



Planning Inspectorate  
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	EN010140 - Helios Renewable Energy
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Part 4
<b>Date:</b>	12 March 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.

## ISH2 PT4

00:00:04:23 - 00:00:06:19

Good morning again.

00:00:08:13 - 00:00:11:17

As it's now 1150.

00:00:13:06 - 00:00:21:07

I'll just wait for a few people to return, or perhaps give an indication if their teams are complete or, um.

00:00:23:20 - 00:00:35:09

I'll just turn to council. I mean, you're still. You're still here. Um, a couple of interested parties of departed. So. Thank you. Um, we'll resume,

00:00:36:27 - 00:00:42:01

um, this hearing, um, at.

00:00:44:21 - 00:00:45:23

Item nine.

00:00:47:27 - 00:00:54:16

Unless there's any further. I'm just looking around the room just to see if there's any. Any. Am I getting some echo here?

00:01:04:28 - 00:01:39:25

Is that better? Thank you. Um, so my intention was to press on if there's any. Anything to mop up at the end. We we do have an AOB slot, but I think, um, looking at people in the room, I think it looks like we're on to item nine in my slightly tweaked agenda. So, so with reference to the timetable, I'm due to consult on any recommended changes to the DCO on the 2nd of May. Um, from my reading of statements of common ground pads and written submissions, for most matters there is progress towards resolution.

00:01:40:17 - 00:02:12:08

I would I would same time encourage all parties to resolve as many matters as possible by deadline seven. Um, that then provides for greater clarity uncertainty earlier in the process. So I'm just trying to encourage you to carry on doing what you're doing and try and move towards resolution as quickly as you can. Really? Um, so I'm going to stick to my roughly the order. So I'm going to start with protective provisions. Um, and ask the applicant, um, briefly.

00:02:12:10 - 00:02:17:02

Well, briefly to provide an update on where we are with these. Thank you.

00:02:20:06 - 00:02:57:24

Um, Catherine Tracy for the applicant. Uh, yes, sir, for protective provisions, we have, um, we will be reaching agreement with everybody, I think is a headline term, sir. Uh, before the end of the examination and some more imminently than others. Um, the Environment Agency protective provisions are predominantly agreed. There is, um, a one, one, uh, clause within there that we're currently still discussing, but I would imagine that that would be resolved, um, certainly by deadline seven.

00:02:57:26 - 00:03:04:10

So, um, and then in respect of the utility providers.

00:03:06:06 - 00:03:11:09

So let me get my notes because I get the, the various acronyms regularly confused.

00:03:11:11 - 00:03:17:04

So I can prompt you, can you, can you start with, um, can you start with national gas transmission as they are.

00:03:17:06 - 00:03:43:15

Now national gas transmission? We are in discussions with um, the lawyers on that. There is, um, progress being made. We've spoken to them and they've agreed with us that we're able to give you the updates, uh, jointly, so to speak, that, um, they have no concerns that this will be resolved by theirs is by the end of the examination, I would be a little bit more hopeful that we, again, can do that before D7.

00:03:43:23 - 00:04:10:05

Can we, um, could we be more specific in the in the in things that I can't stand? I'll describe the way you've sort of been sort of bundled up, haven't they. The gas emissions the and water sign in sewage, I think, um, as a sort of a generic set and I and I've seen national gas transmission, um, and I've also observed that they do have a national transmission pipeline that crosses the site at three points. Um.

00:04:11:05 - 00:04:19:14

So they're going to have their bespoke. They will have a bespoke set of protective provisions added to the draft development consent order. Um, that's what we're currently working on with them.

00:04:19:16 - 00:04:28:00

Do you not? How likely is it that in the end you will agree to their standard protective provisions?

00:04:30:23 - 00:04:43:29

There will be an agreed set on the face of the DCO. Sir, I I'm comfortable that they will be there and we are working on their. They have presented us with their standard protected provisions and that's what we're currently working through with them.

00:04:45:06 - 00:05:20:10

Okay. I think that sounds that sounds that sounds. So getting there. Yeah. Use that expression. Um, I'm, I suppose I dwelt on that because they do have. They obviously have an asset nationally, a national transmission pipeline. So I'd be I'd be I think I would be surprised if they moved much from

their standard position. Um, I think I think they, I think in the latest in the, uh, uh, East Yorkshire um, at this stage of the process, I think that's, um, the standard will come in, I think.

00:05:20:14 - 00:05:23:26

Yes. Yes, sir. Um. The discussions.

00:05:24:17 - 00:05:26:14

No reason to depart. I says I'm sort of.

00:05:26:16 - 00:05:28:07

We are we're apart a little bit.

00:05:28:12 - 00:05:28:27

Um, a little.

00:05:28:29 - 00:05:59:15

Bit on certain points, but I think we are cognizant that they, they do have a mains gas transmission line through the site. We have designed the scheme, though in a way that means that there is very limited interaction with that. Um, and during operation actually, so during construction, um, we've got the set off distances anyway, we're not putting any panels and we, we have no need to To adversely affect their infrastructure. Um, we're doing what's quite surface level.

00:05:59:22 - 00:06:11:15

Um, work. So with tracks or laying cables. Um, and, and that's the discussion we're having because we've, we're, we're talking to the lawyers. These are our standard sets. And therefore we're just working to see if there's any bespoke arrangements.

00:06:11:18 - 00:06:24:12

I mean, I, I appreciate the fact that you're not you've not got a raise on top of the pipeline. Yeah, yeah. Um, but nevertheless there will be interactions. Obviously there's a cable route corridor crossing the pipeline, for example.

00:06:24:14 - 00:06:24:29

Yes, sir.

00:06:25:01 - 00:06:33:27

Yeah, a number of points. Okay. Moving on, because I just wanted to on that one a bit about um, net um.

00:06:35:06 - 00:06:58:19

That's a oh, that's a very similar position, sir. Um, that we are currently talking to them. You'll be aware that most of the, um, utility providers these days have their, their standard bespoke, uh, standard sets of PRS that they would like us to use. And that's the same position they're we're actually waiting for them to come back to us at the moment. On the latest round of comments.

00:06:58:21 - 00:07:08:09

Their submission, they, they, they have some, perhaps not surprisingly, works that may interact or be coordinated. Other projects that may have an interface.

00:07:08:11 - 00:07:15:08

Yes, that's actually been agreed that that doesn't apply to this scheme. So it has been that's an agreed point. Now that that's not relevant to these.

00:07:15:10 - 00:07:19:24

Right. Okay. That's that's helpful. But but do you think at the same position do you think it will.

