

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Springwell Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Part 2
Date:	15 July 2025

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

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

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

File Length: 00:55:20

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:38:20 - 00:00:43:12

Okay. It's 1130 and time for this hearing to resume.

00:00:46:10 - 00:01:16:19

So we're now at, um, item 3.5 of the agenda. Um, and considering the visual impact of highways components. So the district council in its Local Impact report, raised concern that highways elements of the scheme don't appear to be fully considered in the Elvia, despite the potential for adverse effects on the views of the rural landscape, including potential vegetation loss, urbanization and reduction in visual amenity.

00:01:17:10 - 00:01:29:18

Can North Kesteven District Council expand on its concerns, in particular the views it considers would be affected and what further information might be necessary from the applicant?

00:01:29:20 - 00:01:33:22

Thank you for North District Council. Yes. I'll pass over to Mr. Brown.

00:01:36:19 - 00:02:07:00

Thank you all. The Brown North district council. This may be quite a quick one. So just to clarify that the comments at the time of writing our review of the LVA and this and the submission to go into Local Impact report. It was unclear what was included within the vegetation works and essentially the concern that we had with the wider highways works and the, um, the impact and the effect that would have on retention and removal of vegetation.

00:02:07:21 - 00:02:44:15

Um, we've subsequently had a had a meeting with the applicant to discuss this. And on the previous agenda item, I think it was three point uh three. We discussed that vegetation loss. So we've now gone through the proposed vegetation removal. Um, the applicant has clarified how is that that has been presented on the vegetation removal plans included within the Olympe. Um, and then they're subsequently secured through, through the DCO. Um, so being through that process, we're now happy in terms of the information that's been presented on the vegetation removal plans has been represented within the area.

00:02:46:15 - 00:02:51:12

Okay. Thank you. Um, anything the applicant would like to say on that? No.

00:02:52:13 - 00:03:00:13

Rich, give us on past applicant. No. Um, uh, Okay. Thank you for the response. And, uh, um, nothing further to add. Okay. Thank you. Yeah.

00:03:01:03 - 00:03:33:24

Right. In that case, we can move on to, um, uh, 3.6. Um, Clinton glare. So the glint and glare study explains that a 700 metre section of the A15 at the south of spring, while west requires mitigation to reduce glinting glare impacts on road users until advance planting in this area has grown to sufficient density and height. Temporary mitigation in the form of hoarding. Uh, will be would would be implemented to mitigate impacts.

00:03:34:12 - 00:03:42:04

Would this be a three metre high solid plywood hoarding typical of construction sites?

00:03:43:17 - 00:03:52:08

Um. Or if not. Can you provide information on what what type of hoarding this would be? That's the applicant.

00:03:53:13 - 00:03:59:04

Thank you so much. Griffiths and the applicant. Um, Mr. John Bingham, um, can respond to that question.

00:04:00:24 - 00:04:26:15

Thank you, John, again for the applicant. Um, I don't believe the hoarding has been, uh, specifically defined, uh, that the construction of that of that. Um, so we we could respond further in writing on that, on that specific point. Um, however, I imagine it would be a timber close border fence similar to acoustic barriers, maybe that you might see. Um.

00:04:26:24 - 00:04:30:11

Okay. But it would be a solid, solid visual.

00:04:30:13 - 00:04:31:10

That's correct sir.

00:04:31:12 - 00:04:36:23

Yes. Okay. And has the. Okay. So

00:04:38:19 - 00:04:47:19

would that would that be confirmed within the timescale of the examination or would that be. Are you proposing to confirm that in the detailed design process.

00:04:56:20 - 00:05:32:17

Which proves the need for the temporary. Um. Uh, mitigation. Uh, we can confirm that, um, that's what the clinical assessment concludes. And, um, so there will be until the planting has reached the relevant height, which is three metres, then there will be a need for the temporary mitigation in place. Once the planting has reached its height, then the mitigation temporary mitigation would be removed. The Outline landscape environmental management plan, um, secures, uh, the precise detail and nature of that temporary mitigation.

00:05:32:19 - 00:06:02:23

So when we submit that landscape management plan to local authorities, they'll be they will contain the detailed design of that, um, mitigation. Um, and of course, we can't confirm what it would be precisely now because it depends on where, um, what mitigation at the time has reached, uh, whether it's, you know, predict it's going to be 700m. It will be less than that to be the gaps of the, of the of the hedgerow. So that detail can only be provided once. We're actually construct once the solar farm has actually been constructed.

00:06:03:06 - 00:06:07:07

And then we can put the detail into the local authority. The need is though confirmed.

00:06:07:09 - 00:06:56:01

Yeah. So, uh, my question is more about, uh, the appearance of it rather than necessarily the length. I understand that the length might change, but if more details could be provided on the appearance, whether it's a a construction type or a acoustic barrier type appearance. Um, because my next question is how how the visual impact has been factored of this has been factored into the conclusions of the Is because whilst it may be temporary, does it effectively if it if it's a construction type thing, does it extend the in construction appearance Friends of the proposed development for a further three years following the end of construction.

