



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Tween Bridge Solar Farm
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 2
Date:	24 June 2026

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.

AUDIO_TWEENBRIDGE_ISH3_SESSION2_2 40626

Wed, Jun 24, 2026 1:33PM • 43:02

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

planning balance, development consent order, local impact report, North Lincolnshire Council, City of Doncaster Council, critical national priority, over planting, solar farm, grid connection, sensitivity test, ecological impact, public safety, Civil Aviation Authority, construction program, heritage impact.

SPEAKERS

Speaker 9, Speaker 1, Speaker 8, Speaker 3, Speaker 5, Speaker 6, Speaker 7, Speaker 4, Speaker 2

Speaker 1 00:04

Okay, it's now 12 o'clock, and the hearing is resumed. Could I please just confirm that the live streaming and recording has commenced? Yes, excellent. Okay, so agenda item 3c is the overall planning balance, which is effectively weighing the harm against the benefits and reaching a conclusion on whether development consent order should be made or not, so I've reviewed the conclusions of the local impact reports, and I just wanted to get a better understanding of the overall position of the councils on the planning balance to be applied. I appreciate that the benefits and harms have been identified, but what I really want to know is what that means for the overall conclusion. So, starting with North Lincolnshire, your local impact report is Exam Library Reference Rep 1063 and Section 19 of that report summarizes the conclusions, and it identifies that paragraph 19.2 that on balance the principle principle of development is acceptable. However, it also subsequently lists various harms which alleges would arise or alleged shortfalls in information. So I'm just wondering what the council's overall conclusion is. mr. Skelton,

Speaker 2 01:49

thank you. Sir Paul Skelton, North Lincolnshire Council. In short, I think we've probably not reached an overall conclusion yet, because of the shortcomings that we've identified, I could leave it there. I think also, obviously, we've identified the issue about the project itself, and therefore I think when we do arrive at an overall conclusion, there might be two overall conclusions, just having regard to the weight to be given to those benefits in the context of whether the Secretary of State, you advising the Secretary of State, the Secretary of State are satisfied with the definition of the project. Thank you.

Speaker 1 02:42

Okay, so I think what would be helpful, though, is to understand what your view is as the application progresses. So, obviously, if this was a planning application and you, there was a, there were shortcomings in the information provided, you would still reach the conclusion and Understand the approach taken in terms of well, this is a sort of live examination where additional information is arriving all the time, but it would be helpful to understand what the council's current position is, and you suggesting that that will be forthcoming later on?

Speaker 2 03:27

Yes. Sorry, Paul Skelton, not Lincolnshire Council. Yes, sir. I think if you were to ask what my recommendation would be on a planning application at this moment in time, it would probably be to

refuse on the basis that it had not been demonstrated that you know the various issues that we talked about yesterday and today in particular had not been properly addressed. Thank you, sir.

Speaker 1 03:58

Okay, I think when I'd like the Council North Lincoln Council to put their position in writing either at the next deadline or deadline four, just so I can see where the council is, and I'd like you to have regard to MPS en one, I think it is paragraph four point 2.15 I think it's EM one, yes, four point 2.15 which states in part where residual non acar array, which is habitat regulation assessment, or non mc said, which is marine conservation zones. That doesn't apply here. So, where residual non h array and non mc said impacts remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, the. These residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure. Therefore, in all but the most exceptional circumstances, it's unlikely that consent will be refused on the basis of these residual impacts. So I think that sets quite a high bar, but there are exceptions listed as well, which include impacts on human health, public safety, defense, irreplaceable habitats, or an unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero, so they're sort of the exceptions to the rule, but effectively I'd like you to consider that paragraph in your overall conclusion. And is that acceptable?

Speaker 2 05:54

Absolutely, sir. Paul Skelton, North Lancashire Council. I don't see any reason why we well we will aim to do that by deadline three. I will obviously need to take instruction, but that should hopefully be achievable.

