



Planning Inspectorate  
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
<b>Hearing:</b>	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) - Part 1
<b>Date:</b>	01 August 2025

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

File Length: 01:37:11

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:02 - 00:00:38:29

Good morning, everyone and welcome. It's now 9:30 a.m. on Friday, the 1st of August 2025. So we've made it to the end of the week, so that's a good start. Uh, I'm starting the second compulsory acquisition hearing to be held in respect to the application by Morgan Offshore Wind Limited and Morcom Offshore Wind Farm Limited for an order for development consent for the for the project called the Morgan and Morcom Offshore Wind Farms transmission assets.

00:00:40:23 - 00:00:53:22

We will introduce ourselves fully in just a few minutes. Before we do, um, please bear with me while I raise, um, a few housekeeping issues. Firstly, can everyone hear me?

00:00:58:24 - 00:01:04:09

Can you also can the case team please confirm that the meeting recordings and the live streams have started?

00:01:06:02 - 00:01:12:26

Good news. Thank you. Uh, are there any requests for reasonable adjustments or arrangements to enable participation?

00:01:14:18 - 00:01:15:20

No. Thank you.

00:01:18:03 - 00:01:43:09

I understand there are no fire alarms planned for today, so any alarms should be treated as real. If the alarm sounds. Please exit this room at the various fire exits which are positioned around the room to the left, to the right and that door there meeting places in the car park to the right of this building. Please do not re-enter the building until you are told it is safe to do so.

00:01:44:27 - 00:01:47:18

Toilets are out of the doors and round to the right.

00:01:50:14 - 00:02:06:17

Onto introductions of the panel. I'm Jonathan Gorst. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State for Energy Security and net zero. As a member of this panel to carry out an examination. Of the above application. I'll ask my panel members to introduce themselves as well.

00:02:08:00 - 00:02:14:02

Good morning. My name is David Cliff, and I've been appointed as the lead member of this panel by the Secretary of State.

00:02:15:17 - 00:02:22:23

Good morning. My name is Maria Rocha. I've also been appointed by the Secretary of State as the member of the examining authority.

00:02:25:21 - 00:02:38:29

Our fourth panel member is Richard Morgan. He's unable to be with us today, but remains fully involved as a member of the panel for this examination and will, of course, be viewing the recording of this hearing.

00:02:40:18 - 00:03:11:12

I can confirm that all of us, or all the panel, have made a declaration of interest regarding the Planning Inspectorate conflicts of interest policy. Also present today are members of the case team. The case manager is Sian Evans, who is joining virtually today together with Melissa Whitlock, case manager. In the room is Rebecca Luxton, and she supported here at the venue by Alicia Wines. If you have any questions or concerns about today's events, please contact a member of the case team.

00:03:12:28 - 00:03:20:28

The audio, visual and internet service today are provided by CP five, who have a team located at the back of the room. And thank you for them.

00:03:22:23 - 00:03:34:11

That's the team on our end. Now for the others wishing to speak. If I could turn to the attendees first, if they could introduce themselves. And who will be speaking today?

00:03:38:00 - 00:04:00:06

Good morning sir. My name is Liz Dunn. I am a partner at Burgess Salmon and I will be representing the applicant at this hearing. We have quite a number of people with us today, and there will be some sort of moving in and out, I think, at previous hearings peoples have introduced themselves before they speak. Are you happy for us to do that for today as well?

00:04:00:24 - 00:04:02:08

That's fine. Thank you, Mr. Dunn.

00:04:07:20 - 00:04:12:02

Uh, if we go around, is there anyone from Fylde Council here today?

00:04:13:27 - 00:04:25:12

Good morning. I'm Alan Oldfield, the chief executive at File Council, covering estates and landowner. Um, and with David O'Rourke, who's an agent working on our behalf.

00:04:29:14 - 00:04:31:27

Sorry. Was it Mr. O'Rourke? Yes.

00:04:36:20 - 00:04:37:25

Blackpool counsel.

00:04:39:07 - 00:04:44:10

Sir Catherine Knight, DWF legal director representing Blackpool Council.

00:04:49:09 - 00:05:02:03

I don't think there are any other councils that are Uh, in the room. Um, if we could move on to, uh, others who would like to speak today. If you'd like to introduce yourselves,

00:05:04:01 - 00:05:05:07

please put your hand up

00:05:06:29 - 00:05:10:01

and perhaps a microphone could. Could, could could go round.

00:05:13:20 - 00:05:17:06

Yeah. So Andrew Cooney from Pea Wilson and company, Fair Farms.

00:05:23:06 - 00:05:24:09

Thank you, Mr. Coney.

00:05:27:21 - 00:05:30:00

And Mason representing the Mason family.

00:05:34:06 - 00:05:39:23

Thank you for coming, Mrs. Mason. Hope the foot is better. Anybody else?

00:05:42:01 - 00:05:56:07

Uh, Richard Ellis, on behalf of, um, the Ellis family and Midland Riding School and Midland livery, I speak, but I'm just to let you know that if there is an issue that comes up, then I would like to maybe have some input. Thank you.

00:06:04:17 - 00:06:12:01

Is there anyone else who might be wanting to speak today in the room? Yeah. Someone at the back.

00:06:15:12 - 00:06:21:00

Simon Hinshaw, lithium resident. I may wish to make an interjection. Thank you.

00:06:34:03 - 00:06:39:12

Judy Battersby, um, Franklin resident, may want to speak.

00:06:45:03 - 00:06:59:21

And can I see if there's anyone in the virtual room. Who might like to speak today? No. Hands up at the moment. Oh hang on. A couple have just gone up. Several have just gone up. Right.

00:07:01:18 - 00:07:06:06

Can we start with, uh, AP. Uh, in the top left hand corner.

00:07:11:15 - 00:07:35:04

Good morning. Uh, Alister Paul, um, partner of DWF, um, uh, representing Blackpool Airport. Um, don't intend to say too much. Um, but happy to respond to queries through the day. Um, and, um, Catherine Knight, who acts at Blackpool Council, will be given a joint statement on behalf of both the airport and the council. Uh, when we arrive at our respective agenda items. Thank you.

00:07:35:21 - 00:07:40:08

Thank you, Mr. Paul. Um, is that Mrs. Hall? Who's, um.

00:07:44:04 - 00:07:49:12

Yes. Sheila Hall, a local farmer, and I would like to speak this morning. Thank you.

00:07:50:22 - 00:07:57:12

Thank you for joining us. Um, Mrs. Hall. Um, Mr. Dagg, we got you again.

00:08:00:12 - 00:08:25:02

Yes. Thank you, sir. Um, Stephen Dagg, legal director at Womble Bond Dickinson. I'm representing Sabic UK Petrochemicals Limited and Sabic petrochemicals B.V., who I will refer to just as Suffolk today. And I'm also joined again by Jeff Glover, pipelines manager at Suffolk, who's joined in case you have any technical questions or point of clarification that he can assist you with today. Thank you.

00:08:25:10 - 00:08:28:20

Thank you, Mr. Dagg. Um, Miss Staples.

00:08:30:25 - 00:08:31:16

Good morning.

00:08:32:04 - 00:08:32:25

Hello there.

00:08:33:06 - 00:08:39:24

Thank you. Yes. Louise Staples from the NFU representing NFU members. Affected. And I may wish to speak. Thank you.

00:08:41:07 - 00:08:43:09

Thank you. Um. And.

00:08:45:12 - 00:08:46:15

I think it's gonna be.

00:08:54:00 - 00:08:59:14

Uh, good morning, sir. Uh, my name is Kirk McDermott. I am from Savills, and I represent the Duchy of Lancaster.

00:09:01:06 - 00:09:10:21

We had another column yesterday, sir. Um, so. Yeah. You're from Savills. We've got you down to speak. So, um, thanks very much for for joining us today.

00:09:11:03 - 00:09:15:27

That's okay. I may choose to speak later on, and I'll. I'll confirm if that is necessary.

00:09:17:02 - 00:09:40:24

Thank you very much indeed. Thank you for joining us. Um, and thank you again for everyone who's joined with us. Um, just turning to the applicants. Uh, you did mention on Wednesday that someone might like to give a brief overview about some of the practical issues affecting landowners. Um, is is that person going to be here at some stage?

00:09:41:14 - 00:10:07:03

Uh, it's done on behalf of the applicant. It's a joint effort from a number of people who are all here today, and we were intending to bring that in under possibly item seven, which is the, uh, land requirements and different construction scenarios, if it would be helpful to do that in advance. Uh, in advance of that item, we're very happy to as well, whenever suits in terms of the agenda.

00:10:07:23 - 00:10:38:24

Yeah, that sounds absolutely fine. Just wanted to mention it now so that we could, um, see where we were going, but that sounds absolutely fine. Um, I don't want it to take too long. Um, but I think it would be helpful for, for everyone involved to to have a brief overview. Um, so, yes, let's let's put it in item seven. So, um, uh, that's ideal. Thank you for that. Um, just dealing with a few preliminary points back to to those.

00:10:39:13 - 00:11:12:21

Uh, this is a blended event. Um, so obviously there's people in person and virtually through Microsoft Teams were attending the meeting here from the Mill Farm Sports Village in Wesham. Uh, good news is there's no no games planned for today. I think you've got to wait a week before the start of the football season, but I'm sure they'll welcome you back in a week from now. Um, for those attending virtually, please rest assured you'll have our full attention. We may not be looking at you from time to time because we're taking notes.

