know we've got a draft of what we're proposing to do, but we need to get that agreed with Mr. Moyer. And he may suggest some more in some areas.

00:48:58:06 - 00:49:11:08

So the full the full quantum isn't yet fully defined. So we've done the 139. And when we did the ES, we addressed the uncertainty through the use of a precautionary principle where we basically

00:49:12:27 - 00:49:44:21

sort of admitted or agreed that we hadn't got all of the data in order to characterize the archaeology of the area that we needed to collect more. So in the assessment, we we came up with an up to moderate adverse impact on the basis that there could be archaeology of up to national significance there. We haven't found any yet. But that's not to say there isn't any. So we undertook the assessment on a precautionary basis, and we've also had a commitment to complete the programme of trial trenching as soon as we possibly can.

00:49:45:10 - 00:50:27:21

So as soon as we've got that agreed with Mr. Moya, we will look to go out, I think probably next spring, and try and get as much of the rest of the programme done over a sort of six month period. Again, it will be linked to ground conditions and negotiated access onto land, which is not necessarily straightforward for the type of work that we need to do. The commitment to undertake the additional trenching is laid out in the Outline Onshore Intertidal Scheme an investigation which states that if any of the trial trenching has not been completed by the time a consent is issued, then that will be the first part of the program of post consent.

00:50:27:23 - 00:50:34:21

Archaeological work. So the commitment to undertake the work is there, and we will get on with it as soon as we can.

00:50:37:18 - 00:50:38:26

Thank you. So can I.

00:50:38:28 - 00:50:43:12

There's no more trial trenching or results from existing trial trenching or, um.

00:50:45:24 - 00:50:52:01

You know, assessment of existing trial trenching, the results of that until after this examination finishes. I'm assuming from what you've said.

00:50:52:24 - 00:51:27:21

There will be no more trial trenching until after the examination finishes. There will be some archaeological and geo archaeological monitoring of the program of ground investigation work. That's due to commence imminently. And that information will be used to inform the the archaeological mitigation and also the archaeological deposit modelling that we are committed to undertake. So if we can get enough data points from that programme of monitoring, then we will try to create the the geological deposit models as soon as possible.

00:51:27:27 - 00:52:11:19

But again, that programme is quite extensive, so I'm not sure we would commit to having that information in front of the examination before closure. But can I just come back on? Yeah. The final issue was about what we can do with the work that we've done already. And Mr. Moya was referring to, um, the sample process and the need for scientific dating. I've been talking with the archaeological contractor who undertook that trenching. All the environmental samples that we took during the the phase of trenching last year have been processed, and the archaeological contractor has been instructed to provide us with a list of any samples which could be suitable for scientific dating.

00:52:12:06 - 00:52:51:03

It's not it's not a guarantee that any of them will be suitable. Because what this comes down to is how much charcoal was was, um, extracted from those samples and whether any of that charcoal is suitable for radiocarbon dating. But we will get that list and we'll have a look at it. And if it looks like there's potential for scientific dating, then we can pull together a list of samples and get those sent off. And that might help elucidate some of the dating issues that Mr. Moya raised. So the response is the samples are all processed. We we just need to get a list of whether there's anything suitable for dating and match that to the actual features to see what is worth dating and where.

00:52:51:05 - 00:52:55:19

That might take us further down the line. And that's something that we may be able to do quite quickly.

00:52:57:03 - 00:52:57:29

How quickly?

00:52:58:14 - 00:53:04:03

Um, well, it depends to some extent on the availability of radiocarbon dating labs.

00:53:04:15 - 00:53:06:00

That we're talking about within the, uh.

00:53:06:02 - 00:53:07:11

We're talking about within.

00:53:07:14 - 00:53:08:21

The end of the examination.

00:53:08:23 - 00:53:10:17

I'm talking about within a couple of months.

00:53:13:24 - 00:53:29:25

And in terms of the precautionary principle, I think I understand the basis of all of that. But it's basically saying, well, we've not done this further assessment, so we'll just go to a worst case scenario. Is that the way that this is normally assessed in the U.S.? Because really you accept this assessment.

00:53:30:00 - 00:53:37:20

To some extent with these big linear schemes. It is the way it's assessed, because it can be very difficult to get access to do all of the work that's required.

00:53:37:22 - 00:53:55:02

But is that the case for given that there's only been about what is it? I think Lancashire County Council said 25% or more might be slightly more than that. But we're talking about over two thirds. Hasn't been hasn't tried. So is that all down to the lack of availability of access or waterlogged conditions?

00:53:55:04 - 00:53:59:19

Yeah. And it's not that we don't have information. We have we have geophysical survey.

00:53:59:21 - 00:54:01:02

Yes, I understand that.

00:54:01:04 - 00:54:13:18

We just don't have the trial trenching. And that comes down to availability of land because it's all been done so far through negotiated access and all our issues are really trying not to disturb the farming practices too much.

00:54:16:20 - 00:54:29:24

And is there anything in policy guidance or indeed precedent for these schemes? Not the first offshore wind farm that's had an ideological implications. The fact that the opposition.

00:54:30:00 - 00:55:05:19

The policy is to is talks about a proportionate approach to fieldwork, such as trial trenching, where that leads us in terms of discussion of proportionality, varies from from project to project and county to county. I know Mr. Moyer referred to, you know, percentage based approach and some counties would adopt that. Some counties don't take that approach. So it comes down really to what is

negotiated between the parties as being proportionate and appropriate. And then how much of that is actually achieved during the sort of pre-application stage of the project?

00:55:06:08 - 00:55:16:22

Does it relate in any way to the actual potential archaeological significance of the area in terms of what might be found if you did the trial trenching? Some areas are going to be more sensitive than others. I assume.

00:55:17:09 - 00:55:48:11

There is. There is a well, there is that to some extent, um, some areas obviously have much greater archaeological potential than others. And much of the land we're crossing here we'd probably characterize as generally low, but that wouldn't mean that we would want to rule out looking for what could be there, because a lot of places where there's generally not a lot known about archaeology is because nobody's ever really looked for it or used the right techniques to look for it. So it's it's a difficult thing to say. It's generally low.

00:55:49:03 - 00:55:52:01

Um, it probably is, but we need to make sure.

00:55:55:15 - 00:56:05:05

Mr. Moyer, do you think it's in terms of the potential archaeological significance of the area, would you agree it's potentially low or otherwise?