00:06:56:22 - 00:07:31:03

Thank you so much. The applicant, in response to your first part, that question. As I said, the Outline landscape environmental mitigation plan, um, will secures the um, the uh, um, the temporary um mitigation and the detailed design requirement, uh, also comes into play here in terms of the design, precise design of that. Uh, we can confirm in writing examples what it might be. Um, but in terms of the actual final detail, that would have to be, um, at the point of, um, um, further down the construction of the project.

00:07:31:08 - 00:07:50:00

Um, but the securing mechanism for the detailed design is requirement five. And then the outline, the landscape environmental mitigation plan in terms of the assessment and the environmental statement. Um, it has been considered in the environmental statements. And Mr. John Johnson can confirm that if I pass over Tim now.

00:07:51:22 - 00:08:28:00

Thank you, John Ingham, for the applicant. Um, yes. Uh, as has just been mentioned there. Um, it's not explicitly mentioned within the landscape chapter. Um, chapter ten of the, uh, of the, um, of the s, but, um, the landscape chapter and the LDA, uh, which, which constitutes that chapter was prepared with regard to all of the other project documents within, um, within the, uh, environmental statement, including the Glint and glare study, uh, which forms an appendix to chapter five.

00:08:28:02 - 00:08:58:06

And that's where it sets out that that was a, uh, known component of the project. Um, so, um, so, so there is reference to the temporary mitigation there and that so it's recognized that that would sit, uh, within the parameters. So the height of the of that of those structures of that structure would fall within the height parameter of the um operational phase, um parameters of the development.

00:08:58:20 - 00:09:39:22

Um, so, uh, here on the tier one that the, the hoarding or the fencing, um, would be visible from the A15. Um, uh, that is largely the only place that it would be visible from, um, the A15, uh, by by transient users of the, of the A15. Um, but, uh, it's probably also worth noting that although there are reasonable sections of that 700m which don't have existing hedgerow there, there are also, um, lengths of that 700m where there are existing hedgerows as well.

00:09:40:07 - 00:10:18:00

Um, and those are visible as you drive up and down the uh along the, along the A15. So um, the, the, the effects of the, uh, hoarding have been taken into account in the judgments that are presented for the operational phase of the effects. So I think earlier on, you, sir, mentioned extension of the construction phase effects. Those are actually we've assessed the the hoarding as an operational effect for the first, uh, for the first, well, up to a year ten, but it wouldn't actually be at that length of time.

00:10:18:05 - 00:10:26:17

And we've assessed effects up to year ten and then beyond year ten. So in our assessment that first part of our assessment deals with that.

00:10:26:19 - 00:10:54:22

So it's captured within the year one in operation but not the year ten. That's correct sir. Okay. Um, and so I'm not clear on where does it sit in the line of the hetero, the the new and existing hetero. What does it sit in the light? You mentioned that it sits within the operational parameters. So does it sit in the on the edge of the solar development parameters, or can you provide a bit more information about that?

00:11:02:15 - 00:11:09:15

So, uh, um, we do have our expert here. Um, Mr. Griffiths may want to introduce him.

00:11:10:04 - 00:11:38:24

Yeah. Thank you. Richard Gibson, the applicant. Um, it's probably more of a, uh, the Clinton Clare, um, uh, expert in terms of where with the relevant mitigating need to sit in in response to the, um, in fact. So it's probably worth more than the landscape question. It's more of a, uh, technical question on the, um, impact itself. So if I can introduce from Page Power Abdelmadjid, who's a technical analyst there, who can confirm in his opinion where it might have to sit. Yeah.

00:11:40:19 - 00:11:44:05

I'm told you on behalf of the applicant. Please, could you repeat your question, please, sir?

00:11:45:23 - 00:11:48:20

So I just want to understand, um.

00:11:50:22 - 00:12:03:01

Where where the temporary hoarding will be required. Is it required in the line of the proposed hedgerow, or is it setback in the line of the edge of the solar development?

00:12:04:12 - 00:12:10:23

I will do it on behalf of the applicant. Um, mitigation proposal is best suited as closest to the panels as possible.

00:12:11:12 - 00:12:37:07

As close to the panels as possible. Okay. Thank you. And so there is, um, my next question is whether for a viewpoint photo montage 28 B should show this at year one. So I'm asking these questions because I'm not sure what this looks like. And I just want to be clear that what the official effects are on the uses of the A15 of this temporary situation.

00:12:41:03 - 00:13:12:14

Thank you, Sir John Ingham, for the applicant. Um, viewpoint 28. Uh, as you refer to it there, sir. Um, there is a year one and the year ten photo montage. Um, you're correct, sir, that the, um, the hoarding would be visible in, um, that viewpoint at year one, but not at year ten. Um, and so if it helps, we can update that that photo montage in year one for you. Okay. I appreciate that. Doesn't show the hoarding in that photograph.

00:13:13:06 - 00:13:16:22

Could that be done for deadline three? Yes, sir. Thank you.

00:13:18:18 - 00:13:29:04

And, uh, the Clinton Glass study states that would be required for approximately three years. Is this a worst case duration or could it end up, um, being longer?

00:13:32:08 - 00:14:04:03

Um, John Ingham for the applicant. Um, Well, I would have to defer to my colleague on the on the length of time it would need to be in place. But, um, the assessment isn't based on a specific duration. The assessment is, um, for the period of time it's required, um, until, uh, the mitigation planting. Um, so there is mitigation planting proposed alongside the road. Um, and once that establishes to the necessary height, um, that the fencing could be removed at that point.