Speaker 1 06:11

Okay. Thank you. Similarly, City of Doncaster Council's local impact report, which is Rep 1062 sets out that section 17 positive, negative, and neutral effects, but doesn't reach an overall conclusion. And I'm just wondering if the council could please elaborate whether the council is taking the same position as North Lincolnshire Council.

Speaker 3 06:39

Thank you, sir. Andrew Koski, City of Doncaster Council, I suspect. Yes, in short, we're probably taking a very similar view at the moment as is set out in section 17 of the LIR. As you say, we've split it into the positive, neutral, and negative. Obviously, I think there's going to be a particular focus around the issues that are still identified as being in the negative, which include landscape and visual amenity comments on the historic landscape and best and versatile agricultural land. You'll have heard from Emily Jones this morning, I think, on the particular points that she's raised. I think with all the issues we've discussed, there are still outstanding matters that we'd hope we would get resolved with the applicant, and clearly that will ultimately affect our final view on the project. We're obviously mindful of what MPs one says in relation to critical national priority, and the fact that this project falls within that, which, as the applicant has identified in their own planning statement, which we wouldn't disagree with, but I think, in essence, we're probably in the same place as North Lincolnshire, but I would, I would hope that we can kind of firm up on our final view as we hopefully get resolution on the issues that are still to be resolved.

Speaker 1 07:56

Okay, that would be helpful going forwards, because ultimately, in my recommendation report, I want to set out the different positions, and if they're, if they're quite vague, it makes it a little bit tricky for me. Okay? Is there a response from the applicant on any of those points?

Speaker 4 08:17

Tom, at the moment, on behalf of the applicant, I don't think so, so obviously we would disagree with any conclusion that the planning balance points to a refusal. Here we don't accept that, and our planning statement makes clear the basis on which we've, we've reached that conclusion, and we'd go further, actually, so we provided some clarity on this in our responses to written questions on the question of the application of critical national priority, and our position is that, and in line with the recent solar decisions, is that clearly CNP exists, but in this case the planning balance points to an acceptance in our, in our view, and therefore it's not necessary to engage the EN one CNP policy test, which generally applies where there are unmitigated impacts or unacceptable impacts in planning terms, and we don't think that those tests apply here, sir. I think that's the only point I would make, and obviously I'd endorse what the councils are saying around trying to resolve points, and we were obviously working hard to do that, and we'll continue to do that as examination progresses.

Speaker 1 09:36

Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to say anything on the overall planning balance to be applied, mr. Carr.

Speaker 5 09:47

If I may, I think there's something that the council should be aware of before they make the decision on public safety grounds, as you correctly identified. At the areas used by 1000s and 1000s of gray, pink, and Canada geese, the whole site is a traditional feeding and resting area. However, you have overlooked the fact that if area some 2000 hectares is denied to them, they'll be forced to look elsewhere. This may well push them further south and west towards Doncaster Airport. I do not see any mention of consultation with the Civil Aviation Authority, but large birds like geese sucked into a turbofan engines on final approach, landing, or take off will not end well for the geese, aircraft, and passengers and crew, and may well put Doncaster Airport on the map for all the wrong reasons. Thank you.

Speaker 1 10:50

Thank you very much. Yeah, I can see how that's relevant to public safety, which I just mentioned. I don't know if the applicant wants to respond now or in writing, I Tom

Speaker 4 11:05

McNamara, on behalf of the applicant, there's a, there's a few points to unpick there. What I don't have the answer to, sir, is that the engagement that's taking place with the Civil Aviation Authority. Certainly, they're not engaged in this examination process, and so I think I would, I would infer from that that they're comfortable with what is proposed here, and don't see any impacts arising. We obviously talked about ecology and biodiversity yesterday, and mr. Revolta, on behalf of the applicant, laid out the extensive mitigation package that's proposed for the breeding and non-breeding birds, and therefore this displacement that I think mr. Carl was referring to, we don't think is a significant point, I'm just checking to see if there's anything from the CAA. I don't, I don't think there is, but we will provide some clarity in our post hearing submissions on that point.