00:56:06:15 - 00:56:35:19

I'm not sure I'd agree it was low. I would agree more that it's unknown. And that is that is. The problem is that this area has not been subject to any significant assessment previously. There have been some areas we've looked at recently which are very similar to the area being crossed, and they have come across some quite significant areas of prehistoric and Roman activity. Now, I'm not going to say I definitely think there's going to be something there. Um, but that's the whole point is that we don't know.

00:56:37:29 - 00:57:13:22

What are the, uh, from your point of view, are there any obviously they'll be trial trenching will take place post consent, but from the county council's point of view, what are the risks of leaving it to or are there are there any risks of leaving it to post consent? What's the what's the problem of leaving it to post consent from your perspective so I can get an understanding what the implications are. Because obviously we've got to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State. On on this. And it's not unusual, you know, from experience for some archaeological evaluation to be left post consent or post permission in the section 78 world.

00:57:13:24 - 00:57:16:25

So is there any particular particularly risk in this case?

00:57:17:00 - 00:57:52:24

Well, the whole the whole point of doing predetermine determination evaluation is to de-risk the site so that you do actually know what you're going to be dealing with and where and how long it might

take for you to be on site. At the moment, we don't know any of those. And there are things been written into the DCO and the PSI which are going to be stumbling blocks. So for instance, if the sites are going to be developed in stages. Each stage has a reporting stage that's four months for reporting just to draft stage, not to final report.

00:57:52:29 - 00:58:16:28

And if that evaluation was entered to recommend further works, there would have to be a period where a new site would be agreed. And then the works have to be carried out, and they would have to be reported before that area was deemed free to be used for the development. Now we're talking about cramming an awful lot of work into a period before the developer, um, can get on site.

00:58:18:14 - 00:58:20:11

So a risk of delay to the project?

00:58:20:13 - 00:58:21:14

Yes, entirely.

00:58:23:04 - 00:58:33:29

Is that something that you would agree with in the context of, uh, the need for, uh, renewable energy projects such as this, etc.? Is that is that a reasonable comment from the county council?

00:58:34:14 - 00:59:08:23

Uh, mic rolling for the applicant. It is reasonable comment. We are well aware, obviously, within the applicant team of the programme, risk of not undertaking the full programme of trial trenching at this stage, which is why we are looking to move ahead with it as soon as we can in the spring of next year and get as much done as possible. And when we do that work, we will be prioritising, uh, areas where the scheme might need to be in the earliest possible stage post consent. So that would include the substation sites and it would include environmental mitigation land.

00:59:08:25 - 00:59:41:03

And it would include, um biodiversity benefit land. Because this the works required to make those bits of land ready for use need to come through quite early in the programme. So when we do undertake that programme, we will have a priority list of where we want to go first of all and by putting it into next spring. Our hope is that that gives us enough lead in time for discussion with landowners, so we can try and fit it. All of the work into the farming calendar with each landowner as best we can.

00:59:42:05 - 00:59:52:20

And you mentioned the substation sites. Why is the trial trenching not been able to take place so far at the substation sites? I presume there's other assessment works that have been carried out. It might be wrong, but I'm assuming that.

00:59:52:22 - 01:00:23:12

We have undertaken some trenching at the substation sites. But we've got more to do. And the principal reason from memory was to do with, um, livestock movement. Um, and obviously, I mean,

we haven't really gone into the detail, but it's not just the disruption to the land itself, it's disruption to farming activities, such as farmers having to move livestock from one area to another. Uh, whether we then need to permanent or semi-permanently fence off the trenches before livestock can go back in.

01:00:23:17 - 01:00:33:27

It's quite a big operation that needs to be carefully coordinated, and we're mindful of the fact that that there's been disruption already for landowners and there's the GI programme forthcoming.

01:00:34:20 - 01:01:07:22

I know that Historic England, we've not got Historic England here with us today, but in the deadline free response, I think they say something along the lines that there's risk, that significant archaeological remains that would have to be, would have been, would have have been identified or identified post consent. They're saying flexibility should be included with the post consent Mitigation Programme to allow for the appropriate treatment of significant archaeological remains that might may be identified. They seem to be not taking quite the view you are taking, but obviously flagging up the fact they don't think there's been enough, uh, evaluation, uh, carried out.

01:01:08:08 - 01:01:35:10

Are there any are there any implications for the cable route as proposed and or any of the proposals if archaeological assets are found that need to remain in situ. So if something is very significant found that that is that is needed. That may need to remain in situ. What is the flexibility to deal with that. So for example the cable corridor and be for example at the substation, the you know.

01:01:35:12 - 01:02:07:22

These issues are addressed in the outline written scheme of investigation for the onshore and intertidal works. And essentially, if something of national significance were to be present on a substation site, then we would have to look at the design of the substation site to to see if we could raft over the archaeological remains, it would all come down to, uh, things. Things like the floor levels, finished floor levels for the slab, for the substation works. Whether we could we could preserve beneath that. In terms of cable roots, it's like it's slightly easier.

01:02:07:24 - 01:02:48:13

We would be looking at whether or not anything of archaeological interest extended across the whole width of the cable route, and if it didn't, then we could try and work around it. And if we need to cross an area of significant archaeology on the cable route, then we would look to limit the construction activities in terms of rafting the whole road over the archaeology. And the only impact would be the trench itself for the cable, rather than the whole width of the cable route being stripped to expose the archaeology. So we've got tried and tested methods that we've used before on major linear projects, but there's no there's no absolute guarantee with something like The Substation that we would be able to preserve something in situ, it would all come down to, to design.

01:02:49:25 - 01:03:10:09

In terms of the A substation, presumably that will create some engineering difficulties, if any remains had to be preserved in situ. Well, given that what we've talked about yesterday and given the sort of obviously the substations are going to be, to a degree, engineering sort of lead, I'm not sure that's the right word, but but, you know, there's certain things that have to be in place, etc..

01:03:10:18 - 01:03:40:07

Mick Rawlings for the applicant that that is correct, sir. We would have to work closely with the engineers to see how how we could get a design that that was suitable for the protection of archaeology and allows the substation to be built. But mindful of the fact that that obviously we don't want to be increasing the height at the substation by putting in something too significant in terms of a part over the archaeology, but it could be done with some, some, um, geotextile membrane and some slab.