00:14:04:11 - 00:14:39:17

And so just to pick up on, uh, establishment of planting, this is a clarification question. So the statement of common ground with North Kesteven District Council applicants response to ref 15 two. It says at first. So firstly it's anticipated that the planting would be at least 1.8m high at the start of construction and 2.6 at the start of operation of the proposed development. And then in the paragraph below, it says, based on the assumption that in year one, the planting stock would typically be 0.6 to 0.8 meters.

00:14:39:21 - 00:14:49:23

Could you just clarify which is correct? Is it the the higher level of growth for this location?

00:14:56:03 - 00:15:00:18

Again, for the applicant, I'm afraid we may need to come back in writing to respond to that question.

00:15:00:20 - 00:15:01:10

Okay.

00:15:05:15 - 00:15:11:12

Is temporary hoarding to mitigate glint and glare effects proposed anywhere else on this site?

00:15:14:13 - 00:15:16:05

Which groups on Earth happen to know?

00:15:16:22 - 00:15:44:16

Okay. So I note in table 13 of the Glint Angler study that proposed vegetation is providing screening for a number of residential receptors, but the duration of effects is only provided in that table with consideration of screening. So how my question is, how have Clint and Claire affects prior to the establishment of planting being accounted for? If temporary mitigation is not provided?

00:15:47:04 - 00:16:15:12

I will do it on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the geometry assessment, which considers just the bare of terrain and without any application, uh, implemented, uh, the duration effects are then considered, uh, following um, consideration of the baseline uh, and proposed mitigation. Um, the base table summarizes if there will still be an effect and ultimately conclude there will be no impact, which suggests there'll be, um, no duration of effects.

00:16:17:11 - 00:16:22:02

Okay. So for those residential receptors where

00:16:23:15 - 00:16:36:21

the proposed planting does provide screening, that's that's am I correct, an understanding that's that providing screening beyond what is further than what is required to mitigate the effects.

00:16:37:14 - 00:16:38:06

That's great.

00:16:38:10 - 00:16:39:09

Okay. Thank you.

00:16:41:13 - 00:16:46:07

Are there any comments from the local authorities on this agenda item?

00:16:48:21 - 00:17:08:09

No. Okay. So I would now, um, I'd like to open up to, uh, interested parties if they wish to comment on any of the matters we've been discussing in relation to landscape and visual effects so far this morning. I think if, uh, Mr. Frost on the left hand side.

00:17:14:00 - 00:17:50:04

Yeah. Thank you for allowing me to, uh, pick up on a couple of points. Um, Mr. Ingram spoke about the division between the western lower, uh, area and the eastern cliff area. I think it was on agenda .3.1, and he talked about the fact that he didn't think there was any, um, visual impact between the two

areas. Well, along the top of the cliff there is the national footpath, the Viking Way. Um, and the views from the Viking Way are specifically of that area over to the west.

00:17:50:12 - 00:18:21:05

And that's why the Viking Way is there. Um, and taking that route, also, the mitigations he talks about, um, will not be effective because you're in a much elevated position. And so looking down, um, rather than, um, from ground level, uh, at the, uh, at the areas. So, so I think that point, um, should be made that there will be, um, a visual impact and specifically from the Viking Way footpath.

00:18:22:08 - 00:18:57:12

Um, secondly, uh, Mr. Nelson talks about mitigation of the spires and steeples footpaths, and talked about the fact that there would only be three metre high, um, solar panels. Um, clearly there's going to be a six metre high collection station as well, visible from there. Um, so that was admitted from um, from his statement. And also in this Byers and Steeples, there is a large construction compound.

00:18:58:08 - 00:19:18:17

Um, there is crossings for cables and there's also a crossing for HGV vehicles to reach a construction compound. Um, so I think all of these points are against what he's saying is beautiful mitigation. Um, of the Spires and steeples footpath. Thank you.

00:19:19:18 - 00:19:28:23

Thank you. Could you pass the microphone to Miss Williams if all the interested parties who want to make representations do so, and then I'll ask the applicant to respond.

00:19:29:06 - 00:19:31:23

Mark Williams on behalf of Springwell Action Group.

00:19:32:00 - 00:19:34:05

So apologies, this is going to be a bit disjointed.

00:19:34:06 - 00:20:08:23

Because I can't remember all the different numbers, um, that you've you've flagged. Um, and I am going to try and be as polite as I can. Um, I find the responses from the applicant totally disingenuous. Um, they use percentages and numbers to to hide behind reality. We are a community of people who have to live with what you are about to put in our community. Okay. A few months ago, a sycamore tree was chopped down up in the north, the Sycamore Gap.

00:20:08:24 - 00:20:35:19

And what an outcry because one tree was chopped down. It had a huge impact on that local community. You are about to put in over 1.5 million solar panels. Um, a huge number of inverters, um, compounds, six meter high shipping containers, painted green or whatever color you want to paint them. I suggest.

00:20:36:00 - 00:20:39:17

Mr. Willis, can you address your representations to us rather than that the applicant.

00:20:39:19 - 00:20:51:19

Please? I suggest they paint it the Union Jack. Let's really make it stand out. Um, you know, Nathan B was voted one of the most beautiful villages recently.