00:11:13:09 - 00:11:44:14

Um, but we would ask that you, uh, if you are, uh, on camera, um, please keep your your phone off. Uh, and that goes for everyone in the room as well. Uh, and also those in the virtual room. If you could only turn your camera on. Uh, when? When you're invited to speak. Um, we'd like you to continue this morning's business. Um, with only a 15 minute break around 1130. Uh, we aim to finish by by 1 p.m., but we'll keep those timings under review.

00:11:46:14 - 00:12:19:07

Um, virtual attendees. If you leave the meeting at any stage during the break or before you can rejoin using the same link. Um, that's on the, uh, Planning Inspectorate website. Uh, we've spoken at previous meetings about, uh, general data protection. Uh, just a reminder that, um, uh, that if you're in

the room, there's a chance that, um, you may be on camera. Um, so please be be sure if you don't want to be on camera, that you you you let us know about that.

00:12:20:07 - 00:12:39:27

Uh, a recording of today's meeting will be available on the Planning Inspectorate, uh, National Infrastructure website as soon as practicable after this meeting. Um, uh, but during the meeting, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone stating your name and who you're representing each time before you speak.

00:12:41:28 - 00:13:13:22

This is the second compulsory acquisition hearing for this application, and an agenda was published on the 22nd of July. You can find that under EV 9001, at the first compulsory acquisition hearing in early March, we emphasized that individual affected persons would have the opportunity to speak at a later hearing, and this is their chance. Although any affected person can, of course, still lodge a written representation if they considered this appropriate.

00:13:15:17 - 00:13:37:18

And then lastly concerning post hearing actions should they arise during the hearing. We would ask the applicants, as with the other hearings, that they keep a note of hearing actions as they emerge, and at the close of the meeting, we intend to go through the list of actions which will then be agreed and thereafter published as soon as practicable.

00:13:40:28 - 00:14:09:29

Um, the assumption is that post hiring actions will be, um, uh, expected by the next deadline, which is deadline for August the 8th. We are getting a little close to that. Um, uh, and, uh, it may be with resourcing constraints that that might be difficult to, to, to achieve. If that's going to be the case, then I'm sure you'll be raising it. Um, uh, as I say, the the the clock is ticking towards that date.

00:14:13:18 - 00:14:17:15

Does anybody want to raise any points at this stage before we move on?

00:14:21:15 - 00:15:01:15

Right before we move on to the topics listed in the agenda. Can we just touch on the change application? Um, uh, very briefly. Um, it was raised at Tuesday's issue two. At the moment, it's notification of a change application. And clearly that's going to have to be formally lodged and accepted. Um, but can I just ask you as an initial point, if it is accepted? Um, can you just confirm, uh, where this relates as far as compulsory acquisition is concerned or not, if the case may be? Uh, just very briefly.

00:15:04:04 - 00:15:34:05

Laura, for the on behalf of the applicants. Um, so the as we mentioned on Tuesday, issue specific hearing to the change requests involves an overall reduction in the order limits and a consequent reduction in the permanent acquisition powers. All, um, the changes to accesses will fall within the existing order limits. So what we have set out in the change request letter is that there are no.

00:15:34:07 - 00:15:46:25

There is no additional land in terms of there's no land, additional land required outside or within the order limits for permanent acquisition that isn't already identified for permanent acquisition.

00:15:49:12 - 00:15:51:08

I think that's all I was I was looking for.

00:15:51:20 - 00:16:17:00

Okay. On behalf of the applicants. And there will be as as the the the change request documentation noting this is still a request will be submitted at deadline for. And there will be a reduction in some of the plots that we discussed in terms of, uh, around the recreation ground at Blackpool Airport and following on from there because of those, uh, because of the reductions in the order limit.

00:16:18:07 - 00:16:24:25

Yes. Thank you for that. That was just preliminary point. I just wanted for, for for the meeting so that that's that's very helpful.

00:16:25:09 - 00:16:26:29

Just very quickly. Sorry. Are you still going.

00:16:27:01 - 00:16:36:23

To submit the additional bits of the change notification that we discussed on Tuesday morning. I think today I think you said on Tuesday.

00:16:36:25 - 00:16:45:16

Laura Fuller, on behalf of the applicants. Yes, we have been working on that around the hearings and are intending to submit that today. Okay.

00:16:45:28 - 00:16:46:16

Thank you.

00:16:50:03 - 00:17:00:23

Um, and as perhaps a second preliminary point before we get into the agenda items, is the action points from from yesterday. Um, so thank you.

00:17:01:09 - 00:17:45:25

Thank you. Sir. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants. So, um, this is the list of hearing action points that we took. Appreciating yesterday's hearing was quite a discussion. Um, rather than particularly drawing points out. Also, just to be clear that these don't include, um, amendments that the applicant had confirmed that they were going to be making for deadline for anyway. So these are the points that came out of the discussion, rather than things that the applicants were going to be doing anyway. Uh, so the first, uh, action point was on the applicant, which was to carry out a thorough review of the draft DCO for typographic and grammatical errors, including amending the reference to Welsh guidance in schedule two.

00:17:46:04 - 00:18:17:10



Sorry, schedule 12. So that will be, uh, obviously that will be updated for deadline for. And it will be an ongoing review with each of those reviews. Um, the next action was on the um, councils, and I think it was particularly Fylde Borough Council to provide comments on the um, safeguards and controls in the outline plans that are being submitted by the applicants at deadline for. So that will be deadline five for the councils.

00:18:17:18 - 00:18:58:18

And as we discussed, um, we're very much hoping and anticipating that there will have been engagement between the applicants and the council's in advance of that. Um, the next one was on the applicant to, um, look at the definition of maintain, um, in the development and consent order in light of the, uh, confirmed Mona development consent order, particularly in the context of removal of buildings. And that would be for deadline for, uh, the next one was to review, um, how early planting, early landscape planting works are controlled in the outline plans.

00:18:58:25 - 00:19:41:00

Um, and that will be for deadline for the next one. Um, was for the applicants to review the definition of the Morgan and Morcom generation assets. Um, and consider whether those need updating again, that will be done for deadline for uh, there was an action on Blackpool Borough Council to submit any further comments they have on articles three, eight, ten and 47. And again, that's for deadline for, uh, the next one was for the applicants to update schedules five A and five B of the development consent order to ensure they align with the very specific wording in article 12.

00:19:42:05 - 00:20:22:03

Uh, the next one was on the applicants to update the statement of Common ground with National Highways to include their position and confirm their final position on the drafting of the DCO. Uh, will aim for that for deadline for it might be a deadline five um, depending on engagement with National highways. Um, the next one was on the applicants to review the drafting of article 19, which is the human remains article in light of the decision of the Secretary of State on the on the Mona project, um, and to consider whether that needs to be included and if it does need to be included, what further amendments might be needed.

00:20:22:18 - 00:21:09:23

Um, I think the aim was to provide some notification as to whether it's needed or we consider it's needed, and the justification at deadline for if there is amendment to the drafting, we'd be looking to do that for deadline five, given there might be quite a quite some work in that. The next one was for the applicants to explain and provide justification for the general power at article 22, in respect of acquisition of rights. That would be for deadline for um, the next one, uh, was for Fylde Borough Council to provide details on previous development consent orders and possible alternative drafting approaches to article 36.

00:21:09:25 - 00:21:49:18

I haven't got which one that was in front of me at the moment. Um, quarterly article 36, uh, being trees and tree preservation orders. Uh, and that would be for deadline for, um, the next one was on the applicant's aim to review the controls included in the outline management plans in relation to the removal of trees and hedgerows, and to consider whether any drafting updates are required to article

35, which is felling a lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows, and article 36 tree subject to tree preservation orders, including having regard to any anything provided by five Borough Council.

00:21:49:20 - 00:22:23:05

So that would be a deadline five. Uh, action. Uh the applicants to consider the need for article 45, which is the requirements and appeals in light of the decision of the Secretary of State on Mona and the development consent order there, and how that interacts with schedule 12, which is the approval of matters specified in requirements. I think we were looking at deadline five for that one. Um, and it was something I think we'd anticipate speaking to uh, FA Borough Council about as well in our ongoing engagement with them.

00:22:24:01 - 00:22:59:01

Um, the next one was, um, uh, for the applicants to set out on a without prejudice basis, what the drafting implications would be, should the Secretary of State reduce the timescales for implementation from seven years to five years? I think we probably covered that in the hearing in that. Um, I think it's just a check that there isn't anything other than that change in the DCO. Um, but again, that would be for for deadline for um, the next one was on, um, all the councils and I think it's probably a wider request from the applicants.

00:22:59:07 - 00:23:30:19

Um, this is specifically in respect of the outline communications plan. Um, but to provide and engage with the applicants on the outline plans, noting that those are going to be updated at deadline four. So I think we'd ask the council's not to comment on what's in the in the application already. Those will be updated at deadline four. And then to to engage with the applicants on, uh, those updated outline plans.

00:23:30:21 - 00:24:06:01

Looking at, um, at the council's position on each of those. But there was a particular focus on the outline communications plan. So that would be for deadline five. Um, the next one was on the applicants to consider adding the notification or a notification of the construction scenarios into the outline communications plan so that people are aware of when works are taking place. So, um, we will look at that at deadline four. I think that will probably align with some of the other material that we're intending to submit a deadline for, to draw all of this together.

00:24:07:09 - 00:24:40:00

Uh, the, um, there was another action on Borough Council to provide comments on requirement 25, which was the onshore collaboration and its interaction with other The requirements. We'd ask for that for deadline for, um, uh, another one for filed and for the applicants, uh, to engage on the outline design principles and requirement for which was the substation works. Uh, and I think we'd pick that up in the issue specific hearing to on design matters as well.