01:03:41:07 - 01:03:55:13

But there could be design implications which presumably need to be addressed. Obviously it's got to stay within the design parameters. But there is a, there's a there's a risk that there are implications for the for the scheme is what I'm getting at it. It appears that there might be.

01:03:55:27 - 01:04:01:16

Yeah. So certainly for the applicant that that is correct. There is a risk for the applicant team that we will need to address.

01:04:01:28 - 01:04:13:22

Okay. Apparently having problems with the live stream. But I'll press on because if anybody wants to review the recording, I presume the recordings still working. That's what I was told yesterday. But we do need to, uh, we do need to press on.

01:04:14:02 - 01:04:47:20

Um, at least on behalf of the applicants. Can I just, um, we've had a, I think an interesting discussion around this. I think we also have to consider this in the context of the risk that we're looking at here. And whilst, um, I think on every project, uh, you could do more survey. Um, and clearly we, the applicants have committed to, um, to further detail up further down the line, which is entirely in my experience, uh, something that happens where you have a level of survey that you've actually been able to do and understand.

01:04:47:22 - 01:05:28:22

So you're characterizing the area. Understanding the level of risk there is and we have. And in respect to the substation sites, um, it's certainly my understanding and I will, as always, be corrected if I'm wrong, that at the moment it's looking like a very low risk in terms of what has been found on the substation site so far. So the kinds of measures that we were talking about are very, very unlikely to be coming forward. And clearly when the substation sites are, are um, that that detailed, um, uh, archaeological investigation is done, there is, there is sufficient room for there to be, you know, and managing of those elements within it.

01:05:29:16 - 01:06:06:06

Um, within the cable corridor again, we have we've had we have been able to understand and picked out, you know, various elements in terms of the trenching that's taken place. We have an outline written scheme of investigation which sets in place the various measures that will be done and, as Mr. Rawlings has said, secures that further survey clearly before things happen. There's also room within the cable corridor for there to be micro sighting of the cables around various features if they are

found. So it's not a case that there is flexibility within the cable corridor and the trenching to be able to deal with those matters.

01:06:06:24 - 01:07:00:26

And we also have a situation where there is quite a high proportion. The engineers tell me of actually trench crossing where you're going at significant depth. And therefore anything in terms of, of sort of buried archaeology is likely very, very likely to be avoided. So I just think I appreciate that, that, you know, there's discussion. I think the applicant, as has been made very clear, are committed to doing that further detailed trial trenching at a later stage, and it will be very helpful, which is the pre-designed trial trenching, which will influence the design that is taken forward in terms of understanding where those specific features are, and which of the relevant elements of the written scheme of investigation should be built in, in terms of the mitigation that is applied to those? I think I'd heard earlier, um, the council's archaeologist saying he did think it was a low, a low.

01:07:01:05 - 01:07:09:29

Um, there was a sort of low. Um, it was a low risk area. I might or the archaeological potential is low. I might have misheard that, but I thought I heard that.

01:07:10:24 - 01:07:12:12

Saying it was low. Were you?

01:07:13:23 - 01:07:18:17

I don't remember that comment. Okay. But I stand to be corrected if that's the case.

01:07:19:20 - 01:07:46:13

I, I think it's important that we look at it in terms of the level of risk. The level of understanding there is at the moment, the steps that will be put in place to ensure that as part of the detailed design that takes into account archaeology and that those various measures, um, are, are, are in put in place to ensure that, that the approach that needs to be taken to the management of archaeology is done through that detailed design and the final construction.

01:07:47:12 - 01:08:10:01

Thank you. Sorry. Is there any, uh, in terms of other similar schemes? Might be quite helpful. Certainly be helpful for for us just to get a comparison with the if you like, the proportion of trial trenching because it's trial trenching effectively isn't it. That being talked about obviously there's the results of that as well.

01:08:10:07 - 01:08:23:00

So make rulings for the applicant. We can provide that. We ourselves have experience of of trial trenching on these types of schemes. But we can provide you with information from other DCO projects for linear schemes.

01:08:23:02 - 01:08:56:21

And it will be helpful on linear schemes. I mean, I've had experience with this issue on a solar scheme and this comes up quite a bit, I think, on the solar schemes. Yeah, it's with some slightly different considerations, but from, from the examining our priorities point of view. Obviously like many issues

some things can be left for post consent. Of course, that's quite normal and quite standard. But we've got to be sure that what is left for post consent is capable of having a positive result, because we wouldn't generally sort of want to put a requirement on or have construction management plan issues where it's just a bit.

01:08:56:25 - 01:09:07:13

We're not quite sure if that's able to be reasonably discharged or not, because I don't think that would make the tests for putting a particular requirement on. And I think that's where this sort of my concern is sort of coming from the consent.

01:09:08:01 - 01:09:25:20

Thank you. Will, we'll take that away as an action point. I just wanted to make one more point on the substation sites, and that is that we do have full geophysical survey across the substation sites, as well as the trenching we've already done. So we do have some general idea of the archaeological potential across both of the substation sites.

01:09:26:13 - 01:09:55:01

And it would be quite helpful to get from Lancashire County Council if there are any particular areas of the site that are of particular concern in terms of archaeological sensitivity. You may have actually already provided some details that I can't remember, but be quite interesting to get that in terms of other, particularly parts of the site where there's further trial trenching needed, which might be particularly sort of sensitive to help us to come to a view in terms of our overall position.

01:09:55:16 - 01:09:56:15

Is that with a view.

01:09:56:17 - 01:09:59:19

To not doing all the trenches or just doing specific ones?

01:10:00:05 - 01:10:00:20

Uh.

01:10:01:13 - 01:10:21:03

Well, in terms of not doing all in terms of further trial trenching that is being proposed, but not yet done. So the trenching that's going to be done proposed to be done post consent. Is there any areas of the of the site where it's been sort of underrepresented, perhaps in your, uh, in terms of what's been done so far, which are particularly sensitive in terms of what might be found in terms of archaeological.

01:10:21:19 - 01:10:58:17

Um, I don't think so, because there's a mixture of the high areas and the medium areas have been looked at at the moment, although some of the high areas have had nothing done with them at the moment. So they they obviously remain a concern. One thing I should add is that, um, it would help allay our concerns if we could see some sort of timetable for works when they are actually going to happen, and how they are going to fit in with the construction timetable, i.e. preferably before it starts.

Not when it wants to start, because we don't want to see the archaeologists being shuffled around with bulldozers waiting for them to get off the site.