00:20:53:09 - 00:21:25:18

Nathan is on the edge of this development, but it's going to be massively impacted. So let's let's not pretend that there is no visual impact. The applicant also suggests that solar panels can blend in well. Currently, one of the largest solar farms solar factories is about 200 acres. So yes, that 200 acres could have an impact on that local community. But we're talking about a 3500 acre development just for springwell.

00:21:25:20 - 00:22:16:05

Irrespective of Foss Green, irrespective of the odour, irrespective of the substation. Irrespective of the um best that Colby, irrespective of the best at Nathan be putting all that together is going to transform a beautiful landscape into an industrial complex. I've just mentioned about six applications there. The Tech Register has 11 applications currently. Okay, and is likely to get even worse. So if this is consented to God help the the the people of North Kesteven, we are going to be in a hellhole of an industrial complex, and the applicant can sit in the ivory towers that they, they work in, in, in, in big cities and, and and dismiss what the impact could be on the local people.

00:22:16:07 - 00:22:57:00

But locals are going to be devastated as part of the action group. I engage with about a thousand people on this as leader of the parish council. I have regular correspondence with people, and I've had to deal with people who have been in tears. This is going to have a major impact, and I'm really hope over the next three days, and particularly around the walk around on Friday, the planning inspector's team will actually see the impact. So when when the when the applicant talks about hedges, hedges being grown and having 15 metre channels to walk down the community, currently when you walk down a footpath, you can see a vista.

00:22:57:02 - 00:23:21:21

You can see a huge landscape. You can see deer, you can see hares running freely. You don't want to be condensed into a 15 metre channel where you know there are fences, fences either side of that and solar panels and cameras watching you. It's a bond and we need to recognise Recognize that the applicant may get away with this, but it is abhorrent.

00:23:24:23 - 00:23:26:12

Thank you, Mr. Williams. Mr..

00:23:27:13 - 00:24:01:01

Thank you. Thank you very much. I completely support those comments. I would like to pick up a few issues. One is if I could have the map, I don't know if you can put that up again which showed the different applications in the area. Thank you. The point about this one that strikes me is that you've chosen that as your landscape area, and I think you're. I'm not exactly sure if it's intended to be the sort of heathland area, but actually our experience, if you look at it, you know, if you take ten kilometres from Navan, be ten kilometres if you're driving.

00:24:01:03 - 00:24:33:08

How long does that take? Not very long. So that's that is the impact on those residents and that they think is not being picked up today. If you say it's 5% of the whole of that heathland area, which I think I ended up 5.7%. That's still greater than the government is talking about. They're saying it's only a small percentage of land and therefore it should be okay. So this is not in line with what the government is intending.

00:24:33:21 - 00:25:10:01

The other point is that this thing. Yeah. Not to keep on the landscape value. You know, I think the the vital point about here is that it's the impact on the character of the landscape. And that is not just the the land percentage cover as, as the, um, uh, you know, the our colleague said it's not just the percentage if you've got a huge industrial development in your area, what is your eye drawn to? You're looking at a beautiful countryside.

00:25:10:07 - 00:25:23:05

Ah. What's that shining big sea there? It's not. It draws the eye. It completely destroys the character of our rural landscape, and that's what really hurts.

00:25:24:18 - 00:25:57:06

I think also, I would like to point support the point. I don't know why the reds not colored in. Incidentally, that would make it a bit fairer, but I'd like to support the points about the idea of mitigating with fences and hedges. The problem with that is you're just creating another barrier, and it's the same as we've had before. You know where you've got a development and you just hide it with another big wall. Well, now you've got a wall to look at. That also is an alien feature in this rural landscape.

00:25:58:10 - 00:26:29:03

Even if you have hedges and you've managed to find one lane that's got hedges on both sides, I gather Turnbull Lane. But as we said, the actual character of this area is not tunneled lanes. The the character of the area is a big sky's. As we call it, a big open landscape. That's the character of this nature. The nature of this area. And that's why even if you don't cover the whole area with solar and as we said, the applications are really frightening.

00:26:29:12 - 00:26:36:21

If even if you didn't do that, it would still mean that the character of the area is destroyed.

00:26:39:07 - 00:27:10:18

There are other areas, but we are talking about landscape character today. So just in final conclusion. The point that I wanted to pick up and I should say that I'm also chairman of the Cliff Villages Solar Action Group. I didn't mention that earlier and the feeling locally is extremely powerful. We had a public meeting or several public meetings, 2 or 300 people, our halls, which never see more than you know. If you have an event, you normally get a small number Lumber.

00:27:10:20 - 00:27:17:16

Absolutely packed with distressed people. Really concerned about the changing of the landscape.

00:27:19:19 - 00:27:52:15

We had 500 letters, which I presented to the minister last week, and it's, um, that's personally written, and it's really worrying that we can't seem to get a synergy between what the government ministers think, that this is not a big impact and what we are seeing on the ground. You know, this is really, really significant. And the point about the, um, you know, going across the cliff edge, um, I think we did pick that up, but actually, um, this is slightly undulating, this land.