00:24:40:02 - 00:25:02:03

And I think that that links to one of the action points that we had there in terms of that ongoing engagement. Uh, on those on those matters. Uh, the next one is on Borough council. Um, to provide comments on and proposed drafting for requirement for which was the substation works, including the design review. And we've got that one down for deadline for

00:25:03:25 - 00:25:40:09

um, the next one was on the applicant to consider the drafting of requirement for which is the substation works. In light of the discussions and comments provided at deadline four from filed. So that would be a deadline five. Uh, deadline five point. Um, the next one was in respect of article 17 on the applicant's, uh. And requirement 17 is control of operational artificial light emissions, I think. So you'd raised a question as to whether it actually specified that there would be details of the lighting contained in the outline in the operational lighting plan.

00:25:40:11 - 00:26:15:15

So we'll look at the drafting of that one to make sure it's, it's uh, it's clear as to what it's securing. So that would be for deadline for um, the next one was on the applicant's, um, to consider whether there is a statutory requirement for B to be consulted under requirement for which was the substation works, and that would be for deadline for, um, the next one on the applicant to review and update requirement nine, subparagraph one Traffic and transport to provide clarity around who the consultation bodies would be for that requirement.

00:26:15:17 - 00:26:46:07

So that would be for deadline for um, the next one was on Lancashire County Council to share proposed drafting with the applicants for requirement 11, paragraph two on onshore archaeology. I think we'd ask for that as soon as possible. I'm not sure there's anybody from Lancashire here today. Um, in terms of um, uh, their, their comments on that, that's probably something we can try and pick up outside of the examination if we don't have it before deadline for obviously that will become a deadline five action.

00:26:48:00 - 00:27:18:15

Um, and uh, and then obviously for the for the applicants to, um, to review the drafting in light of those comments, um, there was another action on Lancashire County Council to provide comments on air quality and noise and vibration. I think they would do, which we were looking for, for, um, deadline for, um, the applicants to review the wording of requirement 12, subparagraph two on the Ecological Management Plan, and to consider whether any updates are needed to that.

00:27:18:17 - 00:27:52:29

And that will be a deadline for. Um, the next one was on Borough Council to submit comments to the applicants on requirement 14, which was the construction hours, um, noting that the applicants had had um submit committed to removing Saturday afternoon working from that, which will be an update. And I think the applicants would request that that's as soon as possible and pre deadline for. So we'll pick that up separately with the council so that the um, so that the updated deadline for can as far as possible take into account comments from filed.

00:27:53:24 - 00:28:24:15

Uh, the next one was on the applicant to review the wording of requirement 16, which is the restoration of land use temporarily for construction, and consider whether it needs updating to provide any sort of flexibility if there was sequential construction. Um, we've got that down for deadline for I think from memory. That was when we talked about filed. It was one that filed raised and I think

suggested there might be they might have a kind of view on where they would be able to be building in some flexibility there.

00:28:24:17 - 00:28:31:26

So again, it it may end up being deadline five, but I think it's noted that that's something we would be looking at with them.

00:28:33:12 - 00:29:02:07

Uh, the next one on the applicant to review the implementation of uh, the um, various sub paragraphs. Sure. What this one is throughout schedules two A and two B. Oh, sorry. I've got here review the implementation sub paragraphs throughout schedules two and two B in light of filed borough council's comments, I can't remember what that was, but somebody very carefully written it down.

00:29:02:09 - 00:29:23:06

Laura, for the on behalf of the applicants, I think it was raised as a general comment by FA Borough Council that where in each requirement. It has the paragraph that says and shall be implemented as approved. To review that and consider whether it also needed to reference um if implemented as approved and retained, or something along those lines.

00:29:24:19 - 00:29:56:21

Thank you, Mr. Fuller. Um, the next one was on the applicants to consider updating the drafting of requirement 24, which was about amendments to approve details to include reference to impacts not being outside those assessed in the environmental statements. That sort of catch all link back to the environmental statement. Uh, the next one was for the applicants and for borough council to engage on the drafting of paragraph six, which is fees in respect of schedule 12.

00:29:57:00 - 00:30:42:27

Um, and that was we had the discussions about the fee that would be payable for each discharge, the, uh, fees payable under a planning performance agreement and how how that would be managed. So I suspect we've got that. I have we've put that down for deadline for I think it was probably a deadline five at given deadline for next Friday. I think we're not going to have made any meaningful progress on that. So I think we'll have that as a deadline. Five action. Um, the next one on, um, was, um, for Newton with Clifton and Franklin and parish councils to provide the drafting and a full justification for the requirement that was suggested that the that the projects must can only construct concurrently, and that would be for deadline for,

00:30:44:19 - 00:31:04:07

um, the next one on Blackpool Borough Council. Um, I think they confirmed at the hearings. But to confirm whether the the proposed requirement that had been suggested concerning unexploded ordnance at Blackpool Airport, um, is a concern or not, I think you confirmed that it wasn't, but um, it was just having that written confirmation.

00:31:04:18 - 00:31:08:03

Uh, so we do need to take that away. And we will confirm for you a deadline.

00:31:08:09 - 00:31:09:12

So that's the deadline for.

00:31:09:14 - 00:31:09:29

Yeah.

00:31:10:21 - 00:31:46:00

Um, the next point is on the applicant. Um, to summarize, uh, responses to the new requirements, I think this was, uh, so were you had your list, um, that you read out. So if this isn't if the list we have doesn't align with the list you have, I'm sure you'll you'll correct it in terms of. So we had other parties having requested new requirements. That was that was the point we were talking about. So there was the potential for construction, water management plan, air quality monitoring data and review of noise and vibration.

00:31:46:02 - 00:32:19:19

I can't remember who it was that had asked for these things. Construction environmental management plan, um, the unexploded ordnance at Blackpool Airport, which will be subject to confirmation from Blackpool Airport. Hydrology at the sand dunes and a construction management plan that was that was the list of additional points that we thought had been picked up. Um, uh, that we had down. I think a lot of them we can probably respond to for deadline for, because I think the applicant's position is going to be that none of those are needed because they're covered elsewhere.

00:32:20:03 - 00:32:31:01

Um, but if we just provide that initial confirmation for deadline for and and if they are covered elsewhere, just point to where things are covered elsewhere effectively.

00:32:32:23 - 00:33:07:28

Um, then the next one on the applicant, um, to carry out a consistency check across those management plans, where, where we've offered commitments to make sure that effectively the commitments are secured and it is an ongoing activity. Um, and it's just making sure that the, the outline management plans and the commitments register are aligned. Um, that will be for probably deadline five because there'll be quite a, quite a lot of work, but it is an ongoing activity and is being done at each deadline.

00:33:08:15 - 00:33:30:01

Uh, and then the final uh, point that we've got, you'll be pleased to hear, is the applicants updating condition 11 in the marine licences to remove reference to substantially and also to carry out a review of schedules across scheduled schedules 14 to 17 to make sure it isn't there anywhere else. And that would be for deadline four.

00:33:31:29 - 00:33:33:29

Thank you. Thank you very much indeed for that.

00:33:34:07 - 00:33:41:10

I'm asking about one, please. Does the Welsh Government one as well on you? Oh did you. Yeah. Sorry.

00:33:41:12 - 00:33:47:11

That was, that was we wrapped that up. Yes. We wrapped that pop up into typographical errors. So that was the first one.

00:33:47:13 - 00:34:05:10

Sorry, sorry. I was playing catch up at that point. There's just one other one. Er, potentially. And I may have missed this one as well. Uh, it was an article 33 point on funding. Oh yes. It was following the discussions with, uh, Sabic in terms of.

00:34:10:03 - 00:34:21:12

Its being covered in the general correspondence, liaison, etc. that's going on. Protective provisions to address concerns raised by Sabic following further engagements and discussions with Sabic. Because what's written down in here.

00:34:22:12 - 00:34:47:15

Is done on behalf of the applicants. Um, we're aware that Sabic raised the point around article 33. Um, it's our position that there doesn't need to be any. I don't think there was a suggestion that there should be any changes to the drafting of article 33, but we're wrapping those discussions with Sabic as we talk about later up into considerations of the protective provisions. So I don't think there's an action for us on article 33. Uh.

00:34:47:26 - 00:34:49:00

Out of that, that's fine.

00:34:49:02 - 00:34:53:23

But it's part of that ongoing discussion with Sabic to agree the protective provisions.

00:34:54:08 - 00:34:55:18

Yeah. That's fine. Thank you.

00:34:57:00 - 00:35:31:27

Thank you very much for that. Um, very comprehensive run through. I'm glad we didn't do it yesterday afternoon. Um, and, uh, I hope it didn't keep anyone up too late last night, but thank you very much. And that we'll review it and, um, uh, just just make sure we agree with everything. And then the intention will be to publish it, um, by, by midweek next week. Um, right. Well, if we can get back to, um, today's business on, um, compulsory acquisition, um, can we can I ask for the agenda to to be brought up? We're on to, um, agenda item two.

00:35:31:29 - 00:36:07:06

So we're making some progress. Um, main purpose of this hearing is to, is to hear persons affected by compulsory acquisition, which will, um, frequently talk about as um, with the abbreviation CCA and temporary possession, which will frequently abbreviate as TP proposals um and listen to the affected persons who've requested to be heard. The examining authority will also question on other matters relevant to the applicant's proposals for CAA,

00:36:08:21 - 00:36:50:21

and we are going to be raising further written questions, which we publish on the 8th of September. So that's the purpose of today's hearing. Um, and then moving on to agenda item three. Um, an update on negotiations. We'll be hearing from a number of affected persons under agenda item four. Uh, and we'll be returning to, to this topic on on agenda item five. But to set the scene. Um, can I ask the joint applicants to briefly set out the progress has been made? Um, with negotiations? Um, there were many references in the replies to our first written questions to a meeting held on the 2nd of July.