00:07:20:03 - 00:07:20:27

Absolutely sir.

00:07:21:00 - 00:07:25:27

There's no by the seven or you're talking then examination as per usual.

00:07:25:29 - 00:07:38:21

The certainty I can give is definitely by the end of the examination. Um, we are waiting to see what their latest set of comments is. So it depends on the standard. Okay. We are as keen as you are, sir, for them to be done as early as possible.

00:07:38:23 - 00:07:41:10

Oh, just, um, you know, I'm just, uh, trying to.

00:07:42:05 - 00:08:12:14

As you know, this this is a an area that often gets left right to the very end, and it can be. Yes. Uh, if the if, when it happens is too late, it really is not helpful to the EXR and having to to sort of resolve the differences and invite a whole new set of divisions or somehow, um, um, resolve it afterwards. Um, I think what was the other one? Um, um, it would have been you can tell me which one it is, the other. The other.

00:08:12:23 - 00:08:15:21

And I know the local electricity company.

00:08:15:23 - 00:08:25:15

And PG and Northern Powergrid, um, that's in a very similar situation to, to end jet. So in that we're waiting for them to come back to us with a set of comments.

00:08:28:16 - 00:08:50:07

Um, yeah. And we don't have any, um, concerns that that won't be agreed by the end of the examination earlier, if at all possible. We've we have been in contact with all the lawyers negotiating for the relative part, um, undertakers. And they've all agreed that that's a joint statement. They don't have any concerns either.

00:08:51:10 - 00:08:52:05

Okay. Okay, fine.

00:08:52:16 - 00:08:55:10

And I just think the only other one is Network Rail.

00:08:55:23 - 00:09:00:07

Yeah. So I saw that it was a slightly intriguing one. So go and you can you can blame that one.

00:09:00:11 - 00:09:30:18

Yeah. Um, so so they have um rights of access across land owned by Drax to maintain the Network Rail infrastructure. Um, the railway which we're interfacing with, um, and for the cable corridor is, is a private railway. It's Drax is railway, not network rails. Um, so Network Rail will not be requiring a set of protected provisions because it's it's not their asset.

00:09:30:20 - 00:09:38:17

But we are dealing with talking to them about how we can ensure that their rights won't be affected. So there'll be an agreed position for you.

00:09:39:00 - 00:09:41:23

Um, okay, fine. I understand the analysis.

00:09:43:08 - 00:09:47:06

Is there any need to have any discussions with Drax over their there. By the way.

00:09:48:05 - 00:10:01:03

Uh, we have, um, an agreement. Negotiated voluntary agreement with Drax in order to be able to, um, trench this cable under their railway. Okay, so.

00:10:01:05 - 00:10:06:11

Is that in the, um, is that referred to in the examination? Okay.

00:10:06:26 - 00:10:22:16

Um, it's we've got it's in legals. It is being agreed. It is not yet agreed. Um, it's we are taking the rights in the DCO in the same way that we are for all the other cable works, but we're not envisaging needing to rely upon them.

00:10:26:15 - 00:10:43:07

Okay. Thank you. Has anybody. What? You touched on E, didn't you, at the top of that? Um, yeah, I'm trying to think. Okay, I think that's I think I understand the direction of travel and then these things go through, um, you know, iterations and comment lawyers to lawyers. So I understand it takes time.

00:10:44:26 - 00:10:51:29

Okay. I'll move on from protective provisions then. Um, schedule 11 documents to be certified. I just want to. If, um,

00:10:53:23 - 00:10:57:06

um, I'll turn to the council if. Yeah,

00:10:58:21 - 00:11:23:00

I'm. I'm thinking of the outline plans and strategies. Um, the applicant, as I understand, has already made some modifications. Um, are you wishing to see any further changes to any particular outline plans? Possibly with the exception of the one we spoke about earlier, but but in terms of if you could, you know, is there anything further you're seeking at this stage?

00:11:27:25 - 00:11:33:01

Thinking that the CMP and the construction traffic management plan, um,

00:11:35:01 - 00:11:46:01

I can't remember them all off the top of my head, but I think you can. We can, we can if you want to. We can, um, just pull up the the schedule or something of the tract draft DCO.

00:11:46:22 - 00:11:56:16

I think that's, um, still under review with us at the moment, but we've got. Sorry. I think it's still under review with us at the moment on ongoing review. Okay. Okay. I've got nothing to add.

00:11:57:03 - 00:12:03:27

Okay. I think about the stage. Uh, is that the way the applicant perceives it in terms of the council's position?

00:12:04:13 - 00:12:32:13

Uh, Catherine Treacy for the applicant, I believe so. So we've had some comments from the council on parts of the DCO, but I do believe there are other parts that they're still reviewing. Um, in terms of schedule 11, just to flag, we've not yet updated. Okay. Um, this we were proposing only to update it once at the end of the examination, but if it would be helpful, we can update it. But we would need to add in to that the, um, glint and glare mitigation strategy that we need to do, I suppose.

00:12:32:15 - 00:12:35:12

Going back to what I said at the intro, if, if.

00:12:35:14 - 00:12:35:29

As.

00:12:36:01 - 00:13:00:27

A requirement, if I could have the most up to date, most complete version by did I say um, applied Five seven. Because obviously what unconscious is, I'd like to go to one place and find everything, and then I can consider what recommend the changes I might be making. Does that, does that, does that. That might be a very slight modification to the timetable perhaps. I don't know if it is, but but um, um.

00:13:01:24 - 00:13:09:28

Uh, I think um, yes, we can we can provide you with an updated version of the DCO at D7 with as in an as advanced state as possible.

00:13:10:00 - 00:13:11:22

I understand that it's still and we'll.

00:13:12:06 - 00:13:37:01

We'll work with, um, with everybody as well to be able to provide some guidance. So, for example, on the Environment Agency, there is the one clause we're arguing about is an indemnity clause. Sir, that's probably not of great surprise. Um, okay. So we we may well be able to insert the protective provisions, so far as they are agreed with the drafting note to say this is where we're currently at, if that would be useful.

00:13:37:21 - 00:13:51:28

I think so, I think just so it's it's, it's it makes it a little bit easier for me to understand what's left in one place. And, um, uh, and then if I can see what's left to do, if you like, and what I might need to come back on.

00:13:52:00 - 00:14:05:28

Yes, sir. And we are, um, in terms of the various management plans with the council, for example, they have already agreed the TMP. So the construction traffic management plan, I thought is, is agreed. Um, but as I suspect it's the length.

00:14:06:25 - 00:14:08:19

And that's why I said there may be some more work on.