Speaker 1 12:12

Okay, I look forward to receiving that. Are there any more questions on the planning balance to be applied? No. Okay. Right. We'll move on to agenda item 3d then, which is general matters. So my first question relates to the installed capacity of the development, so I'm just wondering, what the overall capacity of the scheme is, in terms of megawatt output, based on the indicative layout, because I know the planning statement provides various figures, but I'm not sure we've got an overall figure or megawatt output.

Speaker 6 13:08

Hello, so yeah, Michael, but Michael Baker, on behalf of the applicant, so in AC, the overall generating capacity of the solar solar solar PV areas is 800 megawatt AC, and the overall capacity of the best units, the battery energy storage systems, is 400 megawatts AC.

Speaker 1 13:30

Yeah, okay. Well, that's what I thought, but I'm just wondering if that's expressed anywhere in the application documents, and often applicants don't do that, because I think they're worried that it's in some way going to be capped, but that's not the approach that the Secretary of State takes. So, there's no harm in including that information or directing me to it if it's already been provided somewhere. So, you'd have to do that now, but if you could do that in writing, that'd be useful in terms of me thinking about drafting the report and being able to say output 800 megawatts, battery storage 400 megawatts.

Speaker 4 14:11

Tom and Atmos, that can, so we can definitely point you to that. I'm just checking now to see if it might be in the grid connection statement, but I don't want to waste your time, sir, so it's just as easy for me to put it in our,

Speaker 1 14:25

but that'd be useful.

Speaker 4 14:25

Written submission, yeah.

Speaker 1 14:26

Thank you. Okay, moving on to over planting, so I'd like to discuss over planting, and that is the extent to which the proposed development has been designed to take into account panel degradation over time, so typically solar developers will over plant the scheme, so they'll include more panels. Necessary in order to account for panel degradation over time, so they can still export the 800 megawatts, despite panel degradation. So I don't, could the applicant explain where I can find information on over planting in the application documents, and summarize for me its approach to over planting, assuming that there is over planting proposed, because I can't seem to see any reference to that in the scheme description or planning statement.

Speaker 6 15:37

He's a Michael Baker for the applicant. Yes, we haven't. I'm not aware that we've expressed over planting ratios in the application. It's just a matter that we don't normally, you know, put at the front of the matters, but in terms of the numbers, which I can confirm now, and we can follow up in writing with, so for the fixed, like we obviously have flexibility in some layouts, so we have a scenario where the solar farm is all fixed panels, and we have a scenario where there is where we have a hybrid approach with some fixed panels and some tracker panels for the fixed panels layout, if it was all fixed panels, then we have a over planting ratio of 1.6 which is about bang in the middle of the range of what you'd expect on a solar farm of this type in terms of the over planting ratio, and in line with RWE East portfolio of the solar farms, certainly, and how we design our projects, and if we did a hybrid, the general approach to tracking technology is that you have a lower over planting ratio because they're able to generate electricity more effectively because they're following the sun, so the body hybrid design scenario, the over planting ratio is 1.56 so it's slightly lower because it's got a bit of the lower over planting required for trackers in there, and so in terms of the megawatt peak, so this is the electricity that's generated in DC before it's converted into AC, and the total megawatt peak of the total

megawatts generated by the solar farm, that's 12 150 megawatts peak for the hybrid and 1280 megawatt peak for the fixed only we can set that out in a table if that's helpful.

Speaker 1 17:45

Yeah, I think because MPS en three footnote 92 explains what over planting is. I'll just read it out. It over planting refer refers to the situation in which the installed generating capacity or name plate capacity of the facility is larger than a generator's grid connection. This allows developers to take account of degradation in panel array efficiency over time, thereby enabling the grid connection to be maximized across the lifetime of the site, however, it does state that such reasonable over planting should be considered acceptable in a planning context, so long as it can be justified and the electricity export does not exceed the relevant NSIP installed capacity threshold throughout the operational lifetime and its impacts are assessed through the planning process on the basis of its full extent. Now, obviously, in terms of the impacts, I think what we, what you, the layout we're seeing includes the over planting, so I think that effectively addresses that point, but the over planting ratio does need to be justified in accordance with the footnote 92 So, what would be useful is if you could set that information out in a separate short statement to be submitted, preferably at deadline three, which sets out the over planting ratios, perhaps compares them to those in recently made solar DCOs, and also provides a justification for those ratios that would be helpful.