00:36:50:27 - 00:36:56:01

So just a general overview as to, um, where you've got to the negotiations. Thank you.

00:36:56:25 - 00:37:30:11

Yeah. Gary Breen, Morgan Land manager, speaking on behalf of both applicants. Um, so since the last compulsory acquisition hearing, we've continued negotiate with affected parties with the aim of concluding those terms during the last collective meeting on the 7th of April with the agent, it was acknowledged that, um, it would be more beneficial for the negotiations to go more to a 1 to 1 basis rather than the generic form. Um, so following that, we issued the fourth version of the heads of terms on the 19th of May.

00:37:31:27 - 00:38:03:02

We've continued to negotiate with landowners and their appointed agents, uh, regarding the heads of terms and the land rights sort. We do acknowledge the previous criticism during the last hearings, um, and through the written representations. And therefore, we hosted a drop in session in Myerscough College on the 2nd of July, uh, with provided agents, and landowners, the opportunity to meet the wider project team to discuss engineering issues and other consenting issues, as well as the heads of terms.

00:38:05:11 - 00:38:23:08

We acknowledge that only six people turned up to that event. Um, but we do think it was a helpful event. Um, and therefore we have planned another event of a similar fashion on the 12th of August, and we have notified all landowners of that that event.

00:38:25:11 - 00:38:55:25

By way of an update on the status of negotiations, um, in advance of the deadline three tracker. Um, we have received 12 heads of terms, uh, from landowners. That equates to approximately 10%. And these terms now then will go to the legal representatives to follow up with the necessary options. We have been made aware of seven landowners who do not wish to progress negotiations and heads of terms any further.

00:38:56:12 - 00:39:01:11

However, we do remain willing to engage with those landowners if their opinion does change.

00:39:06:17 - 00:39:26:24

As a high level overview of some of the outstanding points of difference in the negotiations, and they are items like locations of operational accesses, plant planning clauses, environmental issues and commercial values associated with the demolition and value of the land.

00:39:29:07 - 00:40:00:00

And also, if I may say in regards to item agenda five, um, the land rights tracker. Um, while the applicants acknowledge their standing objections, we don't feel it's unusual at this time for those objections to be there. Um, there are many details where objections remain all the way through. And landowners do not remove the Jacksons Even when the heads of terms are signed, as they are not a legally binding document. Although we are seeking in the heads of terms for those objections to be removed.

00:40:02:29 - 00:40:35:28

When negotiations are ongoing, we are hopeful the negotiations will be concluded in the coming months. But some may run beyond the examination, which we do not feel is uncommon. If the applicants preference to agree heads of terms through a voluntary forum rather than as a last resort user, say the CA part. And so we will continue these negotiations and post examination. And that's that's an update of where we are with negotiations with affected parties.

00:40:37:01 - 00:40:55:17

That's very helpful. And thank you for for being brief. Can I just ask you just to repeat the figures you gave you? I think you said that there were 12 heads of terms The effectively been agreed and now passed to legal. Yes. And that was around 10%. Yes.

00:40:57:12 - 00:40:58:00

That's fine.

00:40:58:02 - 00:40:59:17

Just just over 10%.

00:40:59:19 - 00:41:13:26

Yeah. That's fine. Thank you. Thank you for for for that that that that's really helpful. And I think obviously we're returning to this under agenda item five in more detail. Um, but that just sets the scene. So so thank you for that. So

00:41:15:15 - 00:41:48:02

we'll move on to a gender item for now, which is the representations from, uh, the affected persons. Uh, which is the opportunity for them to speak directly to the examining authority. Uh, nearly all of you have submitted representations in writing. Uh, and we've read these, so please, um, try not to repeat your comments. What we're looking for is either a new detail or a summary, taking no more than five minutes of the position. Uh, we'll then refer to the applicants for any response.

00:41:49:07 - 00:42:22:06

Uh, so upon screen at the moment are the persons who who asked to speak at this hearing. So I'm going to go through them in this order and then at the end, pick up on anybody else who might want to speak. Um, now, the first one by systems said they might want to speak. Um, they don't seem to be here, and we're not sure they're an infected person. So, um, we weren't sure what they were going to say. Um, but, um, uh, if they did, they did.

00:42:22:08 - 00:42:31:28



They did put their name down, so that's why they appeared there. But, um, we didn't think that was going to take very long. Um, in in, in in any event. Um.

00:42:32:28 - 00:42:33:13

Um.

00:42:33:24 - 00:42:36:19

Though as their names on screen. Um,

00:42:38:14 - 00:43:14:06

just to raise it while while while we're under that. Um, we did speak at issue two about the mitigation areas and the provision for biodiversity net gain. And we raised the issue as to whether or not the amounts of land satisfy the compulsory acquisition test, um, as contained in section one, two, two of the Planning Act. Uh, and whether um that, that that provides the Secretary of State needs to be satisfied that the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development.

00:43:15:06 - 00:43:41:25

Uh, and I think this is where the base, um, objection comes from. Um, so if I could ask the applicants, um, can can the panel be or can the EXR be reassured that the applicants are meeting this requirement, taking into account that there's apparently a 60%, um, by biodiversity net gain uplift, which is significantly more than than is currently required.

00:43:42:23 - 00:44:14:11

So this is done on behalf of the applicant. Um, so two points, I think, just to pick up on that. Um, firstly, um, I haven't got the documents list in front of me. The applicant has provided a detailed explanation and justification for both the mitigation areas and that we call them biodiversity benefit areas because because of the considerations around net gain not being a statutory requirement. Um, so we, um, we provided a detailed justification for those areas and why they are.

00:44:14:15 - 00:44:45:28

I think you'll also have picked up from, um, issue specific hearing to that. We have been asked to provide the, uh, the, the, the metric basis on which those on which those calculations were based. And that was an action for us coming out of that hearing. Sorry. The document I was referring to is rep two. Um, sorry. I'll come back to it. Um, uh, so I think the applicant's position is those tests have been met.

00:44:46:00 - 00:45:17:05

I appreciate there's more information going in that will effectively explain that position. So, um, I suggest rather than spending time on it now, and particularly as B aren't here, if we take that as the first hearing action point from this, hearing that as well as updating those that information which we said we would do for deadline two, that we'll also sorry, we said we'd do for deadline for. We'll also address this point as to um, as to the compulsory acquisition part.

00:45:17:07 - 00:45:31:06

I mean, it's effectively fundamental to the justification of the need and the deliverability of those. So it's very much part of how we will be responding. And the document is rep to 046.

00:45:34:10 - 00:46:10:07

Thanks for that. And the way you've outlined is absolutely fine. No, no, no issues about that. I think I just wanted to mention it now because of course it does cross over um, into the CA consideration as well. So, um, I just thought it was worth picking it up. Um, but, um, I think we can move on. Uh, particularly as b aren't here. Um, so moving on to Blackpool, um, Airport Properties Limited and Blackpool airport operations, uh, limited. Um, Mister Paul, I don't know whether you want to say, um, anything about the current position.

00:46:10:09 - 00:46:25:05

We obviously heard a lot on on Tuesday about it at issue two. Um, so, so so we, um, we know that a signed agreements very close. Don't if you want to say any more, uh, in these compulsory acquisition contexts. Thank you.

00:46:26:06 - 00:47:04:11

Yeah. Of course, just just as a bit of background, um, the the, um, apologies. Um, I was to Paul on behalf of Blackpool Airport. Um, just in terms of the land agreement, negotiations are being carried out by, um, uh, Peter Roberts of TWD. And, uh, Peter is acting on behalf of both the airport. Um, so BPL Blackpool airport's property limited. Um, and and Blackpool Council. Um, and so I will pass over to Kathryn Knight on behalf of Blackpool Council shortly to, to read out a joint statement on behalf of um both the airport and the council in respect of land agreement negotiations and the current status.

00:47:04:17 - 00:47:31:29

Um I think the first just a preliminary point is that the, uh, cooperation agreement that is now an agreed form and starting to go through the, um, the governance and signing process, that is not a land agreement. It doesn't secure land rights for the applicants. Um, it is a, um, it deals with operational impact and mitigation and associated mitigation. So, um, the land agreement negotiations is a separate negotiation that that, um, that is, uh, ongoing. And I pass over to Catherine Knight to provide an update on status.

00:47:34:23 - 00:48:07:00

Sir Catherine Knight, Blackpool Council I have a joint statement to read out from the applicant, the council and Blackpool Airport. So the Blackpool are the applicant council and the airport have been in dialogue, and an on site meeting took place in the 1st of May 2025 between Mr. Mr. Peter Roberts and for the council and the airport and Mr. O'Brien and Mrs. Jones for the applicant. Initial heads of terms were issued to the airport and the council in 2024 and whilst discussions have taken place, the focus has been on the Airports Co-operation Agreement, which is the precursor to the land agreements.

00:48:07:21 - 00:48:27:21

Mr. Peter Roberts provided a detailed response in writing to the draft Heads of Terms in the 3rd of May, which were passed. Delcourt McLaren, who applied during this week as an agreed position, has

been reached on the co-operation agreement. It is intended for McLaren and Mr. Roberts to arrange a further meeting to discuss those heads of terms. Thank you.

00:48:28:27 - 00:48:34:28

Thank you. That's very helpful. And clearly you'll submit that joint statement to to the examination.