00:14:08:21 - 00:14:14:26

That so we can provide it. We can we can certainly do an update of where we think things are agreed and who with. Yes. And therefore.

00:14:15:13 - 00:14:20:05

Appreciate this. This is probably to some extent you may already have it in this statement.

00:14:20:16 - 00:14:22:21

Probably got it across multiple documents.

00:14:22:26 - 00:14:35:20

I don't want to I don't want to have more and more things that say the same thing. But but if the appropriate document could be updated. So that is clear. Put it like that. That's um, that might be a and if that fits in with the timetable. So there's something that you can.

00:14:36:06 - 00:14:53:24

We'll see if we can do um a table in the post hearing some research because I appreciate that. You know, some documents are, um, Environment Agency and the council or Natural England and the council. So we can we can say where we think they all are and then at least people can either agree or disagree. Okay.

00:14:54:06 - 00:14:57:07



I think okay. I think it will become clear. And it um,

00:14:58:25 - 00:15:17:28

so I've given the council um, I think you've covered the e um, I had a comment here. Um, Natural England, I think we've had the update about Natural England. Um, are there any other statutory consultees have asked for changes to be made to any of the certified, any of the scheduled 11 documents?

00:15:21:16 - 00:15:27:03

Catherine Tracy if the applicant. No, sir. Not so far as we're aware. Not that haven't already been picked up in the updated version.

00:15:27:05 - 00:15:55:03

As to the position as of now. Yes. No, no. Okay, fine. I'll move on to requirements. Um, because the applicant provided commentary on other changes that have been made and why they've been made. Compared with, you know, as in terms of the track change version, compared with other versions. Is that possible? Just to briefly, I don't think there are many. I'm not trying to make up, you know that.

00:15:55:07 - 00:16:08:16

Um, so there aren't many. Um, they're set out in the DCO Schedule of Changes document, um, that accompanies the folder that accompanies the draft DCO.

00:16:11:29 - 00:16:14:00

And was submitted at deadline for.

00:16:17:26 - 00:16:21:14

I must admit, I tend to work off the track change version of the the the DCI.

00:16:21:16 - 00:16:23:03

I agree, sir, that's okay.

00:16:23:24 - 00:16:25:17

Um, but one document I can.

00:16:25:24 - 00:17:04:15

The only advantage of the schedule of Changes document is it provides you the reason a bit more as to why there has been the change. Yes. Um, so, um, in terms of what has changed throughout in terms of the requirements. So decommissioning and restoration requirement has changed. And that was to add national highways to the um consultees for the deconstruction decommissioning traffic management plan, because while they were entirely comfortable with the highway network as it is today 40 years hence, they were concerned that they might it might have changed.

00:17:04:24 - 00:17:39:13

Um, it was also, um, updated to make it clear that the decommissioning, uh, the damp environmental management plan must be submitted no later than 12 months prior to the decommissioning. And it was also a concern that there was sufficient funding secured to ensure decommissioning in the event

that the undertaker didn't, because that would not probably rest with the landowner. So there was an amendment to include some wording regarding that as well.

00:17:39:28 - 00:17:47:25

Um, we've also updated. Um, there was an inconsistency between business days and working days in the.

00:17:48:03 - 00:17:51:18

I saw. So I did notice there's 7 to 5 days and seven days.

00:17:51:21 - 00:17:59:13

That's right. So what we've done is we've just, um, reverted everything to, um, days.

00:17:59:26 - 00:18:00:25

Right. Okay.

00:18:01:02 - 00:18:03:28

So that there is no inconsistency there.

00:18:04:00 - 00:18:06:13

Is that is that common? Is that a consistent with other.

00:18:06:25 - 00:18:11:15

Uh. They go one way or the other, sir, and there doesn't appear to be much in it.

00:18:11:17 - 00:18:12:05

Consistent.

00:18:12:14 - 00:18:19:08

There's no there's no rule on it. Must be business days or it must be days. But as long as it's clear, it should be consistent, which it is throughout.

00:18:19:10 - 00:18:19:25

As long as it's.

00:18:19:27 - 00:18:20:16

Clear the DTA.

00:18:20:21 - 00:18:22:06

And consistent within the.

00:18:22:08 - 00:18:25:15

Document. So it is now internally consistent with itself.

00:18:26:05 - 00:18:26:29

Yes. Okay.

00:18:27:16 - 00:18:36:17

Um, article two has been updated. So article uh, this was in relation to site preparation works? Yes.

00:18:36:22 - 00:18:40:12

Yes. You're going backwards. You're going to the. You're going to the other areas now, aren't you?

00:18:40:21 - 00:18:42:28

Yes, yes. I don't think there's any other requirement.

00:18:43:00 - 00:18:44:26

No, no. Carry on. That's why.

00:18:47:02 - 00:18:49:15

Oh sorry. Sorry, sir. Just in requirements.

00:18:49:21 - 00:18:51:13

I'm just trying to structure it so I understand where we are.

00:18:51:21 - 00:18:52:12

I've just run through it.

00:18:52:18 - 00:18:53:03

Yeah.

00:18:53:05 - 00:19:03:23

Deadline amendments, sir, but, um, requirement for which is the construction environmental management plan has been amended to include the Environment Agency as a consultee.

00:19:03:25 - 00:19:04:10

Yes.

00:19:04:12 - 00:19:04:27

Okay.

00:19:04:29 - 00:19:08:00

Yeah. And that was whose request was that? Yeah.

00:19:08:21 - 00:19:25:10

And we've added two new requirements from the Environment Agency, which are the hydrogeological risk assessment and the Foundation works assessment, which have been added in as 19 and 20. So just in the requirements section, just for ease of not needing to renumber everything.

00:19:26:15 - 00:19:27:12

Okay. Okay.

00:19:27:21 - 00:19:31:19

Yeah. That wording has been agreed with the Environment Agency.

00:19:31:21 - 00:19:33:14

The source of those are the No. Yes.

00:19:33:16 - 00:19:55:13

Yes. Yes. They were environmental agency concerns. Um, if we're staying in the requirements in just in schedule two for a moment, um, it's worth looking at part two of schedule two, where it's, uh, the days has been its business days has been changed, but it's also been extended, um, which is as a result of a request by the council.

00:19:55:15 - 00:20:00:18

I think I remember that, I think I yes, I think was that discussion previous.

00:20:00:20 - 00:20:15:26

That was an Isa, I think one, yes. And we also had a follow up meeting with them. I think actually strictly speaking there, um, they're proposed amendment was actually for 21 days or something. And we've, we've just gone with 28. We're more than comfortable.