Speaker 6 19:42

We can do that, sir. Michael Baker, for the applicant, we can do that. So, sometimes, particularly on the older DCOs, the figure isn't available for the over planting, so it might be. We'll certainly, we can give you a list compared to the rest of our portfolio, if you like. And then you can see that it's in line with,

Speaker 1 19:56

yeah, I think. I mean, it's usually discussed. I mean. It's not if it hasn't been discussed in the recommendation report, then that's fine, but there are plenty of examples recently made solar DCS where it is discussed in the recommendation report, and where you have figures, I think Tilbridge, Mallard, Pass, and others, if you could compare them, that would be useful, just so that I can understand whether the approach taken is reasonable or not, but notwithstanding that, if you can justify the approach taken, then that would meet the requirements of footnote 92 right? Do the councils have anything to add on over planting City of Doncaster?

Speaker 3 20:48

I'm sure Sherikovsky for City of Doncaster. I was about to say no, but I think my colleague might be about to say something.

Speaker 7 20:58

David Ormsby, City of Doncaster Council. Yeah, over planting is well, it could be an issue in terms of we've got a historic environment, and if there is a way of mitigating the impact of the scheme, maybe over planting is something that could be looked at if you've got more panels going back to what the lady said this morning, you can't continually be pushing back the line of the panels. Well, maybe, maybe not, but we've still got to deal with the issues of setting on the historic cultural side of it, and it just seems to me that there may be areas where it can be pushed back, we haven't actually formed a conclusion about what the setting is for certain heritage assets, and that does need to be debated. So there is quite a degree of flexibility there. The other, the other point I would, I would make is that the scheme is dependent upon other issues, such as the connection to the to the national grid. I'm not entirely certain when it's proposed that electricity from the site will be exported, but in the planning statement there is reference to solar panel being rapidly increasing in technology in industry, so if we're looking at exporting electricity, I don't know about my, I've got somewhere in my mind 3032 as a date,

which probably you gave dependent upon, you know, the connection to the grid, there may well be increases in technology in the in solar panels, which may not need the need, you know, for such an over planting scheme, and I think all the, all of these have got to, all of these issues have got to be looked at against a planning balance that you've got quite a historic landscape. It's, I won't go into what I've said before, but it is a historic landscape. It creates a local identity, local distinctiveness, and I think we've got to look at every possible way of trying to mitigate the impact of the scheme on that on that environment. Sorry, that's my view on that.

Speaker 1 24:15

No, thank you very much. Appreciate that. The applicant doesn't have their heritage expert here, so any of those points you might want to address in writing, but do you have a response on mr. Hornsby's comments?

Speaker 4 24:28

Tom Adama, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I think I mean, what I can say, sir, is that we, we have obviously assessed the impacts of this scheme as it's presented, which reflects the scheme that you can see on the drawings we've assessed it on a worst case basis, and the heritage impact assessment reflects that. So we are seeking consent for the scheme that's before you. We accept that there. Are I mean, and there is some flexibility built in, and we accept that there are potential improvements in technologies that mean that certain efficiencies can be secured, but we, we can't know what those are right now, and so we have to make certain assumptions when we bring forward the application, and that includes a reasonable provision for over planting, reflecting technological constraints as they, as they currently are, we can't obviously plan for things that we don't know aren't going to happen, but clearly you know we will keep those issues in mind as we move forward towards implementation. If the DTO is granted, I will come back on the specific heritage points in writing, because obviously those are there are some technical points there, but I think general principle is that we've assessed the scheme based on a worst case scenario, and then just in terms of the grid connection, I think the data 2032 was mentioned, but obviously things have moved on slightly, and we may well address this as part of the sensitivity testing item on the agenda, but because this scheme has been allocated to gate two phase two as part of the grid reform process, that means that the connection could fall anywhere at the moment within the 2031 to 2035 window, so that's just a point of clarity related to that. So that does, I accept that that gives time for certain things to change, but as I mentioned, that flexibility is reflected, and, and you know, as we move forward, we'll try to do what we can to improve efficiencies.