00:48:35:18 - 00:48:43:19

Sir. The joint. Its intended to submit the joint statement, a deadline for the airport and the council. I'm not sure about the applicant. Yeah, I assume so.

00:48:43:28 - 00:49:14:06

Yeah, that's that's absolutely fine. Okay. Um, so that that that's really reassuring. Um, that that so much progress has been made. Um, and hopefully we will get confirmation, uh, very soon about the, um, cooperation agreement being being being finalised. The the first part. Obviously, the land agreement might take a bit of time to negotiate, and I think that's that's appreciated. Miss Dunne, do you want to add anything?

00:49:14:27 - 00:49:24:06

No. Certainly is done on behalf of the applicants, just to thank Blackpool Council and, uh, Blackpool Airport for their submissions and for the work to get this far.

00:49:31:15 - 00:49:36:23

Um, I don't know if Blackpool Airport or Blackpool Council. I won't say any more at this stage. Or can we move on?

00:49:41:14 - 00:49:48:18

Catherine Knight. Blackpool Council asks do you have anything further? And then I have another point, sir. On behalf of the Council.

00:49:50:11 - 00:49:53:26

Thanks, Catherine. No, I was to Paul on behalf of Blackpool Airport. That's everything from me.

00:49:55:03 - 00:49:57:11

Thank you very much. Thank you for joining us, Mr. Paul.

00:49:59:07 - 00:50:41:11

Sir. Catherine night, Blackpool Council Blackpool Council welcome the efforts and discussions thus far in respect to the airport land. As everyone is aware, Blackpool Council have several land holdings within the district and within the Red line area in respect of the Stargate access and the Stargate ramp. Blackpool Council welcome the advances and the discussions thus far with the applicant in respect of the removal are intended removal of the area from the street works schedule three. However, the council are seeking further discussions in respect of the removal of the temporary possessory rights which remain over that area, and are hoping that further discussions will take place over the next few weeks.

00:50:41:19 - 00:51:14:15

The council will remain concerned as to the extent of the rights that have been sought in respect of the actual use that will be undertaken over that area and consider it to be out of proportionate. The Council have sought council advice and march and intend. And this is a flag for you, sir, to present written submissions at deadline for are the concern remains, and the reading of the DCO as a whole in respect of all the articles and the right sort.

00:51:17:10 - 00:51:42:06

Yeah, thank you for that. I mean, it's a tricky access. It's Stargate, isn't it? It's, uh, you know, a lot of sand tends to be over that, which makes it difficult to, to obtain access. Um, and, uh, you know, it's obviously a very sensitive area close to the, um, the tram terminus. And um, uh, you know, does does present some particular difficulties. So you'll be presenting that a deadline for.

00:51:42:23 - 00:52:13:05

So there was a mixture of representations this week which have now been wrapped up into written submissions, partly because the council, uh, welcomed the applicants. Look, in respect of tourism, which is the main concern for that access, um, at a local level. Um, and Miss Parker and the applicants are getting together on that. Uh, but that remains the main concern is that Stargate access remains open, particularly for the tourism aspect, which is so vital to the council's economy.

00:52:14:05 - 00:52:20:16

Right. So you're submitting something on by deadline for for that? Yeah. Thank you. Mister, do you want to respond at all?

00:52:21:14 - 00:52:51:17

Uh, thank you sir. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants, um, the applicants are very much noted. Um, Blackpool Council's concerns in respect to this. And I think as we discussed, um, are removing, um, the street works powers, um, from the draft development consent order. So effectively the rights that exist are temporary possession. Um, it is very limited in terms of the, uh, the rights that the applicants are seeking.

00:52:51:26 - 00:53:24:20

And, um, it is literally just to launch a small boat to support cable pulling. So, um, the applicants need those rights to be able to access and use that land. The rights that are being sought do not extinguish the rights of anyone else. Um, or and they are considered by the applicants to be entirely, um can coexist effectively with with the rights that are there at the moment. Um, and actually reflect the current use by others, for example, the boat club.

00:53:24:25 - 00:54:11:23

So we are in continued discussions with Blackpool Council about this. We do obviously want the council to be comfortable with the approach that is being taken. We will continue those discussions, um, and, and we will will report, um, further in terms of, um, where we get to. But, um, the applicant's position is that those temporary possession powers are needed. They are proportionate and they are justified. And it's it's then looking at how those work, those work together and the removal of the, um, it's a temporary access point only, um, uh, and the removal of the street works powers we consider deals with the council's points, but we will we will continue to talk to them about that.

00:54:12:21 - 00:54:33:17

And just touching on that. I know that access is close to, um, uh, I'm not sure whether it's Blackpool Council have laid out a really, really good cycle route along there. Um, and the access is very close to that cycle route, which then goes round the terminus. So I'm hoping that everyone's going to take that into consideration as well.

00:54:34:02 - 00:54:49:11

So the there is an intent. They've been working on it to actually map out the cycle route for the deadline for submission. It does it the cycle route goes down Stargate access and around. And if it was to be rerouted, it would actually go over the tramlines, which is considered to be dangerous.

00:54:51:15 - 00:54:55:27

Laura, I look forward to more discussions with the applicant to try and resolve this.

00:54:57:21 - 00:55:30:14

Laura Fuller, on behalf of the applicants, I was just going to add that as well as removing the Street works powers from schedules three and four, we have also reviewed schedules six this week and would be looking to remove the public right of way that has just been referred to from that article, I'm sorry, from that schedule and from the accompanying plan as well as we have no intention to stop up and the use that would be made of that axis will not interfere with that public right of way. So we would not need those powers in that schedule either.

00:55:31:10 - 00:55:36:07

I'm sorry, is that being contained in the next version of the DCO or.

00:55:37:24 - 00:55:42:26

Laura Fuller, on behalf of the applicants? Yes, we would make those updates at deadline for as well.

00:55:44:13 - 00:55:45:03

Thank you.

00:55:45:26 - 00:56:04:10

Sir. Catherine night, Blackpool Council our Blackpool Council are delighted to hear the suggested amendment and we would welcome, if that could be afforded to us, who could have a look? If it's prior to deadline for submission, then we need not actually submit on it, which I think will probably save everybody some time in reading. Thank you.

00:56:15:10 - 00:56:32:18

Thank you very much, Blackpool Council. And that's been most helpful. And also Mr. Paul. Um, now moving on to um Fylde Borough Council. Um, and, um, Mr. Oldfield. Um, I don't know what you want to to say, but please make your submission. Thank you. Thank you for coming today.

00:56:33:27 - 00:57:06:09

Alan Oldfield, Borough council. Um, we're in a different position. We've got four parcels of land that are all subject to temporary possession. Um, we are at a stage where two of those parcels of land yet to be established. Whether we're the rightful owner, a Duchy of Lancaster Beach. Where does the tide,

low tide, start and stop? And we're working through that. And David O'Rourke here is in discussion with the Elkhorn McCarroll on that.

00:57:06:17 - 00:57:43:12

And the Blackpool Road North playing field. It's on a 999 year lease to Fylde Council. And there's an issue of whether we can act on their behalf as extensively as we thought we could, but again, that is being resolved. So we're at the stage where we're trying to establish that we have the rights and the ownership on the four parcels of land that would be used. And once we've agreed, then we can start moving into detail of the each compound, the impact, the duration, the purpose.

00:57:43:22 - 00:58:14:03

We have had a lot of, um, feedback already on proposed duration, proposed purpose. Um, but we've not got into too much detail because we need to make sure that we are able to represent, um, within town trust who own one of the one of the assets. And that we do actually on the part of the beach where there's a compound proposed, um, in terms of plans for Blackpool playing fields.

00:58:14:12 - 00:58:49:14

They're the ones with greatest concern over, um, there's 30 to 40 junior football teams that use that, and the impact and the displacement and the length of time the replacement there. Um, there was we've carried out around £150,000 worth of drainage work over the last 2 or 3 years in that area. There's more to be carried out. There were discussions and plans in place by the football team in partnership with the council, to build a new clubhouse.

00:58:49:24 - 00:59:20:18

We've specked out a new, um, car park for that area. So all that's been held at the moment, which we appreciate. So there's a lot more discussion and understanding of the impacts, the statement and what goes back in that location in particular. But, um, we do have an ongoing and productive, uh, communication with Del Club McLaren, McLaren, which is largely led by David. He may have something to add.

00:59:22:24 - 00:59:33:12

Can I just ask? Can you just go back to the wreck? The freeholder? Can you just confirm the freeholder, confirm the leaseholder and confirm the length of the lease?

00:59:33:24 - 01:00:01:13

David O'Rourke, Marlborough counsel. Yes, the the freeholder of Blackpool Road North is, uh, Plainfield is Luton Town Trust. Fabric Council holds the site and is 999 year lease. And the trust has asked that the council deal with matters on their behalf. And there are some legal issues over that which we are resolving, and I don't think I have anything further to add to Mr. Oldfield's comments. Thank you.

01:00:04:05 - 01:00:14:26

I mean, this issue was discussed at some length, um, on Tuesday. Um, sorry. Wednesday. Wednesday. Um, and

01:00:16:15 - 01:00:28:28

you know, I think everyone is is. We've obviously been to the, um, uh, the rec as a panel to, uh, to see how how much it is used. Um, and you say, was it 30 to 40 pitches?

01:00:31:00 - 01:00:34:11

Alan Oldfield file Council, 30 to 40 teams.

01:00:34:17 - 01:00:35:27

30. 42? Yes. Right.

01:00:35:29 - 01:00:53:05

Not that many pitches. Uh, Saint Anne's football club. I believe that Patrick Cook, um, who's the lead officer for the football club, has also spoke to Delco McLaren. Uh, and he shared his concerns. And, uh, he's in discussions with us and them as well.