00:20:16:00 - 00:20:24:15

And I could just ask the council, I mean, I assume that you're happy with that timescale for us. And, uh, I'm going to get the give you the reference.

00:20:24:24 - 00:20:25:09

Um.

00:20:27:20 - 00:20:30:19

It's a requirement 23 to 23 micro.

00:20:31:01 - 00:20:55:12

Um, I'm just looking at the, uh, decommissioning, um, requirements. Um, I haven't actually seen the dump, so I'm sure my colleague probably has, but I'm just wondering if there is sufficient, um, clause in here to make sure that the decommissioning and restoration does actually occur within a specific timescale and is completed. Um, and second.

00:20:55:14 - 00:21:00:11

Unless something isn't, I think that what he said, I think you've already covered that unless I misheard.

00:21:01:23 - 00:21:14:24

Uh, yes, sir. That that is that's it's required. It's required to. The dump is required to be complied with as part of the decommissioning requirement. And is it required to be?

00:21:16:25 - 00:21:18:29

Yeah, but they want the decommissioning completed.

00:21:19:01 - 00:21:19:16

Within.

00:21:20:20 - 00:21:21:12

Six period.

00:21:26:13 - 00:21:37:09

I'm not sure that the requirement certainly doesn't require it to be completed within a certain period of time, but I would have to check the at the dump.

00:21:40:18 - 00:21:58:08

Itself. But I mean, if that was required, I'm sure we could agree a suitable time period where the environmental statement makes an assumption of how long it would take to decommission of being approximately 12 months or so. If a long stop date needed to be agreed, we could do that.

00:21:59:09 - 00:22:36:13

I think it's just having those those safeguards within, within the dump so that it is something that, um, we can actually require to, to, to, to, to, to bring it about. So it's clear it's got to be, um, decommissioned and land restored by a certain date. And the second point was just whether whether there needs to be something. I mean, technology, technology changes. Um, if in 20 or 25 years time, these aren't actually in use. Is there any sort of claw to, um, bring about, uh, a decommissioning or restoration earlier if the, um,

00:22:37:28 - 00:22:41:18

facility does not continue to be in commission?

00:22:43:05 - 00:22:48:24

Interesting question. I mean, is that is that is that how would that work? Could that could that happen?

00:22:51:05 - 00:23:01:23

Um, what's the solar panels are installed so they have a warranty and an anticipated life of 40 years, hence the 40 year time limit of the development. And therefore, um.

00:23:02:01 - 00:23:06:18

I don't at this stage, there's no there's no how can I say it's not foreseeable?

00:23:06:22 - 00:23:33:18

Um, we are at expressly, um, restricted from repowering, sir. That was um, that was part of the conversation at ish one. And actually the definition of maintain of our development expressly excludes wholesale repowering so that that is not, um, able to occur. It hasn't been assessed in the environmental statement. The DCO does not permit it. It is a put the panels up. Leave them alone, I think and decommission.

00:23:33:20 - 00:23:57:12

If I've got any questions about that around this sort of some of the real nitty gritty details, I'll do them in writing because I think it's difficult to difficult to cover in a hearing, but I think it's raised. It's reminded me of a point I had in my mind. I think that's relevant to that. So that's okay. I think. I think I'm okay with that. Um, so requirements, I think have we done we've done on requirements I.

00:23:57:14 - 00:23:59:06

Just got can I just can I just ask him.

00:23:59:08 - 00:24:00:03

Yes. Of course. Okay. Yeah.

00:24:01:00 - 00:24:06:19

I wasn't aware we'd actually finished some cumulative effects earlier on. We can we can we can.

00:24:06:21 - 00:24:08:18

We just, can we just leave it to the end and.

00:24:08:24 - 00:24:09:21

Finish this and go back to.

00:24:09:23 - 00:24:18:15

It? Yeah, I think that's I obviously I heard some discussions going on I think might be related to that. So rather than do it now can we go back again.

00:24:18:17 - 00:24:28:03

Yeah okay. Okay. And I just have another query about um, the requirement number three, the detailed design approval.

00:24:30:00 - 00:25:20:21

Um, yeah, it's kind of linking that with the parameters, because if there's lack of clarity on some of the parameters points, um, you know, something's down to, um, uh, design guidance. Um, there could be some quite unclear areas here where we're could potentially have areas of disagreement. Um, for example, just in terms of, you know, the scale and the layout of the, um, of the particular elements of the scheme or the fencing, um, we may have, you know, particular ideas about trying to minimise the impact through, um, for example, less use of, of, um, steel fencing, given it's a rural location, we might want some, you know, green, green coated steel fencing or something.

00:25:20:23 - 00:25:40:08

So there's, there's a big sort of quite a big gap between this condition, this requirement and the parameters that we just, uh, we probably want to just either tighten up through the parameters plan or have, um, you know, further detail or safeguards within this, this, uh, requirement.

00:25:41:29 - 00:25:43:14

I think I, I think

00:25:45:07 - 00:26:14:03

I'll, I'll ask the applicant to respond to that. I think it falls into this, this sort of area of we've got these, we've got the requirements, we've got the outline management plans. But you're, you're sort of raising your console. Well, how how do you I think it's a question I must ask. Have you got sufficient control over the design or the final design. The, the ultimate design that's built. Have you how is that. Where is that in the in the process. Where is that in the documentation. So I think I'll just refer that to the applicant.

00:26:15:05 - 00:26:48:11

Uh thank you, sir. Catherine Tracy for the applicant. Um, the detailed design is to be approved by the council. It is to be in accordance with the works plans, which set out where the panel areas will be and where the mitigation areas are, etc., and the principles and assessments set out in the environmental statement. So if we haven't, we've assessed a reasonable worst case scenario, which is the worst we could do. Anything else would always be better than that and therefore should be a lesser impact.

00:26:48:13 - 00:26:55:24

So I would suggest the council have all the control they need. If they're asking us now to commit to detailed design, that's not what we're applying for.

00:26:58:03 - 00:27:04:06

So that's, that's, that's that's where we're at basically. Yeah, that's where we're at. Um.

00:27:07:04 - 00:27:13:07

Any more are there any more comments on on the requirements or you'd like to make or the council would like to make?

00:27:13:12 - 00:27:45:24

No, I think it's just that it's just, um, sort of with my planning hat on, you know, comparing this practice to a, an outline application and reserved matters, if we're, for example, you know, numbers we might want to, you know, have have pinned down in an outline on a parameters plan. So that so there's, um, clarity when it comes to submitting the reserved matters. And I think on, on this site overall, um, you know, setting aside the principle of it, it, you know, the landscape assessments being done on the basis of sort of worst case scenario.