Speaker 1 26:49

Okay. Thank you. Are there any more points to raise on over planting before we move on? So,

Speaker 2 26:58

yes, mr. Skelton, Paul Skelton, North Lancashire Council. Obviously, it's not something that we've, we've picked up on previously, but just harking back to this morning's discussion, I do wonder whether there's justification, or whether the justification for other planting needs to be considered in the context of the infrastructure being provided in Fludson 3p, Thank you.

Speaker 1 27:28

Okay, thank you. And mr. Brooke

Speaker 8 27:32

concerned that the hybrid models, the tilting ones, they've only been put on the Birkwas Hall site, aren't there when take the section on Santolf Road, the southern section, there's nearly two and a half miles of southern facing ones in the block, and take the dirtiness to crawl one off the motorway and south

facing there for over two miles. Days like today, there's going to be a fairly glare, aren't there? Don't you think so? I wonder why you've just earmark boat whistles for tilting ones. I know you've got more ends near there and such like that.

Speaker 1 28:13

Okay. Thank you. I think there are two points which the applicant might like to address, mr. Skelton, and then mr. Brooks, so mr. Skelton is related to the location in flood zone free B, and the implications of over planting. You can address that in writing, and then obviously mr. Brooke point in relation to the tracker panels. Thank you, sir. Tomorrow, on behalf of the applicant, I think I can address point one swiftly, and point two, I might look to my right, but point one, I think, is just bound up with what we were discussing this morning, and I think we took away to consider the siting of infrastructure in flood zone 3b so that will form part of our post

Speaker 4 29:00

hearing submissions. Then, as I say, point to I will look to mr. Baker.

Speaker 6 29:08

Thank you, sir, Michael Baker, for the applicant. The simple reason for putting tracking panels in the more northern area of the site in the hybrid model is better background conditions, which I'd have to expand in writing after the hearing, but that's the simple reasoning, is there's better ground conditions on that area of the site to accommodate tracking panels, which require deeper foundations.

Speaker 1 29:35

Okay, and I think obviously there's a Glenn and Glare assessment as well, which has been undertaken. Okay, let's move on to the sensitivity test, and I just really want the applicant - well, the applicant's produced a sensitivity test, which is document reference rep 2091 I just want the applicant to explain for those present. What the rationale was behind this, and what the findings were. Just briefly,

Speaker 9 30:08

Isabel Hollins on behalf of the applicant. So the pretext of the environmental sensitivity report was following the process from End Get with the potential alterations to when construction well rather when connection might occur that in turn had a potential knock on implication to how the construction process the length of and when it was going to take place might occur, which hadn't necessarily been looked at in detail in the submitted environmental impact assessment, so the set basis of the sensitivity report was starting point of it was these are the two scenarios. Do you want me to just read out what those two scenarios are for clarity? Yes, so the two scenarios were the first one was a single connection date within 2031 to 2035 window resulting in a shorter construction program that would be 36 months rather than the 54 months that had been assessed within the ES, and they would start between January 2026 to run to December 2032 with a potential co-concurrent construction of up to three land parcels. Previously, the ES had assessed up to two land parcels, and then sensitivity test two option was multiple connection dates within that same time period, 2031 to 2035 with the earliest construction starting in 2031 and consistent with the ES would be a 54 month construction program, and so again, no more than two parcels would be considered possible to be constructed at that time, so the process, when, when we had those, was to approach all of the team who had prepared the environmental impact assessment, and ask them whether or not, based on their assessments to date, how they would approach undertaking an assessment to look at that variation. They were given the opportunity to either do a qualitative, qualitative, or a quantitative assessment, or bar socio-economic felt that they only needed to do a quantitative assessment. So, for example, as my colleague from Transport yesterday mentioned, Katie Stock, for example, in the submitted environmental impact assessment, Transport had already assessed a worst-case scenario that construction could be taking place on all five parcels