00:27:52:17 - 00:28:23:17

And it does mean there are viewpoints, um, all along viewpoints through this wide open landscape. And I'm not sure that that's properly accounted for here. So just in conclusion, um, I really hope that you'll look very closely and thank you to the questioning, which I think has been very pertinent. And I think that's been, you know. Picked out some of the real key issues. But fundamentally, this is just the wrong place for such a vast development. Changing the nature of our landscape.

00:28:23:19 - 00:28:24:12

Thank you.

00:28:27:16 - 00:28:28:17

Sorry, sorry, sorry.

00:28:29:03 - 00:29:04:00

Thank you. David Crampton, resident of North Kesteven. Um, a point I'd like to make about cumulative effect. We're all familiar with tech um, register, which changes twice weekly. So the register alters on a twice weekly basis. I understand the amount of connections that the need to be generating best is far in excess of the current schemes planned for Lincolnshire, which suggest that more schemes may come forward in the future. So I question whether we have enough information to assess the cumulative effect, because I think there's potential for more schemes.

00:29:04:02 - 00:29:07:10

I think that's a reasonable conclusion to make. Thank you for your time.

00:29:09:21 - 00:29:12:03

Thank you. If you hand it back to Mr. Williams.

00:29:12:18 - 00:29:19:15

Sorry, I did say I was going to struggle with my notes, so. Final point. And again, representing the spring Well action Group. Um.

00:29:21:20 - 00:29:52:00

I think if we one of the things the applicant talks about is temporary. Temporary to me is a road closure for a road repair or a bridge repair or, you know, a weekend closure. 40 years is not temporary. I think I said at the last event, by the time this this application is completed and finished and potentially decommissioned. My daughters who are in their early 20s will be 70. So that's not temporary.

00:29:52:02 - 00:30:31:08

It's a lifetime. Okay. Um, I do want to touch on this holding piece that that the applicant is talking about having hoardings 700m down the A15. The A15 leads into Lincoln. The view is a beautiful cathedral, so anyone driving down the A15 is going to see a minimum three metre high hoarding hiding hideous solar panels. Okay, um, the applicant must be sourcing plants from some wonderful place somewhere in the world that grow rapidly.

00:30:31:13 - 00:31:03:17

Because again, at the last, um, meeting, we had, uh, a plant expert who who farms in this area said you will struggle to get anywhere near the growth that that the applicant is predicting in within ten years. So realistically, you're going to have hoardings down the A15 probably for close on ten years. So I think we should suggest a banner for that hoarding. What about something like EDF destroying landscapes down down that 700?

00:31:03:19 - 00:31:05:23

So I. Mr. Williams, that's inappropriate. Thank you.

00:31:10:19 - 00:31:14:12

Any other interested parties that would like to make our presentation?

00:31:16:09 - 00:31:21:22

In which case could I ask the applicant if they'd like to respond to any of the points that have been raised?

00:31:23:19 - 00:31:53:24

Thank you. Sir. Uh, then can I just thank everyone for those comments? Um, I will be passing to Mr. John Ingham and possibly Mr. van der Nelson, um, to see if they've got anything verbally to respond to, although of course, we may reserve to put any responses in writing. Um, I will though, just have a few points mentioned. So I think on Mr. Frost's comments on Viking Way and the collector stations are passed to Mr. Ingham. Um, in terms of Mr.

00:31:54:01 - 00:32:32:01

Williams, I do want to clarify that, um, we have not said there will be no visual impact. We have not said that. I have not said that today. The applicant has not said that today. And we do not dismiss the impacts that, uh, that uh, will arise as set out in the environmental statement. We do accept there'll be some, some residual, um, uh, landscape effects and indeed, um, as does the national policy statement and one at paragraph five point 10.5, and I quote, virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape.

00:32:32:16 - 00:33:07:15

Um, so I will make that point that we have not said there'll be no impacts. Um, I also think we have to accept that there is a balance to be struck between another, uh, effect on both the national population and local residents, which is the impact that is recognized by the government on the climate change. And this project is responding to that impact that is affecting every resident and every person in the United Kingdom on climate change and this policy and this project responds to that need.

00:33:08:05 - 00:33:40:05

And the location of that need has to be located close to grid availability of grid connections. Hence why our site assessment has located Springwell here. Um, that also partly responds to Missus Overton there. Um, I will just clarify, Mr. Ingham, I'm going for more detail about, um, you know, we totally disagree that, um, the character will be destroyed. That is not our conclusion. We disagree with that. Mr. Ingham can no doubt expand more. Um, on the cumulative effect point for Mr.

00:33:40:07 - 00:34:17:05

Crampton. Um, we have assessed those schemes that we are aware of. We have followed the planning Inspectorate's guidance on looking at the long list and the short list of cumulative um, schemes. Um, and so that is how we've carried out our cumulative assessment. And then going back to Mr. Williams point on the that this is not a temporary scheme. That is a challenge to government policy. Aim at paragraph 2.10 .66 of n three. Um. The adopted National Policy statement from the government or Parliament says that a time limited consent, where granted, is described as temporary because there is a finite period for which it exists.