00:27:45:26 - 00:28:17:21

But if this was, uh, you know, um, a planning case, we might perhaps be looking at the, the, the scale and concentration of what's being proposed. And because this has been on a landscaping has been assessed on, on a worst case scenario, it gives us less opportunity to perhaps say, well, on those particular fields, you know, we can reduce the impact by reducing the number of, um, solar panels or, or lessening the spread of the area and introducing more landscaping.

00:28:17:23 - 00:28:50:13

So there isn't the opportunity to to do that through um, through through the requirements. It's, it's it's now through looking at the, um, the, the plans that have been submitted and the visual impact that we need to assess that, um, overall harm to the character of the area and the cumulative impacts. Um, so

we're it's not something we can deal with through, through, through through the requirements. It's more looking at the what has been submitted now.

00:28:53:05 - 00:29:01:15

Okay. Um, do you want to come back again or is there anything further to to add to what you said or.

00:29:04:15 - 00:29:36:29

Not really sir. I mean, we, we have set out clearly where the panel areas will be. This is 190 megawatt, um, scheme. We need enough panels to generate that. Um, the environmental assessment has been done on that basis. The landscaping strategy. Mitigation strategy has been developed sensitively with the landscape and with other constraints we're delivering BNG. Um. This is exactly how an outline application would be taken forward if it was a tcpa, um, with all matters reserved, sir.

00:29:37:01 - 00:29:37:16

So.

00:29:39:11 - 00:29:46:19

Okay. Okay. Um, I think I'll move on. Um, I think if there's nothing more on requirements, I'll.

00:29:46:21 - 00:30:43:18

I'll say I do have a couple of points on requirements. I've noticed that in requirement three, actually, there is a typographical error. Um, well, no, actually, sorry there isn't. There is a typographical error in requirement 14, which is about fencing, um, where we refer to three L, and actually that needs to be all three one. And it needs to be um, really 31J. But um, I think I would just flag that we need to add a requirement for the glint and glare mitigation strategy, and we are going to need to tweak the fencing requirement, um, slightly as a result of, uh, the amendment that was made to the definition of commence, as, um, the Council and Natural England were concerned with the breadth of site preparation works that could be undertaken without all the various management plans being signed off.

00:30:43:22 - 00:31:09:03

Um, we took that point and we have therefore slimmed down the definition of commence in article two. Um, and site preparation works accordingly in the interpretation section as well. But that just means there's a consequential amendment to, um, requirement 14 that just needs to be picked up, and that is to strike out the words um, includes any site preparation works in subparagraph two.

00:31:09:05 - 00:31:19:02

I think I noticed that that yeah, that's narrowed down the the breadth of site preparation to not include things like demolition And what I will call construction, if you like. Yeah.

00:31:19:05 - 00:31:19:24

Yes, that's right sir.

00:31:19:26 - 00:31:22:23

Yeah. Okay. Okay. Um,



00:31:24:11 - 00:31:57:29

anything you'd like to add? I don't I don't want to close it down prematurely. So. So. Okay, we've already touched on some of the other changes. Um, let me just return to my notes, requirements, other parts and schedules. Was there anything else? Um. Oh, yes. I'd say something from yesterday, wasn't there? Was that you did say, I think that you were considering some changes to the requirements in relation to the gliding club. Is there anything more you can say about that in today's session, or is that still working progress?

00:31:58:21 - 00:32:24:16

Uh, so that's the introduction of a requirement to ensure that we produce a glint and glare mitigation strategy. Now that the club have seen the updated glint and glare and had the opportunity to put their submission in so we would That will be. We'll draft something and circulate it, but it will be for approval by the local planning authority. Um, but it's just to secure that we deliver it.

00:32:24:18 - 00:32:28:26

That's all I was looking for. Yeah, just just to recap on that point. Um.

00:32:32:01 - 00:32:41:24

Does anybody know, uh, would any other interested party like to comment on, uh, the draft DCO, the outline management plans, the requirements?

00:32:43:27 - 00:32:46:03

No. That's fine. Okay. Um.

00:32:49:13 - 00:32:53:06

So I'm going to. Oh, Mr. Wilkinson. Okay.

00:32:53:08 - 00:32:59:06

I don't know if this is an appropriate time to do it, but I'd like to bring some up again on the landscape and visual, if that's all right.

00:32:59:13 - 00:33:27:18

Well, what I what I'll do then is I'd rather sort of do a, we'll do item ten which is action points. And I'd be like yesterday I'll say, well people I think have picked up any action points. I don't suggest we, we try and summarize what runs through them, um, and then move straight on to any other business, and then we can just pick up anybody who feels they'd like to say a bit more about cumulative effects or anything that's relevant to the agenda of any, um,

00:33:29:07 - 00:33:30:23

does that want to comment on that?

00:33:31:19 - 00:33:37:01

I've got a program questions in relation to written questions.

00:33:37:16 - 00:33:38:15

And AOB then.

00:33:38:20 - 00:33:39:09

Yes.

00:33:39:11 - 00:33:39:26

That's fine.

00:33:39:28 - 00:33:41:04

Do you want me to do that now or later?

00:33:41:06 - 00:33:42:00

Can we, can we.

00:33:42:07 - 00:33:42:29

We can do that.

00:33:43:17 - 00:34:03:01

Absolutely. What was I suppose, some leftovers from item eight and then which became item six. Let's not get confusing. Um, so I will I think the council wanted to revisit, or perhaps that was something I didn't quite cover earlier that they'd like to add to. Is that is that, um,

00:34:04:29 - 00:34:08:20

the case? Is this is this a good opportunity? Is this a good time to do it?

00:34:10:27 - 00:34:11:20

Okay, fine.

00:34:14:23 - 00:34:45:13

John Wainwrights on behalf of North Yorkshire Council. Um, really, um, it was uh, would like an opportunity just to provide an update on the cumulative effects and really just to raise and reiterate a couple of points about the cumulative effects. Um, since the original application submission, I don't know whether it's possible that I could share my screen just to highlight some of the points.

00:34:45:25 - 00:34:48:09

It is useful to see, uh, a plan.

00:34:49:06 - 00:34:49:21

But.

00:34:52:04 - 00:34:55:10

Um, I just find it.

00:35:07:21 - 00:35:10:03

I think it's the one that's in.

00:35:14:21 - 00:35:52:03

So just to share a plan. This is a plan that was submitted with the application. It's figure 15.1 which shows the cumulative schemes in and around the proposed, uh, development. Um, we would consider that all of these schemes are relevant in assessing the cumulative effects. Um, it's unclear to us why some of them have been scoped out of the assessment, but a number of them have been. Um, but the other point to have is that this is a moving situation.