at the same time. Therefore, they'd already assessed beyond the two parcels and beyond the three parcels that would be under this sensitivity. So, they didn't need to do any further quantitative work. They only needed to look at it from a qualitative perspective. The only people who needed to look at it from a quantitative perspective was the socio-economic team. They needed to look at it from an accommodation during construction phase. So, within their assessment, within the ES, they had looked at up to two parcels being constructed at the same time, and a worst-case scenario would be that 100% of the construction workers needed to build this build the solar park would need to be brought in to the local area and accommodated within the area and therefore would there be accommodation available for those so their quantitative assessment increased those numbers and also had to increase from from two parcels to three parcels, and also had to increase where they may be for a shorter period of time. So, from a quantitative perspective, their figure changed from, let me just find it for you, sir. Under two parcels, there would have been a scenario where 483 workers would have needed to have been accommodated within the local area, and under the three parcel scenario, that would increase to 654 workers with the local area. Now, their assessments, even when they did that quantitative work, as is presented within the sensitivity test, the ES assessment found that there was a minor to moderate adverse effect on accommodation demand for visitors, that's already presented within the yes, and that stayed the same with those increased numbers.

Speaker 9 34:08

So, the interpretation of that is that the local area already has capacity to accommodate the worst case scenario, if it was three parcels of 300 of 654 and there is also the capacity, even within that system, to continue to have spaces for general tourists who would want to come to the area, and therefore there is capacity within system, which is the same as what it was already presented within the environmental statement. So, even with the alterations in the quantitative assessment, their findings, as presented within the submitted ES document for socioeconomics did not change, and that was the same across the board for every single topic. They've all been assessed, all of them determined that through their route of assessment that the findings, even in the alternative scenarios, the findings remain the same from a residual sensitivity. Perspective as presented within a submitted ES.

Speaker 1 35:04

Okay. Thank you. So, I've got a couple of questions on that. So, in terms of scenario two, you mentioned multiple connection dates. What is the basis of that? Why multiple connection dates? I

Speaker 4 35:24

Tom, half the applicant, so that simply reflects the the reconnection agreement that was in place that had some capacity coming online in 2029 proportion, I think it was 320 megawatts thereabouts, and then the remainder coming online at the end of that period, so 2032 for full scheme connection, but of course we're now in a position where we don't have full clarity on what the whether it's going to be a phased connection or a single connection, and so what we tried to reflect in the sensitivity testing is the optionality that exists. So there could be a scenario where it's phased, and we've, we've considered that as part of sensitivity test number two, and there could be a scenario where it's a single connection within the 2031 2035 window with everything happening at one all at once.

Speaker 1 36:27

Okay, so it's just a reflection of the fact that you don't know whether it'll be a phase connection, and you previously had phased connection agreed,

Speaker 4 36:39

correct?

Speaker 1 36:40

So, in terms of the construction period, what remind me, what the original period was

Speaker 4 36:48

talking about the more on behalf of the applicant, 2028 to 2032 I think Q 2020 8q, 2032

Speaker 1 36:57

so what, 48 months, I think.

Speaker 9 37:02

No, it was 54 months,

Speaker 1 37:04

right? Okay, okay. Say that I mean, you mentioned the worst case scenario had already been assessed five parcels at any one time, presumably that's over that 54 month period as well.