01:11:01:16 - 01:11:09:28

Just to respond to the requirement that companies need to be on stages, they need to submit.

01:11:10:19 - 01:11:31:01

Yeah. Sorry. Mick Rawlings for the applicant the the requirement in the draft DCO that covers the archaeological work, uh, does set out the possibility of it being done in stages. So it talks about no stage being commenced in terms of construction until the programme of archaeological work has been undertaken in accordance with the agreed written schemes of investigation.

01:11:31:27 - 01:11:53:01

I mean, if there is a note to that can be done though on what is the process from now. I mean, you did describe quite a bit earlier on in response to my first question to you, just to get the process, what is being done from now, you know, all the way through to project implementation? I think that would actually be quite helpful to try and piece this, to try and piece this together. The other.

01:11:53:27 - 01:11:57:27

Sorry, sir. Yes we can we can produce that as a note post hearing note.

01:11:57:29 - 01:12:25:01

The other thing. Uh, for the county council, uh, is obviously the outline written scheme of investigation. You you're probably aware of that, but if there's anything that you will be aware of, that if there's anything in that too, that you think needs alternative drafting or needs to be enhanced and you've not already said so, then provide details of that to in writing rather than now. Unless you've got any major concerns about that you want to raise now.

01:12:25:16 - 01:12:35:21

Know that that document we've already seen and we've we've agreed it with the with the with the applicant. Um, the, um, the DCO is going to be the thing to control the other things.

01:12:36:03 - 01:12:36:18

Yeah.

01:12:36:20 - 01:12:38:10

Okay. Thank you.

01:12:39:25 - 01:12:40:17

Is there?

01:12:42:16 - 01:12:43:01

Sir, if.

01:12:43:03 - 01:12:43:18

I can just come in.

01:12:43:20 - 01:12:44:07

On a quick.

01:12:44:09 - 01:13:07:22

Point. Just ask one quick. One more quick question. Actually, Lancashire County Council, in terms of there's been quite a lot of concerns in written and some oral submissions from, uh, local residents, etc. about the effects on Quakers wood burial ground. Um, and I couldn't quite I think that you're not actually raising county council. Any particular concerns about that?

01:13:08:17 - 01:13:24:10

We think the works that have been done already there demonstrate that it's not likely to be a graveyard. The trenches, um, means of construction there means the impact is going to be low if there is any impact. And there are measures in the on on the, in the WSI which will address the excavation of human remains.

01:13:24:12 - 01:13:34:08

That's as I understood it. It's just I think you're starting to ground probably has not been updated yet. So that's in response to your question. But yes, that's that's fine. That that clarifies that. Uh,

01:13:35:29 - 01:13:36:14

yes, sir.

01:13:36:29 - 01:13:37:14

If I can.

01:13:37:16 - 01:13:38:01

Make one point.

01:13:38:09 - 01:13:44:15

For the applicants. Um, we'll come back on detail in terms of a full list of examples. But just from my own personal.

01:13:44:17 - 01:13:45:03

Experience.

01:13:45:05 - 01:13:54:14

On the East coast, um, the East Anglia One project did no trial trenching, uh, pre-application. And then I think it was circa 690.

01:13:54:16 - 01:13:55:04

Trenches.

01:13:55:06 - 01:14:33:09

During that post consent phase, followed by extensive strip map and record, again all part of project risk management. Um, as we came up to the construction program and then more recently, East Anglia one North and two, we did a sample of, um, it was around 60 trenches. Originally um, 90 had been identified, but as we've spoken about access issues, 60 were able to be achieved. So it's entirely normal for a in some cases, no trenches to be undertaken or a relatively small sample to be undertaken on large scale linear projects with the ultimate risk setting with the project in terms of how we manage that against construction timescales.

01:14:34:09 - 01:14:49:18

Yep, I am aware of that. I am aware of that. But obviously there needs to be a sort of line that needs to be taken in terms of when does it get to the line of what is enough and what isn't enough? Uh, I understand that, um, Mr. Cope, uh, just a very.

01:14:49:20 - 01:15:20:06

Quick, uh, John Cooper Borough Council at a very quick point, just because we are, um, discussing the historic environment item on the agenda. And you mentioned Quakers Woods and comments that have been received by the people. Um, I know that the discussion was primarily focusing on archaeology, but I just because of the way that the the question was asked, um, I just want to clarify that Ford Borough Council still, um, stands by the comments submitted in writing about Quakers Woods and its heritage value.

01:15:20:21 - 01:15:25:15

Otherwise, beyond its status as as a specifically as a graveyard.

01:15:26:22 - 01:15:59:05

Sorry. That's in terms of the effect on its setting and presumably on its setting as a non designated heritage asset, because that's what it is. And it's a non designate. It's not a designated heritage asset as it's non designated. So that's the that's the setting which and I've read the submissions and I understand those. And I think the applicant has responded. And I understand that that's one of the issues where we'll have to go away back on everything and go away and consider and take our sort of final position. But yeah, I understand those. Yeah, those concerns. And I'm not sure I need a response because I think you've already provided a response.

01:15:59:20 - 01:16:00:18

Have you? Have you?

01:16:01:21 - 01:16:31:09

Sir? Yeah. Mick. Mick Rawlings for the applicant. We provided that in a response to your written question. Yeah. Um, so it would be in, um, our response is Rep 3056 in our response to your question, 11 .1.4, where we undertook an assessment in that response of the likely impacts and effects on Quakers would, as a result of changes in its setting during construction and during operation of the substations. So that's now with you.

01:16:31:11 - 01:16:45:15

Thank you. Yeah, I think it's one of those positions where you've both given your positions in writing. That's the thing. We need to go away and consider. I don't think we need any further questions on that. I had a couple of hands up again. Let's give you a name, please. And then.

01:16:46:27 - 01:16:47:15

Keith Mackay.

01:16:47:17 - 01:16:48:09

From Fredericton.

01:16:48:11 - 01:17:21:05

Parish Council. Um, just a couple of points on the historic, um, information, but there is evidence of Neolithic and Mesolithic occupation in, in the Fylde. Um, he suspected it was all over the files, but we're not sure. There were definitely, uh, Bronze Age material extracted won whilst they were constructing Preston Dock. Um, so we'd expect that to be over a larger area. And there's an issue around, um, Echo.

01:17:21:07 - 01:17:26:26

Lane, which is one of the sites of the. I think it's the Morgan substation.