00:35:52:05 - 00:36:00:00

And since the original application, there have been other applications in the area. Um, just see if I can

00:36:01:18 - 00:36:04:23

generally point to the screen.

00:36:06:13 - 00:36:38:10

I think if my pointer is showing, um, just to the north side of the application site. There's another application for solar and battery energy storage, which is at, uh, scoping stage. Um, balloon mound application, which was originally at scoping stage when the application was submitted. Um, is now a full application that we're looking at within planning. Incidentally, Barlow Ash Mound was scoped out of the cumulative assessment.

00:36:39:19 - 00:36:51:28

Um, additionally, we also have the Humber Carbon Capture Pipeline and CEP, which is another substantial scheme, uh, connecting to Drax power station.

00:36:53:15 - 00:37:24:02

And I think the point to raise with this is that these are transformational scale projects and collectively in and among the settlements Comments of Campbell Smith host Courtney Barlow. Drax village. This will be a substantial, transformative change to that landscape and setting for those villages and those communities.

00:37:24:11 - 00:37:45:05

And it's really just to point out that the landscape isn't just an empty place, it is a landscape which incorporates these villages and sensitive uses of that landscape. So it's inevitable that these cumulative landscape effects will affect those communities.

00:37:46:26 - 00:37:47:11

Um,

00:37:48:29 - 00:38:33:00

I think there is another point as well. And it has been raised in the applicant's response to the local impact report, and it's really relates to the need and the amount because in Reviewing the submissions, it's unclear to us where it is demonstrated the need for this amount in relation to that connection point. So we understand that the applicant has justified, uh, significant effects on the basis of, um, the need to provide energy to support grid upgrading and the energy white paper.

00:38:33:15 - 00:39:04:21

And they've also gone through this process of looking at alternative sites or alternatives, um, reviewing the constraints for all those uncertainties. But nowhere in that submission can we see an explanation that this amount is required. And we think that is a pertinent issue when we're talking about an amount which is potentially responsible for significant residual effects.

00:39:05:22 - 00:39:13:05

Um, so I think there's a couple of points, really, one, to draw attention to the fact that, um.

00:39:16:00 - 00:39:28:19

There's a clear direction of change in this area towards energy generation and, um, legacy schemes linked to the power station. And, um.

00:39:32:01 - 00:39:35:25

It will have a transformational change on this area.

00:39:40:06 - 00:39:42:08

Thank you, thank you. I mean, I think, um,

00:39:44:02 - 00:40:05:03

I think that's that's clear, isn't it? That's abundantly clear from, from from the number of proposals. Um, but I'll ask the applicant to, to respond on 1 or 2 points you made, which was, um, whether whether some of these were scoped out of their cumulative assessment. Was that was that what you said? Was that what you suggested or did not pick that up correctly?

00:40:05:05 - 00:40:47:13

Well, I think through our representation and response to the Local Impact report, we've explained that we do have concerns that some of the effects are understated, and we've listed some examples of why we think that's understated. And another example is that it's unclear why some of these schemes had been scoped out. The applicant doesn't seem to have taken an holistic view of the cumulative effects in that area. The approach seems to be looking at and focusing on individual character areas, and even dismissing some of those character areas which are just touched on by the application.

00:40:47:26 - 00:41:20:00

But this isn't the approach which is typically recommended that the cumulative assessment should look at the effects within the study area, the character areas aren't, strictly speaking, a designation. They're just a descriptive area. So for a number of reasons, we would maintain that. We think the cumulative assessment and the landscape assessment are potentially understated.

00:41:20:02 - 00:41:24:19

And it's really just to, um, maintain that position.

00:41:25:22 - 00:41:27:12

I'll ask I'll ask the applicant to.

00:41:28:13 - 00:41:28:28

No, no.

00:41:30:11 - 00:41:39:18

I'll, I was going to respond to the general point which I think was was cumulatively understated. The the effect, the impact, the.

00:41:39:20 - 00:41:40:05

Effect.

00:41:40:12 - 00:41:44:29

And whether whether you've, whether you've taken into account sufficient schemes.

00:41:47:06 - 00:41:52:26

Or what the guidance says on that. Yeah. What are you supposed to do if you like, in this, in this respect?

00:41:53:15 - 00:42:28:05

Catherine Treacy for the applicant. Um, so in respect of scope of cumulative schemes to be considered, um, You are required to consider those schemes which are approved or in planning, or those which at least you have sufficient information in the public domain to be able to assess against. So it is standard practice for schemes at scoping to be scoped out, um, on the basis that they are far too early in their design evolution for us to be able to know what we're assessing and what those impacts might be.

00:42:28:26 - 00:43:01:27

Um, the environmental statement, uh, does assess the cumulative schemes it's required to assess and that it's right and appropriate for it to assess. The cut off date was June 2024. Prior to that, the council had been given the list of schemes that were proposed to be scoped in and um into the assessment. A number of the schemes that council have raised today are schemes that have come forward after us, and therefore they those schemes are required to undertake their cumulative assessment including our scheme.

00:43:01:29 - 00:43:35:05

So there is in the evolution of schemes coming forwards a full cumulative assessment. But again that is um, standard practice and acknowledged as a right way to do things. But you can only assess what's in front of you. You can't assess what's coming behind you. It is for that scheme behind you to assess you. So if the council have concerns with new schemes coming forwards, they should be approaching those schemes and asking them to assess themselves in combination with us. Um, in so I think that's um, the higher level point on cumulative.

00:43:35:07 - 00:43:45:19

If you'd like us to address the have we properly assessed it? I do still have Mr. Myers here who is able to talk about that.

00:43:46:04 - 00:43:49:12

That will be that will be helpful just to complete the complete picture.

00:43:49:22 - 00:43:50:07

Um.

00:43:53:27 - 00:44:22:10

Some advice for the applicant. Um, we've we've set our position on cumulative landscape and visual effects in the, in the landscape and visual impact assessment. Um, when we've looked at the cumulative effects, we've we've assessed the relationship of the proposed development in the context of the other schemes, which are which, which were proposed at the time that we were doing that assessment. Um.

00:44:24:24 - 00:44:48:24

And we've looked at those in the context of whether we think they would collectively, um, result in it becoming a key characteristic of that landscape in which it's being proposed. And then we've also looked at the potential for things like simultaneous or successive or, um, sequential views as people travel through that landscape and how it would change. Um,

00:44:50:22 - 00:45:24:00

we focused the assessment on where we think the key significant what where we think the significant landscape and visual effects would occur. And when it comes to assessment or under assessment. I'm a bit confused because I don't think we're apart in terms of we've identified there is a significant effect on the landscape as a consequence of the project in the context of the other plans that were in other the other projects which were considered cumulative schemes.