00:34:17:07 - 00:34:50:17

I accept you may disagree with that, and Mr. Williams may disagree with that, but that is policy. And, um, that is not the subject of this, um, examination. Um, and as for the, um, temporary mitigation for the Clinton Clare, it's as Mr. Ingham said, it would not be 700m. Um, it would be, um, dealing with the gaps in the hedgerows. And we're going to provide the expanding authority with a photo montage of what that might look like. So that's my brief overview, but I'll pass to Mr. Hammond, perhaps Mr. Nelson as well, to see if there's any else I want to add to that.

00:34:52:04 - 00:35:30:07

Thank you, Alex Nelson, for the applicant. Um, I just wanted to clarify a few points coming back, um, in particular to Mr. Frost's point about the spars and steeples. Um, I think he referenced various heights about solar panels, which I didn't, um, refer to earlier. Um, just to clarify, in terms of our design response, um, we've, um, taken consideration of the spires and steeples has, has been a key consideration of our design response. We have excluded, um, solar panels, um, entirely from the west of, uh, the spa and steeples, uh, route.

00:35:31:02 - 00:36:09:20

Um, and that's, that's taken place throughout the various iterations of the design, um, stages and process. Um, and we've also excluded, um, solar panels for a large stretch of, um, uh, to the, to the east of the route, so that actually we only have panels directly adjacent to the spires and steeples for approximately 250m. Um, Principally in two fields. Um, where we do have that, we are providing that 15 meter offset and we are providing the mitigation planting, which, um, I fully accept will take time to develop.

00:36:09:22 - 00:36:50:05

But once it is established, um, will screen, uh, the, the, the panels, um, in terms of the satellite collector compound being next to the spars and steeples trail, that is not the case. The satellite collect compound is located in by 22, which is another, uh, field away. I haven't got the exact measurement. I imagine, from a very crude measure on my plan. It's about 400 to 500m away from the Spars and Steeples trail. Um, yes, except that the construction, um, compound is located next to the spars and steeples, all within the fields, so it could be located nearby, but that is.

00:36:50:07 - 00:37:23:24

And that is a temporary effect which is taken account for in the, um, Elvia assessment. Um, and I would also kind of highlight that we are we are taking measures to upgrade the spars and steeples trail and, um, respond to other objectives as set out in the neighbourhood plan, um, which is about improving the cycling connection between Scott Wick, uh, up to Ingham um station for where that sits within our ward limits. Um, and just responding to, um, a comment which kind of spread across Councilor Overton's, um, Mr.

00:37:24:01 - 00:37:56:08

Williams, um, point around kind of fence lines. Um, we are seeking to create pockets of, um, open space within and break up that solar development where that is the case. The fence line will be set back to the edge of the solar. Um, so we wouldn't put the fence line right up against the, um, effect of public right away or sit against the weather where the solar, uh, um, is. Um, so up to the point of work. Number one, the yellow shaded area in the works plans.

00:37:56:24 - 00:38:27:18

Um, and with regard to the hoarding, as my colleague um, along the A4, uh, along the A15, as my colleague referred to earlier, that mitigation is best placed against the solar. Um, we do um, uh, have built in a wider offset along the A15, um, to at least 25m to that, um, uh, where the solar, uh, proposals are proposed. So that will at least be 25m away from the road. And um, as Mr.

00:38:27:20 - 00:38:35:07

Ingham said earlier, we will update our visual to give you an impression of what that looks like. If I pass over to my colleague, Mr. Ingham.

00:38:37:23 - 00:39:17:17

Thank you very much. John Ingham. Uh, for the applicant. Um, there's a few points I just want to pick up as well. Um, I think the first one just for your benefit. So, says, um, I wanted to highlight the Viking way, which is shown on, um, it's figure 10.3. Um, within is volume two, chapter ten. That is A066. Um, for reference, um, and uh, it's shown as a, uh, as a yellow, um, highlighted route on that, on that figure.

00:39:18:08 - 00:39:21:05

Sorry. Do tell me if you want to wait for the figure to come up.

00:39:24:10 - 00:39:27:10

So the figure was ten points. Which which one was it?

00:39:27:12 - 00:39:28:12

Oh. 10.3.

00:39:28:14 - 00:39:29:18

10.3. Thank you.

00:39:31:15 - 00:40:09:13

Um, so there was some discussion around the Viking way there. And, um, I absolutely concur that the root of that. Uh, it does follow the top of the, um, of the linking cliff and, uh, it does enable long distance views to the west, across the land, to the west. Um. It's not my place to comment on other, um, projects coming forward in that landscape there. But, um, just to make the point that really from the top of that cliff there, there would be no view of the Springwell solar project at all.

00:40:09:23 - 00:40:34:07

And we discussed, uh, I had quite an extensive, uh, discussion with, um, Mr. Brown from the representing the councils about potential viewpoints along that route there. And, um, it's a matter of the agreement. I think that we agreed that there was there wasn't going to be any view from that location of Springwell solar farm. So we didn't include any viewpoints, uh, from that location.

00:40:34:24 - 00:40:40:01

Um, so it's very interesting and that that was discussed with the local authority and agreed. Yes.

00:40:40:03 - 00:40:52:14

That I believe there's quite a good record in, um, Mr. Brown's Review, um, of of that correspondence. Um, yeah. Um.