01:17:26:28 - 01:17:28:10

Which line did you say?

01:17:31:07 - 01:17:51:26

It's the one that leads off from Lower Lane and crosses over the down river. Um, that is an area that was, um, provides evidence of early agricultural practices, which was the Rowan furrow farming, which was common across this part of the field. Um, there are still some examples around, and I think that's one of the areas where there still is.

01:17:54:09 - 01:17:54:28

Thank you.

01:17:56:09 - 01:18:03:09

Thank you. And before I come back to the applicants again, have you got your microphone? Yeah. Give your name again, please.

01:18:03:11 - 01:18:35:15

Good afternoon, councillor Noreen Griffiths and parish council. Fylde borough council. Um, we raised the issue of bodies on the Morgan site at the back of, um Quaker ward. And, um, I've been told I couldn't find the report on the scrapes, but I was told verbally that nobody had been in the big field where we think the bodies have been.

01:18:35:22 - 01:18:45:06

I don't know if that's right or not. Um, and have you geo faced the big field, which is going to be the Morgan Field behind the Quaker ward?

01:18:46:27 - 01:19:23:07

Um, I've also received an email from, um, the Preston Quakers, which says Quaker trustees have written to Morcom and Morgan regarding protocols, if any exhumations were contemplated. We know from your message the site is being investigated by Oxford Archaeology North. We are unaware of any direct communications to us from Morgan and Morecambe or Oxford Archaeology North, so I think they would like to be informed of anything.

01:19:24:03 - 01:19:24:24

Thank you.

01:19:25:19 - 01:19:34:02

Okay. Thank you. Brief comments back. I mean, you can reply in more detail, as I'm sure you will at deadline. Uh, for anything brief you'd like to say?

01:19:34:10 - 01:19:34:25

Okay.

01:19:34:27 - 01:20:18:02

Okay. MC Rawlings for the applicant. In response to the first comments. Yes, we're aware of that general potential for Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age. That's all set out in the historic environment desk based assessment that we produced that goes through period by period. So we know about what was found in Preston Docks, that sort of that sort of stuff. And we know about the Poulton Elk, um, and the Mesolithic potential from that sort of fine. So we are aware of all of that. Um, we have not seen in either in the geophysical survey or in any of the actual site walkovers that we've done and any evidence for row and furrow agriculture that still has in evidence that's still present.

01:20:18:26 - 01:20:51:10

A geophysical survey often picks it up as a relic, but we haven't really seen that on the geophysical survey here, so I wouldn't be I wouldn't be able to say for sure that there is any of that. There's certainly not not anything that's visible in the landscape in terms of the earthworks that you would expect to see. So it's possible that it might have been there and now it's been ploughed out. But as I said, the geophysical survey can often pick up that as a relic signal, which you can't see on the ground in terms of topography. And again, we've got a full study of the leader.

01:20:51:14 - 01:21:18:27

And the leader will often show up relic, um, Rowan Furrow. And we again, we've not seen any of that. So if we if we come across any in terms of where we're looking with things like trial trenches, then we will have a look at it. But it's not one of the places where we found it to be extant on the ground. And we'd have to consider preservation or or avoidance. Basically, in terms of burials, we we haven't.

01:21:18:29 - 01:21:21:19

Gone briefly because we're beyond 5:00. So we've still got.

01:21:21:21 - 01:21:22:06

A.

01:21:22:08 - 01:21:22:23

Couple.

01:21:22:25 - 01:21:23:10

Of.

01:21:23:12 - 01:21:56:18

Terms of Quakers Wood and the burials. We have not done any survey of any sort of geophysical survey or trial trenching on any of the land that is considered within the tithe map of 1838 to be a possible Quaker burial ground. We've addressed that issue through adjusting the scheme to avoid those areas, and where we have to cross one of those possible burial grounds west of Quakers Wood. That crossing is done using trench technology, so we will go underneath those fields in that area.

01:21:56:20 - 01:22:20:24

So at the moment we are we have not done any survey there. We are not intending to do any further survey there. And we in the trenches that we've done on the route so far, and the locations of all trenches are in the interim trial trenching report that's been submitted. We have not found any human remains in any trench, so we've not had to apply for a license to exhume human remains because we've just simply not found any.

01:22:21:15 - 01:22:52:24

Okay. Thank you. If there's anything you want to discuss separately, then there might be an opportunity sort of afterwards and then any further submissions on that at deadline for. Thank you. Thank you for everyone's submissions. As I said before, I'm aware there's also issues regarding designated heritage assets, which some of those we visited at our site visit and those are being taken into account also. So just because there's no questions on those doesn't mean to say we're dismissing those. So thank you everybody for those submissions. We move now to item five.

01:22:52:26 - 01:23:15:29

What I'm going to do is because I can't bear leaving Mr. Innis any longer. Uh, from Orsted and more than in transmission, we'll go to item five B which is interrelationships. Interrelationships with Orsted East Irish Sea transmission infrastructure. And is Mr. Innis actually still online?

01:23:17:23 - 01:23:31:00

Good afternoon sir. Colonists from Shetland. Wedderburn appearing on behalf of an offshore wind farm limited and Orsted East Irish Sea transmission limited. And hereafter I'll just call myself Orsted Transmission.

01:23:31:18 - 01:24:11:15

Okay. Thank you. And thank you for your patience, for waiting until the end of the agenda for this item to be to be considered. Obviously we have read the submissions on this, so we don't need, uh, to go through those again. But what I'd just like to establish today is, is there any update on any progress being made between yourself and the applicants on the concerns that you have, uh, made, obviously primarily in terms of the, uh, where the projects connect or might connect in your case, to, to pen with them Within Penwortham substation and the resulting implications of that.

01:24:11:18 - 01:24:15:05

Is there any sort of movement beyond the sort of the latest position that you provided.

01:24:16:03 - 01:24:48:17

Um, colonists on behalf of busted transmission? If I could break it down into probably two broad topic areas. The first is the issue about access to Penwortham substation. Um, as it currently stands, there has been no movement, um, from at the position that we've presented to the examination. We've heard from injured, uh, National Grid electric transmission who've indicated where it is likely that the two projects were connected to.