01:00:54:18 - 01:01:17:04

Right. Well, that's really helpful. Um, as I say, it was discussed in detail earlier in the week. Uh, and there were a number of action points arising as a result of this. So I think, you know, the panel were well aware of the issues relating to, to to the ground. Uh, and the applicants are trying to, um, meet your concerns as far as possible. I don't know if you want to say anything else today.

01:01:17:06 - 01:01:49:14

Mr. Li's done on behalf of the applicant. No, I don't think we've got anything further to say. We are. We are in active discussions with the council regarding this. We've obviously put forward the section 106 agreement to address impacts. And, um, are in discussions in terms of the, the terms um, for the agreement with Fylde Council in respect of um, we talked about matters around public open space, but ensuring that they're comfortable in that regard. But we'll be drawing all of that together in our in our submissions and our notes from the hearings.

01:01:51:16 - 01:02:16:19

That sounds fine. Thank you very much indeed for for coming in and attending today and for, for, um, your interest and certainly well aware of the issues. So tend to move on. Um, to Sabic is next on uh, on on the list. Um, so that was Mr. Dagg. Um, over to you. Uh, what do you want to say today, Mr. Dagg?

01:02:18:25 - 01:02:52:04

Thank you, sir. Um, Savage doesn't object to the scheme in principle. Um. However, it does need to secure suitable and adequate protective provisions within the DCO before it can remove its objection. So my intention this morning, sir, would help you is to take a few moments to to reiterate the key themes of Suffolk's objection. To provide an update as to where negotiations have reached and consider how we can reach a resolution. Sir, I am conscious of the constraints on time and will be as brief as possible.

01:02:54:00 - 01:03:10:26

Um, yeah, that's that's fine. We did have. We do have protective provisions later in the agenda. But, um, if you say you're going to be pretty brief, perhaps we can cover off your concerns at this stage as

as you have put yourself down as a speaker. Um, we might as well hear from you now. So. So please be brief.

01:03:11:17 - 01:03:29:08

My my my my thoughts coming into this hearing was that it was probably more efficient to roll up our comments into one, um, one representation. Um, so if you if you if you can bear with me, I understand that you don't give us any more than about five minutes. So I do appreciate that. Thank you.

01:03:29:13 - 01:03:30:14

Press ahead please.

01:03:31:24 - 01:04:08:23

Um, in terms of the current position, Savic provided its protective provisions to the examining authority in annex two of its written representation. And that's rep 1-195. And those differ materially from those currently contained in part three of schedule ten of the current draft DCO, which is 3-009. There have been some fruitful negotiations between the parties regarding the final form of the protected provisions, and we have moved a lot closer to agreement, but they do remain some areas where agreement has not yet been reached

01:04:10:10 - 01:04:40:27

because amended protective provisions are not before the examination. The backdrop against which I have to make these representations today, inevitably, is the latest draft order, rather than anything that we may have negotiated. Areas where we may, um, we may have an understanding do remain without prejudice unless something is formally submitted to the examination. And so, against that backdrop, I just wanted to highlight a few themes from subjects represent detailed written representation.

01:04:42:03 - 01:05:00:09

First one is around the t pap. So Sabic is the owner and operator of the TransPennine Ethylene pipeline, which is known as the tap. Tap is a high pressure buried pipeline which is used to transport ethylene between Teesside and Runcorn.

01:05:02:01 - 01:05:40:06

The electricity cables proposed by the applicants will cross the t pap roughly at right angles to the southeast of Newton, with Skiles creating the possibility of an accident or, more pertinent to this particular hearing. The possibility of severance of the pipeline due to the acquisition or suspension of rights. And additionally, as I raised yesterday, the applicant has chosen this location for permanent environmental mitigation works. Those works 49 A and 49 B, and they include the creation of wader scrapes and also of planting, which could negatively affect the T pair.

01:05:42:02 - 01:06:06:00

On this point, Savic does take some comfort from the amendments to the overarching Ecological Management plan, which was submitted to deadline to which the applicant referred to yesterday. This recognizes the location of the TP app and the need for standoff distances for the wader scrapes. However, we do still consider that amendments will be needed to the protective provisions to deal with subjects concerns.



01:06:08:11 - 01:06:17:06

In terms of regulation, the TPP is a major accident, has a pipeline, and it's governed by the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996.

01:06:19:07 - 01:06:51:08

These regulations placed Sabic under a duty to take all necessary measures to prevent a major accident from occurring, and also to limit the consequences to people and the environment of any major accidents which do occur. Paragraph 4.2 of subject's written representation said this out in more detail, so it's important that suitable and workable protective provisions are included in the DCO in relation to the approval of works details to allow Sabic to comply with those statutory duties

01:06:53:06 - 01:07:18:19

in terms of any necessary diversions. The nature of the TPA means that it can't easily be diverted. Um, any diversion would be likely to have to isolate a section of the pipeline in excess of ten miles in length, and then purge it with ethylene before the works could take place. And that's a process which would be likely to take between 5 and 6 weeks to complete.

01:07:20:15 - 01:07:39:24

That means that the consequences of an interruption are difficult to quantify and would be difficult to minimize and mitigate. But as a signpost, some of the key points around potential disruption to Sabic and to the broader chemical sector are set out in section 4.3 of Suffolk's detailed written representation.

01:07:41:16 - 01:07:58:15

Um, it's important, therefore, that protective provisions either provide that the tap cannot be diverted, or the diversion only occurs as an absolute last resort and places very careful limitations and and controls around the applicant's powers of compulsory acquisition of Suffolk's rights.

01:08:00:24 - 01:08:39:27

Um, I wanted to make an important point about Suffolk's status as well, to set the context of its request for protective provisions. Although the pipeline has similar characteristics to the assets of statutory undertakers, Sabic is not itself a statutory undertaker. This means that, notwithstanding the nature of its pipeline subject, doesn't benefit from any of the protections which might otherwise apply. For example, article 42 of the order, which deals with statutory undertakers and the standard protective provisions in part one of schedule ten, i.e.

01:08:39:29 - 01:08:52:24

the Protected Provision Schedule. It's therefore entirely reliant on secure and protected provisions to secure its operators. And we'd ask that the examining authority keeps this in mind when considering this issue.

01:08:55:06 - 01:09:18:26

One important feature of Suffolk's operations is that they are split between two companies. Sabic UK Petrochemicals Limited, which operates the Pep. And Sabic petrochemicals B.V., which owns the

ethylene within the pipelines. This arrangement is one which reflects the international and transcontinental nature of Suffolk's chemical business.

01:09:20:22 - 01:09:38:00

It's a well-established principle that protected provisions have a role in protecting the financial position of an organisation affected by the scheme, because otherwise the authorized development could cause a third party to suffer significant financial losses and therefore put their future operations at risk.

01:09:39:22 - 01:09:40:28

Subjects. Protected provisions.

01:09:41:24 - 01:09:45:14

I think you've had your five minutes, so you're about to wind up. Hopefully.

01:09:46:02 - 01:10:27:25

Uh, I, I am I want to make, uh, I want to make, uh, one more point. So if you could briefly. Thank you. I will do, um, uh, to to to close off the point that I'm making at the moment. Um, the protective provisions therefore provide for the benefit of the indemnity and the insurance policy to include petrochemicals BV. And this is the place and the applicant in the same position that they would usually be. My final point sur is around um, the progress that is being made, but also around what happens if we can't reach final agreement on the outstanding issues.

01:10:28:11 - 01:11:03:09

My previous experience of that scenario is that it can lead to a series of submissions very late in the examination, with each party seeking to have the last say as it addresses points that have been made in the last submission. Um, what we're therefore asking is that in circumstances where agreement has not been reached, that the examining authority should require the submission of a statement of common ground between the applicant and Sabic at deadline six on the 22nd of October, setting out the final position, and that would include each party's preferred protective provisions.

01:11:04:04 - 01:11:35:23

A red line showing the difference between the two, and each party's reasoning as to why their version should be preferred. At the moment, we don't consider the production of the statement of common ground at earlier deadlines as necessary, or a good use of the resources of the parties. So, and we'd rather that those resources are applied towards reaching in a great position. Um, but any statement of common ground, which was submitted at deadline six, could then be limited in scope only to outstanding matters and make good use of the party's time.

01:11:36:18 - 01:11:47:19

Uh, just to close out. So I will set out that request in writing at deadline four. And perhaps the applicant, having heard what I say today, can consider what I've said and do likewise. Thank you sir.

01:11:48:12 - 01:11:58:17

Mr.. Thank thank you very much. And that final point was, I think, well made. Um, and thank you for making that. I think that that's that's a useful contribution. Um.

01:12:00:28 - 01:12:21:05

I don't want to go too far down this because we might be here for some time. Um, is there a way that, um, you can respond so that we can deal with. And these are these are important issues, but, um, um, Mr. Dyke has raised some, some, some points, but, uh, you know, I'm not sure. In today's forum I want to spend too much time on it.

01:12:21:14 - 01:12:42:27

Said Lasdun on behalf of the applicants. Um, I think there are it's important that we just come back on a few points. Um, my colleague Miss Fuller has been dealing with the negotiations with Sabic and the protective provisions. Um, and I think there's just some key principles we probably just need to draw out in terms of where we are. Clearly, discussions are ongoing, but I'll let Miss Fuller do a very brief overview of where we are.