Speaker 9 37:21

Yes, so that was assuming that that would be over that, that, that extended period of time as well. Yes. Sorry, Isabel Holland's Texas group. Sorry,

Speaker 1 37:28

that's fine. Thank you. And do any parties present have any questions on the sensitivity test? No. Okay, right. We'll move on to change request again. We discussed the implications of the change request documents for biodiversity and ecology yesterday. I just wanted to know if the councils or anyone else present has any other comments to make in relation to the applicant's changes to the application. If you do, could you raise your hand? No. Okay. We'll then move on to agenda item four, which is other matters. I don't have any other matters to raise. Does anyone have any other matters they would like to raise, yes, mr. Brooke,

Speaker 8 38:24

a couple of items of great importance that I need to take back to the drainage board with regard to the area of land between IDB drains and the solar fence that is going to need to be maintained and cut annually, and there could be 500 acres in there, like who's going to pay? I've had various from these chaps, I've had various answers over the last 18 months that we want something that's plumbing concrete now, because if it's going to be passed on to the drainage board, these chaps that's got the panels, they're going to pay, then it'll go on their drainage rates. So, I just like an answer for Friday, like you can, they can decide today.

Speaker 1 39:14

Okay.

Speaker 8 39:16

And also, are you going to have a look at the site itself as it is now, or

Speaker 1 39:23

sorry,

Speaker 8 39:23

are you going to have a look at the

Speaker 1 39:25
yes, the

Speaker 8 39:25
site,

Speaker 1 39:27
but I've made one unaccompanied site visit last time I came up,

Speaker 8 39:31
yeah,

Speaker 1 39:32
and I'm planning to make another, so do you have some suggested locations, but I haven't, you still haven't seen. Yeah,

Speaker 8 39:41
I certainly have. Yes,

Speaker 1 39:43
if you could send them. Yeah, I haven't undertaken it this week.

Speaker 8 39:46
I've got the rock violet with me tomorrow, my daughter.

Speaker 1 39:50
Okay, that's fine.

Speaker 8 39:51
So she will get to you.

Speaker 1 39:52
I would prefer them in writing, yeah, yeah, as well.

Speaker 8 39:56
She'll do that,

Speaker 1 39:57
okay.

Speaker 2 39:58
All

Speaker 1 39:58
right, so with the. Applicant, like to come back on mr. Brooks' point,

Speaker 8 40:07
we need to get annually onto that land to do all the ditches out annually, that's the thing, and if you don't, it'll be overgrown.

Speaker 1 40:13

Okay, mr. Brook, so is this referring to the buffer? This is a buffer zone at IDB one around the ditches, six or

Speaker 8 40:19

nine meter strips on various ditches, 40 ditches.

Speaker 1 40:24

Okay, would the applicant like to respond on that point?

Speaker 4 40:32

Tom atomar, on behalf of the applicant, sir. I've been trying to find the reference within, because I believe this is discussed and secured by the outline landscape ecological management plan, and I can see that there is a reference to maintenance obligations in relation to retained ditches and ponds. I would, I would just like to go away and check that that comprises also the corridor between the panels and those ditches, which I can do in the written summary following this hearing, but if that is the case, and I think I think it is, then of course everything that's included in the outline landscape and ecological management plan will become a legally binding obligation for the full operational periods, that's for the full 40 years of the scheme, so hopefully that provides some assurance, and as I say, I'll just go and confirm the references for you, so that you can, you can find them.

Speaker 1 41:33

So I don't know whether that also relates to potentially protected provisions, terms of IDB, are there protected provisions

Speaker 4 41:43

Tom Adama applicant. Yes, we have included some protections for the both drainage authorities,

Speaker 1 41:48

but we won't discuss those now, because

Speaker 4 41:50

okay,

Speaker 1 41:50

we're gonna have the compulsory acquisition hearing,

Speaker 4 41:53

yeah.

Speaker 1 41:53

Okay, right? Are there any other issues anyone would like to raise before we move on to close the hearing. Yes, mr. Sierra Kovski,

Speaker 3 42:09

just Andrew Shirkovsky, for City of Doncaster Council. Really, just to update you, sir, there has been a further exchange of the standard common ground between ourselves as far as CDC are concerned, and the, and the applicant, I'm assuming that will be passed on to you in due course, mr. Scanlan, no doubt comment.

Speaker 1 42:33

Okay. Thank you. All right, let's move on to close the hearing. We've got the compulsory acquisition hearing at 2 o'clock Thank you all for coming today. It's now 12:43pm and the hearing is now closed. Thank you.

42:55

Bye.