01:24:49:10 - 01:25:52:29

Um, but there has been no response. Substantive response to the applicant, uh, to that information, um, and no indication as to whether, uh, given that information, there will be a narrowing of the requirements of, uh, works, are extant at substation, and response to that, there still seems to be at an absolute position on, um, um, keeping every option open. Um, the issue that this gives rise to is that this will be a constraint on other parties trying to get in, and the response from the applicant to date is that somehow we should rely on their discussions with the net and, um, protect provisions agreed between NDA and the applicant, uh, which we now know also appears to incorporate a side agreement or potentially a side agreement as well, but that will be in relation to DNSSec works only, and that is only one component part of the ability to access the substation.

01:25:53:07 - 01:26:28:12

And in effect, as it currently stands, the the the extent of the uh works numbers associated with 400 kV connections essentially wrap around almost the entirety of the access to the substation as it currently stands. So the position on this is there has been, first of all, no change in the applicant's position as far as we're aware. Um, and as I say in terms of the key issue is if the order limits, we say that there's information available and obviously that should be tested with the applicant by bye bye by the examination.

01:26:28:18 - 01:27:01:00

But if it's left like this, um, the actual date when, uh, a project design is finalized, it's pretty late in the day. It comes after if ID comes after appointment of contractors. Um, the final design is usually undertaken with the contractor, uh, helping and assisting. And that is really going to be far too late in the day to give certainty to other parties who are going to potentially connect into this substation. And the consequence for that is that will be very difficult to get the most efficient, uh, entry in.

01:27:01:05 - 01:27:32:18

And it will also be hard to design the most appropriate and effective mitigation. So it does have consequences. And in the absence of the applicants moving, then it's our submission that the that in the recommendation some mechanism has to be provided for providing refinement. And of course in that context, if it's left to a formal process, either through a requirement, then it only met a fairly advanced stage that that is undertaken.

01:27:32:23 - 01:28:03:28

The alternative would be that the applicant, um, chooses to enter into an agreement with the, uh, Austin transmission, where they try and agree a framework for cooperation around this matter, which

can often allow information to be exchanged in advance of a formal submission or of a discharge. Um, so at the current position, uh, so the position is uncertain. There isn't a substantive response. Um, and that doesn't appear to be a framework for going forward.

01:28:04:11 - 01:28:38:12

Um, the second wider issue is that having set out, um, and I think in our submissions at deadline three, we provided the, uh, scoping reports. Um, and the likely broad indications of what's being considered in terms of routes, um, into bandwidth, given that it is likely there's going to be overlaps potentially offshore and onshore. And we say that the sensible solution is to to come to an arrangement for information sharing. Um, and again, that would in part in the first instance could be delivered by uh, an agreement.

01:28:38:23 - 01:29:04:14

Alternative in the absence. This is very specific and is unlikely to be a matter which would be suitable for a requirement and would be a protective provision. So we said there is going to likely to be overlap, and that this should be covered off a range of solutions for providing that we're happy to to seek to try and work with the, the applicant, um, on these matters. But at the moment, uh, there isn't a lot of progress.

01:29:07:06 - 01:29:10:09

Okay. Thank you. That's a helpful update. Thank you.

01:29:11:16 - 01:29:44:28

Thank you. Sir. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, um, uh, we note the submissions, um, in respect of the East Irish Sea project. Um, the applicant's challenge at this point is there is no project for the East Irish Sea yet. There is a, um, there is a, uh, an indication of a project coming forward. Um, and we understand there is a 2037 connection for this project on into Penwortham on the Tech Register. It is also one of a number of projects connecting into Penwortham.

01:29:45:00 - 01:30:16:00

So there's Merseyrail, Network Rail, a number of other projects who are all very comfortable, um, uh, with the approach of managing those interactions through, uh, through National Grid and and their works. So the applicants are obviously cognizant of the position. Um, at this stage, our view is it is entirely inappropriate for us to be making provision for a project which is not identified. It's cable corridor yet it hasn't connected.

01:30:16:08 - 01:30:47:14

Uh, it hasn't indicated or been given any indication, as we understand it, from National Grid as to where it might be connecting into Penwortham, how it might be getting into Penwortham. And so for us to be guessing where this might be and seeking to make some kind of provision for it is, uh, is not only unreasonable but actually impossible at this stage. So there is a there is a process that is followed. And, um, Mr. Onus will be very aware about how projects kind of sequentially connect into National Grid.

01:30:47:18 - 01:31:28:28

And there are situations where there are overlapping rights. Uh, there are situations where there need to be protective provisions to deal with those projects, but it is done on a sequential basis effectively as to how those projects come forward. Um, National Grid ultimately will be the organization that determines where those projects connect into where the bays will be. Uh, and the connection point, um, that that they indicated isn't a matter for applicants effectively to choose. So there will be a point assuming this project, the the East Irish project comes forward, um, and assuming the Morgan and the Morgan projects are consented, where that interaction will happen.

01:31:29:00 - 01:32:16:20

But it isn't now. Um, and there is a process and there are recognized processes by which that should be done. The applicant's position is that this it is entirely inappropriate for us to be agreeing protective provisions with the Irish Sea Project. When there is no project, we don't know what those interactions are going to be, and frankly, we'd be making them up, which would be not a helpful thing for anyone to do. Um, I would just like to flag something. I think Mr. Ennis suggested that the scoping report for the East Irish Sea project had gone in. I might have misheard him, but we certainly haven't been able to find there isn't, as far as we understand it, in EIA scoping report that has yet been submitted for this project, our understanding was it was coming in September or October time, but certainly as far as we're aware, there is no published information.

01:32:17:03 - 01:32:53:12

Uh, again, scoping would be at a very early stage in terms of what this project may entail and what it's considering around its its connection and how it would be, uh, connecting into Penwortham. So at this stage, we note the comments, we note, um, we, we do note and understand those concerns, but we don't think it's something that we should or need to be addressing at this point. And it will be addressed through future, uh, engagement through National Grid. And then as the projects come forward on a sequential basis, uh, the appropriate provisions being put in place when those interactions are properly understood.

01:32:53:26 - 01:32:54:15

Thank you.

01:32:56:26 - 01:33:15:02

Thank you. And if further information becomes available either between now or the end of the examination, or between the end of the examination, and the Secretary of State's decision, which could be three months or longer. Would that that would that change.

01:33:15:24 - 01:33:57:03

What you've just said in any way? The applicants? Um, it it very much depends on the level of information that is available. Um, we as far as I understand it, the this project is connecting into Penwortham. They have a connection agreement for 2037. So so there is a degree of certainty if we call it that. Um, in respect of that, how the project gets from. Um, it's a grey area to there is another question. I think um, I understand what was submitted was a was a scoping report boundary potentially, but not the scoping report which actually shows two potential corridors, um, coming down to Penwortham.