00:45:25:10 - 00:45:43:05

Um, and that's reported in the, in the assessment. Um, so we've assessed the scheme on its own proposed mitigation in that context, and we've also assessed the project in the context of the schemes. And I think we we're in broad agreement on on the judgments that have been made as well.

00:45:44:27 - 00:45:51:06

Thank you. Thank you for that. Um, any any further comment from the council on response from the applicant?

00:45:56:06 - 00:45:58:26

Um, no, we don't have any further comments at this stage.

00:45:59:02 - 00:45:59:26

Thank you. Okay.

00:46:02:02 - 00:46:07:23

Um, anything from other IPS under this, uh, area? Uh, yes. Okay.

00:46:08:06 - 00:46:38:22

Leslie Martin, on behalf of hold. Um, just one brief comment. Um, we are at the point, obviously, in these proceedings of discussing the cumulative effects in the process. So an arbitrary date regarding submissions of other projects seems less important somewhat than taking on the holistic view and the reality of what's being faced and the number of projects in this area. And as described by the council

themselves, this is a moving space. We are very close to this grid connection point and everybody is racing to connect to it.

00:46:38:24 - 00:46:54:09

So we could be looking at any number of projects. Um, and I think we do have to base on what we see now. Um, and these projects we do know about now, we do know they are likely to be happening. So I do think they need to be viewed in that way.

00:46:54:29 - 00:47:27:13

Okay. Thank you, thank you. Um, I'm assuming that that that was covered in your written submission, and we'll the applicant will cover it in its written response, essentially. Um, thank you. But thank you again. Um, was there anything else do you want to come back to? If there's nothing else on what I'll call the main agenda items or the topic items? I'm just looking around the room just in case there is. I will come back to the applicant on any any further adding on that or the proclamation that you wanted to wanted to mention.

00:47:28:18 - 00:48:01:01

Thank you, Sir Catherine Tracy, for the applicant. I think, um, I would just like to pick up finally on the point raised by the council about, um, why this area and do we need it? Um, and I think it is important, um, to, to make it very clear that. And one makes it abundantly clear at 323 that it is not the role of the planning system to deliver specific amounts or limit any form of infrastructure covered by this NPS.

00:48:01:03 - 00:49:00:09

It's for industry to propose the energy infrastructure they want. Um, and then it's for the government to assess it and that the government does not consider it appropriate for planning policy to set limits on different technologies. But planning policy can be used to support the government's ambitions in energy policy and other policy areas. That's paragraph 3 to 3. And then, um, particularly important a paragraph three to 6 to 3, two, eight. So which I'm, I know you're aware of, but, um, for the benefit of others and it is it is important that the Secretary of State should assess all applications for development consent for the types of infrastructure covered by this NPS, which includes solar, on the basis that the government has demonstrated that there is a need for those types of infrastructure which is urgent, Uh, solar development is of critical national priority, and it is not for the applicant now to need to justify that there is a need for it, 3 to 7 says.

00:49:00:11 - 00:49:30:26

In addition, the Secretary of State has determined that substantial weight should be given to this need when considering applications for development consent under the Planning Act 2008. And finally, 3 to 8 says the Secretary of State is not required to consider separately the specific contribution of any individual project to satisfying the need established in this NPS. Um, and that is the backdrop against which this is to be considered. So it is it is not for the applicant to need to justify why here.

00:49:34:29 - 00:49:36:28

Yeah, I understand, I understand, um.

00:49:39:24 - 00:49:58:16

So if there's nothing else on the agenda items or this, um, further further discussion on cumulative effects, um, We'll carry on with AOB and let the applicant, um, basis points around the program, I think. Thank you.

00:49:58:18 - 00:49:59:03

Okay.

00:49:59:15 - 00:50:02:00

Thank you. Sir. It's just a, um.

00:50:05:05 - 00:50:35:26

It's a programming point in regarding, uh, relation to second ring questions, and it's only because we didn't have first written questions. Um, the program is at this stage, uh, particularly tight, and I appreciate that, but nine working days to receive your questions, and we do work on the basis that we get them at the end of the day on the Thursday. So we actually only have the Friday, um, and then the following week to get, uh, substantive responses.

00:50:35:28 - 00:50:58:01

So if you're going to be asking a number of questions, cognizant of this fact that this could be this is your first written questions and ours really. Um, it's very It's very tight. And when, when we I raised this point in the preliminary meeting and the program was adjusted for first written questions to give us another week. Um,

00:50:59:20 - 00:51:13:03

I have looked for more spare time in the program, sir, and I'm not entirely sure it's there, but I just need to flag that to do justice to written questions. We should have a bit more time.

00:51:13:05 - 00:51:13:26

I'll take that one away.

00:51:14:02 - 00:51:14:29

Absolutely, sir.

00:51:15:01 - 00:51:15:26

Yeah. Um.

00:51:16:23 - 00:51:23:08

I think initially my my first comment will be we are we are well into the process. I don't I don't want to, um.

00:51:25:09 - 00:51:48:13

Um, I want to ask the questions that are necessary to be asked at this stage of the process. Um, without, you know, a couple of, I can't say, numbers and types at this stage. Um, but I'll reflect on that. And, and if there, if there is a, uh, I mean, I'm just looking at the timings, you know, if there was a, if there was a possibility of of um,



00:51:50:06 - 00:52:24:25

I mean, I see deadline seven isn't until 24th of April which, which would which would actually give you a lot more time, wouldn't it? For example, if I but I don't want to commit to that. I just want I just want to see what might work or what what impact it might have, which I don't really consider at this stage. So let me take that one away. Um, but at the same time, I will with a bit more time, I'll probably be able to say, well, okay, how's that? How is that looking in terms of quantity of questions and what what that imposes upon yourself and, um, and, and think about.

00:52:24:27 - 00:52:25:12

That.

00:52:25:27 - 00:52:30:06

And let you know, I'll obviously try and let you know as soon as I can sort of what where that's going.

00:52:30:12 - 00:52:30:27

Yeah.

00:52:31:12 - 00:52:47:12

Yeah, yeah. So that that's fine for us. I mean, we're not needing a significant amount more, but about three weeks would be nice rather than nine days. So yeah, you know, so if that can be found in the program, so we can probably work with that.