01:12:44:06 - 01:13:22:00

Laura Fuller, on behalf of the applicants. Um, yes. We touched on this briefly yesterday. Um, and obviously welcome and acknowledge the, um submissions from Savic. Um, and we did have a productive meeting on Monday, as I mentioned yesterday, where we did go through these concerns with Sabic. And as I said yesterday, we do strongly feel that we have a way through this with the protective provisions, the version that is currently being negotiated between the parties. Um, I'm certainly personally feel confident that we can resolve this, and I will certainly be aiming to do so before deadline six.

01:13:22:07 - 01:14:01:00

Uh, acknowledging Mr. Dyke's submissions about needing to otherwise provide a statement of common ground. Um. Appreciate that. Uh, in the event we weren't agreed, there would need to be that exchange as he has outlined. Um, so his suggestion does make sense, but I am very confident that we can resolve this through the discussions we're having in relation to the drafting of the protective provisions. But, um, We have proposed some drafting this week, but obviously we're still just in the early stages of discussion in terms of just resolving those key issues that have been highlighted.

01:14:01:06 - 01:14:32:21

Um, I just want to emphasize that there will be definitely be no diversion necessary of the pipeline, um, and certainly no severance. Um, but appreciate that we need to reach agreement on the protective provisions to give the assurances that Sabic require. And also, just to highlight that the updates to the outline ecological management plan, as I think Mr. Dagg acknowledged, that does, um, provide the protections and sets out the buffers in relation to the planting.

01:14:32:23 - 01:14:37:05

Um, so that that also provides protection for the pipeline.

01:14:38:23 - 01:14:52:03

That's very helpful. Um, Mr. Dagg mentioned he's putting in a summary of his submission deadline for. Are you going to be putting anything in on on on in your in early response.

01:14:53:23 - 01:15:19:02

Laura Fuller on behalf of the applicants. I think at this stage, we would just intend to put our update into these these statutory undertakers tracker. The protective provisions tracker. Um, we have got an agreed statement which we would be inserting in there. Um, and I suggest that we wait to see the submissions from Mr. Dagg and then ideally, where we are at deadline five, we hopefully will have some significant progress to report at that point.

01:15:19:23 - 01:15:36:14

One point, Mr. Dagg did mention is that Sabac are not a statutory undertaker. Um, it does seem as though the, you know, this is an important issue. And is it? One way of meeting his concern is to treat them as if they were actually Undertaker.

01:15:37:22 - 01:15:53:14

Laura Fuller, on behalf of the applicants. Um, that is how we have been treating them. Um, and that is why we are including protect provisions acknowledging the importance of the pipeline and obviously the safety concerns around that.

01:15:55:26 - 01:16:15:26

Does that have any more implications? Um, in terms of giving them a sort of formal status? Um, you know, if he's saying they're not a statutory undertakers, strictly speaking, under the terms of the statute. Um, is it possible that you could sort of confirm formally at some stage that they are being treated as if they were one.

01:16:16:14 - 01:16:53:06

Uh, lays done on behalf of the applicants? I think for the purposes of negotiating the protective provisions, they clearly are. They don't then get the benefit of obviously of section one, three one and one, three, two in terms of the, um, serious detriment test that applies. However, given that these concerns have been raised, given that the cables will cross the pipeline, um, and, and we have the environmental mitigation areas, it is um, it's important that these issues are addressed and the applicant's position is that the appropriate place to do that is through those protective provisions.

01:16:53:23 - 01:17:30:23

Um, and um, I would like to just emphasize, emphasize that significant progress has been made, um, and is being made in respect of those appreciating those that and you will say that ultimately there is an element of commercial negotiation within those as well. So there are the, um, there are the, the, the necessary sort of physical protections. Um, but there is a consideration as to the appropriateness of those and in respect of any commercial matters around things like insurance and indemnities, but they are matters that we're discussing at the moment.

01:17:32:08 - 01:17:47:24

Thank you both. That's really helpful. And thank you. Mr.. For, for for joining us today. So, um, I'm going to move on at this stage. Um, and next in line is is Mrs. Sheila Hall. Mrs. Hall, are you. Yes, I can, I can see you. Can you?

01:17:51:01 - 01:17:53:07

Oh, that's gone off. Sorry.

01:17:53:27 - 01:18:12:18

Yeah, you're coming up. So thank you for joining us today. We did? Of course. Um, uh, meet with you on the company's site inspection, and you showed us around, um, uh, the land, um, and have made previous representations and indeed appeared at previous hearings. Is there anything you want to add to your previous submissions today?

01:18:13:05 - 01:18:51:00

And there's a couple of points I would like to make if possible. So thank you for the opportunity to speak at this hearing. Um, I am a local farmer, um, and representing the family farm. Um, sadly, despite the comments made at the first compulsory acquisition hearing on the 2nd of May, the applicant's agents have not engaged meaningfully with my agent on the heads of terms documents over the intervening months, my agent and I remain committed to progressing these discussions with the aim of reaching a voluntary agreement.

01:18:51:22 - 01:19:28:12

But our ability to do so depends on the project team engaging constructively with us. I'd also like to highlight that my agent and I are still struggling to get answers to our questions on the proposed approach on the different areas of my land. Our questions are relate to issues that fundamentally impact what the land can and cannot be used for. During both the construction phases and in the future, which impacts the plans for our the farm and what can and cannot be done long term and short term.

01:19:29:26 - 01:19:37:04

My impacted fields are prime grasslands that currently produce good quality silage to feed dairy cows.

01:19:39:05 - 01:20:03:19

I do not understand how the applicants can state in their current documents that we will be able to resume current agricultural practice. While they also say that they do not yet know the location of key items such as joint bays and link boxes that are likely to significantly and permanently impact the future activity on the land.

01:20:05:22 - 01:20:11:00

The lack of meaningful discussions over recent months is deeply disappointing.

01:20:12:22 - 01:20:52:00

However, the project team issued a letter last week on the 24th of July stating their willingness to work with me and my agent on the agreements. I ask that this time the project team live up to that statement over the coming weeks so that we can make progress. And finally, um, I just want to note is really good that the project team are holding a further land agent engagement meeting at Myerscough College. As unfortunately, not all of us landowners had the opportunity to go to that to to issues with the mailing for the, um, of the invitations.

01:20:52:28 - 01:21:01:27

So hopefully the project team will be able to engage more meaningfully with a number of us landowners in the coming weeks. Thank you.

01:21:03:15 - 01:21:08:11

Thank you very much, Mrs. Hall. Um, very few applicants want to respond at this stage.

01:21:10:01 - 01:21:40:09

Yeah. Good morning, Harry Stubbs, on behalf of both applicants. Um, I just don't thank Mr. Hall for for inputs there. Really, I think, um, as as my colleague, um, uh, Mr. Breen set out, I suppose since the last year hearings, we've endeavoured to increase our engagement and be more visible and more present and and look to engage further. I think there's a couple of items that Miss Hall raises around the impacts that we probably pick up under item seven, if that's easier than covering them twice. Um, okay.

01:21:40:11 - 01:22:10:28

No problem. Thank you. Uh, we do have another meeting booked in, uh, with Mr. Furnival, who is Mrs. Hall's agent? Uh, amongst others. That's him for the 11th. Um, to hopefully progress those terms further. Um, I think just on the landowner event mailing, I'm not 100% sure why invites didn't didn't arrive to certain people. I know Miss Hall's raised that. Miss Hall's raised that previously to us. And, you know, I can offer apologies to it. The agents all were informed as well, though, so we had hoped to cover all they might have.

01:22:11:00 - 01:22:21:12

You know, the message might have got through, but appreciate it hasn't. Hence the second in, uh, invitation going out for the second event, which we hope you know, everyone else can attend.

01:22:23:20 - 01:22:51:27

Thank you for that. Uh, it sounds as though your message has got home, Mrs. Hall. Um, and, uh, the applicants, um, have apologized for any previous, uh, um, misunderstandings. But, um, there is the second event. You got the opportunity. So, uh, um, please, um, uh, you know, continue to, to keep us informed about progress and, um, hopefully things will, will, will move on now. But thank you again for, for for joining us. Is there anything else you want to say or.

01:22:52:13 - 01:22:55:16

No. That was all I had at this point in time. Thank you.

01:22:55:19 - 01:22:56:18

Thank you. Miss. All.

01:23:02:20 - 01:23:14:22

Right. Moving on, Mrs. Mason. I'm not sure. What do you want to speak from back there or whatever's? Yeah, whatever's. Whatever's easier for you, and you stay sitting down, if that helps.

01:23:15:08 - 01:23:15:23

Can you hear me?

01:23:15:25 - 01:23:49:03

Okay. Yeah. Thank you very much. Um, I'm Mason, on behalf of our family dairy farm. Have I got three minutes or five? Just as a point five. Oh, wow. Right. I can speak slower. Thank you. Um, in our farm is impacted heavily by the proposed cable corridor were effectively cut in half. Um, and we have a permanent loss of 40 acres for the Morgan substation. Um, a couple of new points. In 1995, there were 35,700 dairy farms in the UK.

01:23:49:27 - 01:24:22:00

In 2025. There are an estimated 7000. Key drivers include economic pressure, shrinking margins, psychological factors such as the perception of the loss of control or the autonomy over operations. Dairy farmers are economic, economically vulnerable businesses operating on very tight margins. We do not make a large income in comparison with the investments made in infrastructure or the land, or the ridiculously long working hours.

01:24:22:18 - 01:24:53:23

Many other businesses would find a return on our capital capital laughable. Any slight destabilization can have catastrophic effects on our economically vulnerable business. This project, if given the green light, will have a massive destabilising effect on our business and I suspect as our business will be left moribund if it can even survive the construction phase. Promises made to yourselves that the impact statement will be provided by deadline one.