01:33:57:21 - 01:34:28:03

Um, uh, so I think it probably going on to the next point. Around what point might the joint transmission project be able to consider the East Irish transmission project from? A from a sort of cumulative or an interactions perspective? It's only when there's sufficient information available about that project to be able to really properly understand the likely impacts and the interactions, and we certainly haven't seen that information at this stage.

01:34:28:21 - 01:35:10:10

A cumulative impact assessment has to be proportionate, and it isn't, for it wouldn't be for the transmission assets to guess what the assessment or um, the uh, or those interactions might be. We recognise that the Planning Inspectorate guidance on cumulative assessment does talk about tier one and two projects, and tier two projects can be projects that are in scoping. But it's very well understood. I think that there has to be enough information in that scoping report about the nature of the project, about the nature of the impact and the nature of the potential interactions for a proper cumulative to assessment to be undertaken.

01:35:10:18 - 01:35:46:07

And it's the applicant's position that, given the timing of this application and given the potential timing or the position of where the East Irish Sea transmission project is, we think it's very unlikely that there will be sufficient information in the public domain, certainly during the course of this examination for a proper cumulative assessment to be undertaken. Um, if if that changes, it's clearly an ongoing it's an ongoing consideration. And as new material, as we've done with the other cumulative matters comes forward, if there is sufficient information, it will be considered the.

01:35:46:12 - 01:36:23:21

The comfort that can come is that this is a project which is coming forward, and therefore for the East Irish Sea project, it can do a cumulative assessment of the transmission assets and therefore that material will be before the decision maker. So it's something we will keep an eye on. But I think at this stage it's the transmission assets position that we think it's very, very unlikely that there will be anything meaningful that we could do a cumulative assessment on of this project, particularly given it looks like they will be taking two routes to scoping, which frankly, is almost impossible to do a cumulative assessment of.

01:36:23:23 - 01:36:24:12

Thank you.

01:36:24:23 - 01:36:29:23

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Ennis. Would you like to come back on that?

01:36:31:17 - 01:37:03:02

Thank you. So on behalf of the transmission deal, first of all, with the point about assessment, I think in our, um, at, um, 3103, we said that at the moment the level of information is limited and as a consequence of this isn't really about having a level of detail that will enable cumulative effect of cumulative assessment to be undertaken. What we're here really discussing is about a coordinated approach to the delivery of national infrastructure.

01:37:03:18 - 01:37:43:15

Um, and, and the premise appears to be that, um, the problem all sets out with the project that comes afterwards. And our line is it's not quite as simple as that, where when it's dealing with in particular the access to a substation, if the first party takes, um, extensive, uh, works plans and relevant rights and doesn't refine those, it does become harder for the subsequent projects to then work out how it's going to fit in and connect and and the timescales as we've set out in rep.

01:37:43:29 - 01:38:18:03

Um uh one three 103. That the application, uh, for the, um, the submission assets would be, uh, potentially 2027. Uh, that there is going to be that potential overlap between the further design, effectively, of this transmission project before you and, uh, the, um, application, a consideration of the transmission and routing and mitigation of the second project so that overlap is likely to occur based on the timelines.

01:38:18:07 - 01:39:06:05

Uh, they're anticipating and deal also with the the current connection date is not necessarily the connection date that will prevail. There is a long history of, uh, connection dates coming forward, uh, through once applications are submitted and further engagement with the various, uh, grid national grid entities. So in terms of that process, if you leave the DCI as it currently stands, this applicant can sit with very broad powers, very broad application areas without any duty to refine them, even though, um, for example, National Grid may have given them very detailed information about where their grid connection is going to be within that timescale.

01:39:06:21 - 01:39:38:17

So that's the bit that we say that there's already information from National Grid saying, uh, where the connections that's been made. Why is such flexibility having to be retained if it is to be retained? There should be a mechanism for providing refinement at that remains. So as I say, that's a key issue because of the constraints and tightness at the existing substation. There are, as you've heard, lots of constraints.

01:39:38:19 - 01:40:10:16

It's not the most straightforward. And that's why it does help to ensure that the information that's available at the earliest possible date. And I say that can either occur through a formal process or can be agreed. But the problem for a subsequent applicant is this is we sit discussing these matters today. But in terms of the process, once the development consents been granted, it then gets handed over to a different team to implement, and they're clearly focused on their interests.

01:40:10:19 - 01:40:48:19

And unless there is some mechanism for cooperation or requirement for cooperation that can get that behind. So that's why we say in relation to these matters, there needs to be a process. There needs to be coordination. And I have that in the last iteration of the DCO that the applicant have even chosen to put in an onshore collaboration requirement 25 between the applicants. So the importance of collaboration and the sharing of information is recognised and even acknowledged between the two applicants.

01:40:49:06 - 01:41:04:03

And in my submission, one one reads. National policy collaboration is key and is certainly part of N5, and certainly we will make representations to that effect in our follow up to this hearing.

01:41:04:11 - 01:41:40:04

Thank you. That's helpful. What I would ask for is to make it clear what you consider to be the risks to your project. If there's anything that you've mentioned possible requirements, but if there's anything that you think should go into the DCO to provide suggestions for that, notwithstanding what the applicant said, but also it does seem as though this needs continual discussion between yourselves and the and the applicants, and it would be helpful to for you to if there's any particular sort of policy for that you want to refer us to.

01:41:40:19 - 01:42:14:06

That backs up the need for what you've been talking about. That would be helpful as well, to put it in a policy perspective, because I was, you know, obviously we the two bits were obviously both nationally significant infrastructure and it would seem sort of illogical that one was not to allow the others to go. They want to go ahead. I don't think we're in that sort of situation at all, actually. Uh, but in terms of sort of what risks you perceive, if you can make that sort of clear at deadline for, uh, and any sort of alternative drafting for the DCO, that would be helpful as well for us to consider should we, should we need to

01:42:15:23 - 01:42:18:25

and if the discussions can continue.

01:42:19:06 - 01:42:29:07

Thank you. There is absolutely no risk through this that that another connection to Penwortham cannot come forward based on the rights that the applicant is seeking.

01:42:29:10 - 01:42:30:25

Okay, well, if Mr. Ennis.