00:40:55:02 - 00:41:29:02

So, yeah, that was the point about that. And there was a point raised. I just a point of clarification. Um, I think it was Councillor Overton, um, referred to 5% of the of the land area. Um, I think that was an aggregation of the effects on the national character area, the landscape character type and the landscape character areas. Just to be clear, uh, those overlaps. So that's effectively double or triple counting those figures. So, um, the landscape character type overlaps.

00:41:29:08 - 00:41:49:02

It's not far different from the overall area of the, of the national character area. So, um, those figures, um, which were discussed this morning and which we're going to confirm in writing. Um, it's not that there would be 5% across the whole area. That's an aggregation of the effects on the landscape character areas. Um.

00:41:51:20 - 00:41:52:11

Um.

00:41:56:05 - 00:41:56:20

Uh.

00:41:57:00 - 00:42:30:06

Yes. I think the final point I just, I wanted to pick up on was, uh, the suggestion again, that the character of the landscape would be destroyed, I think. Um, and, uh, the point there being what the applicant acknowledges that there would be significant adverse effects, um, in certain within a defined tract of the landscape. Um, however, uh, we we we we strongly, uh, refute the suggestion that that would destroy the landscape.

00:42:30:17 - 00:42:46:10

Um, the landscape, uh, would remain, um, accessible and, uh, in many ways still the, the recreational amenity value and the visual amenity of the landscape would remain. Albeit I understand,

00:42:47:23 - 00:42:53:03

the many members of the public may disagree that that's, um, you know,

00:42:54:16 - 00:43:36:15

that there's, um, that there wouldn't be an adverse effect. We acknowledge that there would be an adverse effect. But, um, we we refute the suggestion that that landscape would be destroyed. I think the design principles which we have embedded within the scheme ensure that that is a landscape which, uh, would remain, uh, overall, principally in agricultural use. Um, there will be, um, a substantial amount of solar in certain areas. Um, but the effects on the, uh, landscape are localised and, uh, there are, there are opportunities to enjoy the landscape in all in different directions from, from the solar farm.

00:43:37:13 - 00:43:38:03

Well.

00:43:39:17 - 00:44:04:06

Thank you, I just got a couple of questions following up that, um, so the going back to the point that Mr. Frost raised on the Sparrow steeples way and the visibility of the satellite collector compounds. Um, is there any visibility of the satellite collect compound from the spire since Staples Way?

00:44:09:17 - 00:44:23:13

Uh, Alexandre Nelson for the applicant. So my particular point was, um, just clarifying that it is the satellite collector compound is not next to the spars and staples. I will pass the mystic thing of who who might be able to confirm the visibility of it.

00:44:23:15 - 00:44:45:22

Okay. So I understood the point you're making. And this is another question as to whether you can actually see it. Because it does it does appear from the, um, zone of theoretical visibility plan. Um, figure 10.7 a um. That it would be, it would be visible. Um.

00:44:47:13 - 00:45:41:05

So, uh, John Ingham for the applicant. Um, you've correctly identified the figure there, so it's figure, um, 10.7. Um, and, uh, there's a TV, uh, illustrates that there would be a negligible glimpse, I would suggest of. Um, the, the collect compound at satellite collect compound there from the, uh, from from the, um, spires and steeples way. Um, I think, uh, once mitigation planting has established, this is, um, this is a, uh, is a TV prior to the implementation of any mitigation planting, um, that, uh, that there would be a negligible glimpse of, uh, the satellite collect compound from um from the from from the supplies and staples way.

00:45:41:13 - 00:45:50:12

It is that in uh, as you cross the east side of field C7 that yields. Is that where you would see it?

00:45:51:16 - 00:45:55:06

I apologize I don't have the fig field.

00:45:55:08 - 00:46:01:10

C7 is the uh where there's the access road coming in from the B1 188.

00:46:06:11 - 00:46:07:01

Yeah.

00:46:07:03 - 00:46:18:16

Yeah. So, uh, John Ingham for the applicant, it would be the western boundary of field C8. Um, so it's just at the south of Brickyard Plantation.

00:46:19:03 - 00:46:19:18

Okay.

00:46:24:06 - 00:46:27:24

And field C9 or. No, just fields. Yeah.

00:46:32:12 - 00:46:41:14

Uh, no, sir. There's actually a an existing hedgerow, I believe, on that particular section there. So that that would create some screening.

00:46:42:07 - 00:46:42:22

Okay.

00:46:42:24 - 00:46:45:00

Thank you. Um.

00:46:47:24 - 00:46:53:10

And just to, uh, pick up on a point raised by Miss Overton

00:46:55:06 - 00:47:18:15

around the fact that around, um, her concern that the impact on character area isn't necessarily bounded by the character area boundaries. And this is this is something we discussed earlier. Um, but whether there there was anything that the applicant's team wanted to respond on that.

00:47:24:19 - 00:47:53:02

Uh, joining them for the applicant. Um, within the environmental statements in chapter ten, we have defined the tract of the landscape over which we say there would be a visual impact. Um, in, uh, yeah. There isn't any instance where either in landscape, character area 11 or 7, the effects would extend beyond those character areas. Um, so yeah. No.

00:47:53:04 - 00:48:09:12

Okay. Yeah. I understand your position. Right. Okay. Thank you. Um, so it's now, uh, coming on to 12:20, I suggest now's a good time to take a.