01:24:53:28 - 01:25:05:29

To show the economic impact on each farm holding along the route have. To the best of my knowledge, not being provided, nor, I believe, completed at all. I have written proof of this.

01:25:08:19 - 01:25:23:03

The applicant claims the temporary disruption will not affect the overall viability of farms in App 104 6.113.9. How would they know the impact if they haven't assessed it?

01:25:26:04 - 01:25:57:23

Claims that the applicant affirms their commitment to negotiating with affected parties in affected parties. In rep 30575. 1.13 are stated, yet their behaviour is not of that of a negotiator. From the very first meeting in our farmhouse kitchen on the 11th of October 2023. It was clear that the project was comfortable with using heavy handed techniques and stating we have compulsory purchase powers, but we don't want to use them.

01:25:59:00 - 01:26:31:10

Family members in their 90s have been bombarded with paperwork requiring even their deceased wife to complete this to assist the project with ownership of the land. Negotiations are not improved by the precipitous serving of a section 170 notices on the 20th of March by a project who claimed it has not been possible to agree the terms for voluntary access. This was at best dishonest. As I understand, negotiations were still ongoing.

01:26:32:02 - 01:26:44:16

Yet the project is committed to working with us voluntary heads of terms, for which we were offered a generous £500 to sign included 16, which feels akin to a gagging order.

01:26:46:02 - 01:27:20:21

I'm curious if the behaviour by the applicant, who claims to be committed to negotiation process, would actually prefer instead to use their powers of compulsory purchase. After all, I suspect this will be a cheaper option. I note the blight budget is capped in rep 3056 and in question 51.9. The examining authority asks about this, and I believe there's been professional advice being sought by the applicant. I wonder if the blight is time limited because my land will be sterilised for my future generations.

01:27:22:03 - 01:27:47:13

Compulsory acquisition is not a viable option for our land, and the project is not a welcome business partner. We have diversification projects underway which have been jeopardised by the project and I refute the project's claims. Nor has any party raised specific concerns that the application has impaired their ability to sell land or property. In rep 101 12 and I have evidence of this in my submissions.

01:27:49:24 - 01:28:23:00

We invested heavily in additional farmland as part of our pension pot. I naively thought that owning your own land or property meant it was yours. It seems I was wrong. I can talk for hours about how this uninvited project will negatively impact our business, our beautiful farmland, and has brought additional stress affecting our mental health at a time when, believe me, we have plenty of worries enough. However, I'm only allowed three minutes and given that I horribly suspect this may be a done deal.

01:28:23:06 - 01:28:24:17

I think I better stop here.

01:28:25:09 - 01:28:40:09

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Mason. Um, can I just ask you. Um, in terms of contracts. Um, for for for supply. Do you have a main contract that, um, that you supply to.

01:28:40:12 - 01:28:57:03

It's dairy? We have temporary. I mean, I have to be honest, we've temporary, um, stopped my dairy enterprise, paused it. Mhm. Um, so at the moment, we have paused our dairy operations with a full intention of going back into it. So the company we would supply, I presume I'm allowed to say the name is Arla.

01:29:00:17 - 01:29:06:11

And that's for how many. Um in when, when operational. How many in the dairy herd again.

01:29:06:18 - 01:29:25:02

Um, I'd have to ask my husband, um, who isn't currently here, I'm afraid, but I can find out for you. Yeah. Um, it's a pretty large dairy herd. I don't know if Mr. Fehr can jump in with, um, how big my farm is for me. Um, but it's about a 400 acre, um, farm. I couldn't just tell you the number of heads of cattle off the top of my head.

01:29:25:04 - 01:29:29:06

Okay. Thank you. Uh, over to the applicant.



01:29:29:28 - 01:30:08:22

Thank you. Sir. Les. Don. On behalf of the applicants, I'll deal with the sort of more technical points. Um, and then, um, probably hand over to Mr. Stubbs, um, to talk about the engagement perspective. Um, so just in terms of, um, the hearing action point and the expectation around a, a sort of economic appraisal of, um, of the farm business, I think, um, the wording of the hearing action point was to provide a series of plans showing the distribution of landholdings within the order limits, and that was what was that was what was provided by the applicants.

01:30:09:10 - 01:30:40:11

Uh, I know, um, miss Mason has been in touch with the applicants regarding requests for information, and those have been provided. Um, and I think it's been made very clear that the information that she sought isn't information that the applicants have. At this stage, there hasn't been that detailed assessment done in respect of her property. Uh, so just, um, in terms of the, um, section 172 notices, which are the, um, notices, uh, effectively requiring access to land for survey.

01:30:40:26 - 01:31:17:23

Um, appreciate that they are, um, often unwelcome and may sometimes come when there are negotiations around license, but there are situations where the timing is such that that you need to get onto land at a particular time to undertake surveys. So they are very much a last resort. Um, and um, the applicants obviously do it as a very much as I say, as sort of a last resort. Um, miss Mason also mentioned, um, blight. I think we've gone round and round this one a bit in terms of of what's been there, uh, and the discussions on blight.

01:31:18:01 - 01:31:48:28

Um, the applicants haven't had any indication from any party that they would be considering serving a polite notice in respect of this property, and it is just worth noting that blight is where people want to sell their home or their business, or whatever it is. Um, prior to the compulsory acquisition taking place. And nobody, as our understanding is that nobody wants that to happen.

01:31:49:07 - 01:32:30:11

It's certainly not the applicant or the professional team. Advisors experienced that on this type of project, which is which is, um, the provision of, of um, underground cables that um, the outcome is that businesses do sell or go out of business. It's about accommodation. It's about making those things work together. And I think we are going to talk about it more in respect of, of item seven in terms of how that's done. But it certainly isn't the intention, as I say, or the experience of the applicants or their team, that that is the outcome of of these sections of cable.

01:32:30:13 - 01:32:44:22

You know, underground cabling in, in this environment is very different to high risk projects or things like that, where, where clearly that that is a more, a more frequent, um, uh, activity. So I'll pass over to Mr.. Um.

01:32:48:23 - 01:32:49:08

Sorry.

01:32:50:02 - 01:33:30:10

Yeah. Can I, can I just buzz in? Um, except what you say about the the economic appraisals. Um, and I think that's correct. As, as as as as you updated it. But I think there are certain businesses, um, where that probably would be a really useful analysis. And this is one of them. Um, so is it something I think that could be should be prepared and considered because, um, you know, it was it was apparent from, from our investigation at this site when we did the company's site inspection.

01:33:30:25 - 01:33:44:07

Um, and, and from the plans that you were talking about that you produced, um, there was was quite an impact on, on a certain number of farms and this was certainly one of them. So is that something which could be considered?

01:33:44:19 - 01:34:15:13

So it is done on behalf of the applicants. We will take it away. Um, I think we have explained previously that one of the biggest challenges of doing this type of appraisal is the information that we need in order to undertake it, and it clearly requires the parties whose lands are affected to provide that information. Um, in terms of being able to undertake that assessment. So that's not just about the existing practice, but use of other land. Uh, and those and those sorts of, and those sorts of things.

01:34:15:15 - 01:34:26:21

So we'll take it away and think about it in terms of how we could do it. And and we will we'll come back on that in terms of whether it's a possibility.

01:34:26:27 - 01:34:32:28

Could you come back by deadline for us to, you know, whether or not it's if anything's possible?

01:34:33:15 - 01:34:34:23

Yes, sir. We will.

01:34:34:25 - 01:34:35:29

Thank you. Thank you.

01:34:38:05 - 01:35:16:04

Yeah. Good. Good morning, Harry Stubbs, on behalf of the applicants again. I don't know whether it's appropriate or not, but I'm unfortunately one of those stats that miss Mason mentioned of being a dairy farmer. So I do have empathy there and understand the position. Um, I think just taking a couple of the points around there, I think, again, underwriting seven will probably come on to some of the accommodation and mitigation pieces. But one of the two of the things I did just want to pick up is the, um, perceived sort of gagging, uh, clause within the terms. There is a clause within the, um, within the heads of terms that, that, that requests removal of objections and parties when they decide not to object.

01:35:16:21 - 01:35:25:04

Um, this is is tested, uh, under the East Anglia projects. Um, by. I just get my reference completely right.

01:35:25:06 - 01:35:26:21

Mr. Stubbs, I'm just stopping you.

01:35:26:23 - 01:35:27:08

Sorry.

01:35:27:14 - 01:35:37:27

This this is the way every project goes ahead. So. So, um, you know that that's not lost on us, so I don't really want to hear too much about that point. I accept what you what I think you're going to say.

01:35:38:02 - 01:36:09:23

No, no. Absolutely. Fine. Thank you very much. Um, well, I suppose just moving on then. There are matters are outstanding there, you know, regarding location of ponds and, um, also some of the, um, mitigation land and adjustment, I think we are trying to look to address some of those through the voluntary agreements where, where possible. Uh, we do have another meeting again in the diary, uh, with the effective parties, agents on the 11th of August. Uh, and we are, you know, very willing to keep progressing this and trying to look to come to some form of voluntary solution to a lot of the issues.

01:36:16:25 - 01:36:49:08

That that. That's fine. Um, there will be some general questions later, Mrs. Mason. So, um, I don't know whether you're staying for the rest of the, um, the meeting. Um, because, um, you know, clearly there's going to be more information coming from the application later, which, which which I think might be helpful to you. Um, but thank you very much for for your contribution and coming, coming today. Um, it's it's now 1107. So I think it's probably a good time that we have a break.

01:36:50:01 - 01:37:00:04

Um, so break till, um, 1125. Adjourned till 1125. Thank you very much indeed.