01:42:30:27 - 01:43:04:10

Provides, I appreciate the points that Mr.. Mr. Innes is making. These interactions are managed, I would say day in, day out by National Grid in terms of the projects that are connecting in. The applicants need to retain flexibility because just in the same way as Mr.. Mr.. Ennis has said that their connection date of 2030 7th May be brought forward. National grid have indicated where they think the projects might connect into, but again that could change. So the flexibility that's being sought by the applicants in terms of where they can connect into, we've explained previously, isn't entirely justified.

01:43:04:17 - 01:43:19:19

We've taken these points away, but I think it would just have to be proportionate in the in the consideration that we're giving to these and the reliance on process that comes forward afterwards, which will ensure that those parties interests are properly protected.

01:43:19:21 - 01:43:31:14

Okay. We understand the respective positions. I think that's as far as we can take it today. So thank you, Mr. Innes, for your contributions and for waiting so long to make your contributions. Thank you.

01:43:33:24 - 01:43:38:16

Mr.. Sorry. Mr.. If you're still there. Mr.. Walker wants to make a comment very quickly, Mr.. Walker.

01:43:38:18 - 01:43:40:15

Yes. Very quickly. Um.

01:43:41:24 - 01:44:13:29

It's just to point out and we can submit this with our written response, that the, uh, two options that are being considered by this project, the East Irish Sea project, the landfall, for one, is down near Crosby well to the south. And the other one is at Russell Beach to the north of Blackpool, which is our alternative route. Um, it goes past Stanley, but it is going to that goes then on to connect with Penwortham. So the feasibility of that landfall is certainly got this far.

01:44:14:11 - 01:44:16:29

Um, so I would just like that to be noted.

01:44:17:01 - 01:44:22:02

I appreciate you not discussing this, but this is a single project. The, uh, East.

01:44:22:06 - 01:44:23:26

Can you provide that at deadline for now?

01:44:23:28 - 01:44:24:27

Because I say it now.

01:44:24:29 - 01:44:25:14

Very, very.

01:44:25:16 - 01:44:41:02

Briefly. The project is a single project. It's not two project and it's promoting DC rather than AC because of the connection. And therefore the cable corridor can be significantly narrower, as can the landfall than these projects. I'm not going to say any more. Okay.

01:44:41:10 - 01:44:58:06

Thank you. I think we're at the point now where, if any more is said for anybody, it's probably now going to just, uh, as a hand goes up in front of me. One last brief point, please, because we are well beyond the time we're meant to finish. So we're getting to the point where, personally, I'm starting to lose the ability to understand.

01:44:58:15 - 01:44:59:16

Brief as I can.

01:44:59:18 - 01:45:01:18

And thank you, Mr.. You may go now.

01:45:01:20 - 01:45:02:05

Yeah.

01:45:02:07 - 01:45:02:26

Uh, I'm Peter.

01:45:02:28 - 01:45:03:14

Collins.

01:45:03:21 - 01:45:04:06

Um.

01:45:04:08 - 01:45:17:02

File councillor and also, uh, parish council at Newton Clifton. Uh, I'm the chair of the Energy working Group. Um, what's what we're talking about is holistic network design, how all these projects will be looked at.

01:45:17:08 - 01:45:19:24

Sorry we can't get back into the detail of that today.

01:45:19:26 - 01:45:41:29

Going into the detail, what I want to say is that way back in 2008. National grid did a similar exercise and they looked at connection points. They knew there was going to be offshore wind energy out in the Irish Sea, and they looked at four connection points. And the ones they consider were Heysham, Stanhope, Deeside and Wilford. That at that point wasn't built.

01:45:42:01 - 01:45:55:12

Can I ask you to put the submission in at deadline for. Okay, partly because it's been a very long day for everybody, and I think I am starting to sort of struggle to understand points because it's been such a long day. I think it'd be really beneficial if you provide it in writing at deadline for.

01:45:55:14 - 01:45:55:29

It.

01:45:56:01 - 01:45:56:16

So.

01:45:56:18 - 01:45:58:09

That we can understand it and we can get a response to it.

01:45:58:11 - 01:46:02:05

Yeah, just a couple of minutes. At that point, Penguin wasn't concerned.

01:46:02:07 - 01:46:26:23

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. We have got to the stage now. Well, I don't want to take any more submissions at this hearing today, because we got to the point where it's 25 to 6. And I think as a panel, we got to the point where it's difficult to sort of take any more points in. And also I don't want to move on to discussion about back to alternatives, because that all can be provided in writing. So I'm really sorry. but it's got to the point now where we have to. We have to start to wind up for today. But we do want your submissions in writing.

01:46:27:00 - 01:46:29:27

You know, I was going to thank you, but I mean, I well, I do.

01:46:30:10 - 01:46:56:05

I apologize for taking this this position. We do want your submissions. And I will say to everybody the position, our alternatives. We're still open to written submissions on it. Just because we're not considering that this hearing doesn't mean to say it's not a relevant, important matter to us. We've already had hearings on that. We've already had submissions, and I imagine we'll get more written submissions and that can continue. And we welcome that. And if anything residual falls out of that, we need to consider at a future hearing, we we will. But I'm going.

01:46:56:07 - 01:46:56:22

To open.

01:46:56:24 - 01:47:00:26

Up 1008. Thank you. Stan always preferred to pen with him. Thank you.

01:47:03:06 - 01:47:31:08

Okay. I think based on where we are and the fact that I've got nothing really significantly major to raise in terms of cumulative effects assessment other than getting an update, which I think can be provided at deadline four. I think I'm happy to leave things where they are for today, because I think I've gone as I've said. Unfortunately for the gentleman, I've gone beyond the point where, you know, we can all really concentrate. So I suggest that we close the hearing.

01:47:31:18 - 01:47:39:19

Now, shall we do hearing action points tomorrow morning at the start? I think it'll give us a little bit of time to. I think everybody's had it.

01:47:39:21 - 01:48:09:26

I think that's a good idea as well. Uh, so yes, we'll do the action points tomorrow. And thank you for everybody's submissions over the last two days. I know there've been very long days, but the submissions have been very helpful. Uh, so thank you for those. Please submit your written versions of your summaries of your submissions by deadline for and of course, tomorrow morning we're returning at 930 for the development consent order hearing. So thank you for everybody.

01:48:10:01 - 01:48:11:22

This hearing is now closed.