00:48:13:05 - 00:48:27:02

So I suggest now's a good time to take a lunch break. So if we break for an hour and come reconvene at, uh, 20. Oh, sorry. Mr. Frost, would you like to just wait for the microphone to come?

00:48:32:17 - 00:48:36:10

And then. Sorry, Miss Overton, did I see your hand after as well?

00:48:37:11 - 00:49:15:15

Hey, Mr. Frost. Um, it's just one point picking up on Mr. Ingham's statement there that the mitigation planting is likely to stop us being able to see a six metre high collection state um, station, which is only 450m away, I think he said. I mean, that just raises that whole point about what we are going to be able to see from the footpaths around the area if this mitigation, um, is going to be hedges that stop us seeing collector compounds of six metres high, 450m away.

00:49:15:18 - 00:49:22:04

We're certainly not going to see any long views. So just like to point that out to, uh, to Mr. Ingham.

00:49:23:06 - 00:49:26:23

Thank you. Thank you. Can you pass the microphone down the line to.

00:49:31:00 - 00:50:04:10

Thank you very much. Marianne Overton, chairman of the Cliff Villages Social Action Group. The issue, the mitigations been mentioned, but my point was that that mitigation, creating new barriers to cover unsightly industrial development doesn't cut it. That just doesn't do it because you're creating another new barrier which is equally as unwanted in the case of particularly the wooden ones. And obviously in the in the hedges, you're still creating a barrier effect, which is not part of the natural character of our area.

00:50:04:24 - 00:50:37:13

The other point that was raised, I understand, is about the balancing the the impacts, balancing the adverse impacts which have been acknowledged, significant adverse impacts, um, against the need. And we haven't discussed need today because it wasn't really on the agenda. But we talked before about needs, uh, whether it's there's absolutely no I haven't heard a clear explanation of the choice of sites. I understood it could be anywhere along that grid line.

00:50:37:15 - 00:51:11:16

Anywhere along that line. And of course, there is no grid currently. So I know those points were added extra. But we do want to tackle that. And indeed we are something like 330% oversupplied if all the applications went ahead. So there is no you know, the need is not clear. And secondly, why not put them on roofs. There's thousands, hundreds of thousands of acres of commercial roof lying vacant. So I realise that we are talking about landscape, but because that was raised, I think it just wants tackling at some stage.

00:51:11:18 - 00:51:12:11

Thank you.

00:51:13:02 - 00:51:15:03

Thank you. I think, Mr. Williams.

00:51:17:09 - 00:51:58:04

Sorry. I again, um, Mark Williams, um, Springwell action Group. Just to reiterate what, uh, Councillor Overton has said, if we look outside the window of this building, we see hundreds of rooftops, not a solar panel in sight. That's where the applicant should be. Should be starting this project. Get these roof spaces covered in solar panels. Then look at land. The other point I was going to raise on the, um, the area of not just Springwater East, but across the entire development where people walk that they walk their dogs, they cycle their, you know, big groups.

00:51:58:06 - 00:52:29:11

If you if you're if you're out in that environment on a Saturday or Sunday, you see loads of people, okay. And I press the the inspector when he does his is a company site visit on Friday to actually appreciate what people use that land for. Okay. These are people who who enjoy the countryside. These aren't people who live in cities and and think it's okay. Walking down, um, alleyways.

00:52:29:15 - 00:53:09:03

With high rise buildings surrounding them. You know, these are people who enjoy the countryside. That's why they live there. So it's very easy for the applicant and the applicants representative to say that there will be minimal impact or no impact, or the impact will decline after ten years when trees, plants have grown. That's not why people live there. People have moved into these areas to enjoy the countryside, so they don't need a classroom based study to say mitigation will happen because in many cases, a lot of these people will be long gone by the time mitigation gets anywhere near covering these solar panels.

00:53:09:08 - 00:53:09:24

Thank you.

00:53:11:23 - 00:53:21:13

Very small point. I just want to pick up about the story, the landscape. I didn't say destroy the landscape. Destroy the nature, the rural nature of the landscape. That was the point I was making.

00:53:21:15 - 00:53:33:16

Thank you. I understood. Thank you. Would the applicant like to come back on any of those points? I don't want to get into a discussion on needs and alternatives. Now, if we could keep it to landscape manager.

00:53:34:02 - 00:54:17:07

Thank you so much. I. Yes I agree. I mean, I think what Mr. Williams is saying goes to the goes to government policy and this is not the examiner. This is not the forum to debate public policy. I'm afraid you may disagree. Mr. Williams may disagree with public policy. The government policy that is a different issue to what this examination is here for. The need is established, um, is classed as significant in the national policy statements and therefore we should not be discussing need in this

examination. Um, the government, um, uh, and the recent um, uh CCG report and the roadmap accepts there was a need for both, uh, large scale solar and rooftop solar.

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

Rooftop solar does not remove the need for large scale solar. Owner all together is required to hit the climate emergency set out in government policy. That's the challenge to government policy. That's not for this examination. So I just wanted to make that point that as far as we're concerned, we should not be using any of the time for that.

00:54:41:05 - 00:54:59:01

Okay. Thank you. So if we now take our one hour lunch break, it's 12:25. So if we, um, reconvene here at 1:25, um, where we will start with, um, cultural heritage agenda item four. Thank you.