00:52:47:15 - 00:52:50:26

Well, I'll have a I'll have a I will have a think about that one.

00:52:51:02 - 00:52:51:21

Thank you.

00:52:56:12 - 00:52:58:21

I'll see I'll hand up. So I think to be fair to.

00:52:58:25 - 00:52:59:10

Sorry, sir.

00:52:59:23 - 00:53:00:08

Yeah.

00:53:00:10 - 00:53:30:12

Leslie Marsden on behalf of Holt and could I just comment in relation to that last statement that was made regarding timeframes and limitations to be able to do justice to what's being said? And equally, I think that stands for everybody involved. And parish councils, for example, only received letters regarding um, referring to the common ground aspects on a Friday and were expected to um, have their responses in by the Monday. When it's commonly known that parish councils only meet once a month, for example.

00:53:30:19 - 00:53:36:26

Um, so I don't think it's the only end. So that are governed by such restraints and feel the force of them. Thank you.

00:53:36:28 - 00:53:50:21

I take that point and I'm aware of of of the if you like, the difficulties faced by parish councils Becoming engaged in that kind of, kind of aspect of this process. Um, I just have to take that one away.

00:53:55:04 - 00:54:01:22

Right. If we're all done, I think I'm all done. Um, the time is now. 1244.

00:54:02:02 - 00:54:02:19

Excuse me.

00:54:02:21 - 00:54:03:06

Oh.

00:54:03:08 - 00:54:05:04

Is there any chance I can just add one more one?

00:54:06:04 - 00:54:06:25

Mr. Wilkinson?

00:54:07:03 - 00:54:40:19

Yeah. David Wilkinson under the landscape and visual. In an earlier submission, I requested if a temporary and to scale solar panel, maximum height could be erected out of scaffolding in a field next to the A1041 from Jalan to cross leeward just before the Black Dog public house. Uh, I do feel that this will, uh, you know, show the gravity of the situation. Uh, whatever that may be bestowed upon it.

00:54:40:28 - 00:54:43:11

And it's only going to be temporary. Is the scaffolding.

00:54:47:04 - 00:54:53:20

I'm going to ask out and ask the applicant to respond now. I'd just like them to sort of think about what? Well, they can respond now.

00:54:55:08 - 00:55:10:03

So it's not appropriate or necessary. We've got visualizations that show the size and scale. And if you stand in the landscape with them at arm's length, there are other solar panels in the landscape that people can look at. We will not be erecting solar.

00:55:11:01 - 00:55:26:06

I was going to make the second point that you made, which I would hope that this is a fair compromise that you could, um, I think other other facilities in the vicinity, that.

00:55:26:13 - 00:55:27:12

Of that size.

00:55:27:21 - 00:55:31:22

Of that size of comparable size, shall we say three meters.

00:55:32:28 - 00:55:40:02

Yeah. Um, so the, uh, there is a solar farm on the other side of the 1841 that's currently in construction and erecting panels.

00:55:40:04 - 00:55:41:01

Exactly. Camilla.

00:55:41:14 - 00:55:50:24

Isn't it? Yes it is. It is the Camilla one. So there, there. Ahead they will be putting up solar panels. If needs be. We can identify others in the local areas.

00:55:50:27 - 00:55:57:25

Nothing near like that stage yet. Nothing near like that stage yet. I'm coming out of that.

00:55:58:03 - 00:55:59:18

Well, we'll leave it there, okay?

00:55:59:20 - 00:56:01:17

It's just. There's just a perimeter fence around.

00:56:01:19 - 00:56:04:13

We'll leave it there. Um, I've got another comment from.

00:56:04:15 - 00:56:05:00

Yes.

00:56:05:02 - 00:56:11:26

Sorry, could I just comment? The Camilla Lane ones are fixed ground panels, not rotating panels, and I don't believe they're of the same height.

00:56:12:24 - 00:56:13:10

No.

00:56:14:00 - 00:56:30:13

Look, um, I think the applicant, I'm going to join this place. I mean, the applicant has said they published visualisations that they stand by. Um, he may not agree. You may not agree for that. Okay. I'll let you say one more. I'll let you come back once. Okay.

00:56:30:15 - 00:57:02:23

It's easy, uh, to look at something on paper, even like a map. But when you actually see where you are, you can see better in your head. In your mind's eye, the gravity of what you're looking at, and a temporary scaffolding got nothing to put up, but you be able to see just what is about to be potentially bestowed upon you. And it won't cost a lot to put up a temporary scaffold, maximum height, and not to look at another one in the vicinity that is not even erected yet.

00:57:02:25 - 00:57:26:15

And, uh, it won't take long to put a scaffold up. And I do feel it really needs to be done so that people can actually get a grasp of what, uh, they're about to receive. If you say. But just go into the environmental statement. Appendix 7.7 visualizations, part one of two.

00:57:28:25 - 00:57:36:10

Three. Do you remember we looked at, uh, the inception and then year one and then year 15?

00:57:37:26 - 00:57:50:25

I don't want to sound flippant, but do you think Turner or Constable will be inspired with what they saw and with what they heard?

00:57:53:05 - 00:57:57:21

Mr. Wilkinson, thank you. That's a big that's a really good question on which to end, I think.

00:57:58:10 - 00:58:00:27

Thank you very much. Thank you for that. Thank you.

00:58:02:12 - 00:58:13:08

I'll leave that there. Um, so the time now. So just to recap, the time is 1248. And, uh, I've got one more question from the council. Sorry. Comment. Okay. Yeah.

00:58:13:15 - 00:58:35:20

Just under any other business, um, could the, the council would like, if possible, just to submit a short written statement on why we think the community fund might be justified, um, for, for for mitigating the, um, impact of this development. Um, um, is would you agree, would you be agreeable to that?

00:58:35:22 - 00:58:57:02

I think in principle, you can make submissions with the submissions that you feel appropriate, and if you could make that obviously in line with the buy deadline five I think that's the next one, isn't it? That's the next available one. Um, I will consider it, I think is is the line I'll take I will make the submission. I'll consider whether to accept it into the examination.

00:59:04:18 - 00:59:07:03

Is that give me the clarity on that point.

00:59:07:05 - 00:59:11:14

I think potentially an explanation of need for for the understanding.

00:59:11:17 - 00:59:12:22

Yeah I understand yeah.

00:59:12:24 - 00:59:13:27

That's okay. That's fine.

00:59:15:20 - 00:59:19:20

Right. I've just cast my eye around even once more.

00:59:23:00 - 00:59:31:09

And okay, the time now is 1249. And this this hearing is closed. Thank you for your contributions. It's been helpful. Thank you.