

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Springwell Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Part 3
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: 01:26:32

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:16:12 - 00:00:59:05

Okay, the time is now 125 and time for this issue specific hearing to resume. Um, so we'll pick up with um agenda item for cultural heritage and starting with 4.1 uh, which relates to the archaeological disc based assessment. I understand that there was a meeting arranged on the 19th of June between the applicant, the county council, and Historic England. Um, is there an update that the applicant can provide on the discussions that have taken place since deadline two, and whether there is agreement on what further work, um, might be undertaken on the archaeological desk based assessment.

00:01:00:15 - 00:01:23:00

Miss Coleman for the applicant. Thank you. Um, yes. Um, there has been, um, that meeting and then a few further meetings. So there's been quite positive, um, engagement with the authorities and Historic England. And we thank the other parties for that. I'm going to pass over to Mrs. Jan Richards, principal archaeology and built heritage consultant at Headland Archaeology, which is part of RSC, to provide an update on those discussions.

00:01:26:08 - 00:02:03:03

Thank you. Yes. Jane Richards for the applicant. Um, as we agreed with the local authorities at deadline one, the desk based assessment has been updated with a new figure showing the heritage assets and the zone of theoretical visibility. Um, we have, as Miss Coleman said, has had further engagement with the local authorities regarding the further synthesis of the desk based research and geophysical survey results which are being incorporated into the updated outline scheme of investigation. Uh, we've shared a draft of that synthesis with Historic England and the local authorities have agreed the principles of the targeted and question led approach to further evaluation.

00:02:03:07 - 00:02:06:21

And we're preparing the documentation to secure that through the DCO.

00:02:08:03 - 00:02:35:00

Thank you. And so, will those updated documents be available to submit at deadline three. So desk based assessment and outline a written scheme of investigation. Is it just those two documents. Sorry. Yes. Okay. And can I ask for the county council if they've got anything to add to on progress that has been made regarding the architectural text based assessment.

00:02:35:09 - 00:02:48:08

Thank you. If I may just comment first, John Hunter, on behalf of the County Council. My understanding is as well, the crucial to this will be some revised wording of requirement 11 in the draft DCO.

00:02:48:10 - 00:02:53:08

Yeah, we'll come on to requirement 11 an agenda item for 4.2. Thanks.

00:02:53:10 - 00:03:08:11

And I'll leave it there. But just to note that um, and then otherwise in relation to the detail of those discussions and how it's progressed matters, I will hand over Affirmé to Matt Parker, Wooding to my left, who is the Historic Environment Infrastructure Officer for the county council.

00:03:10:04 - 00:03:40:08

Thank you. Matt Parker awarding El-Sisi. Yes, we've had a number of meetings with the applicant and Historic England, and we've made some substantial progress on the matters of substance outstanding from the previous hearing. Uh, we are in a broadly in agreement in the the, um, the, uh, outline WSI uh, that's that's been progressed. We are still have some small, um, topics to, to resolve. Part of those will be when detailed design has been submitted.

00:03:40:13 - 00:03:44:13

Um, but but otherwise, uh, we are broadly in agreement.

00:03:45:03 - 00:03:59:08

So the matters that are outstanding are they matters that you want to see further progress on within the examination period. Are you happy for those matters to be dealt with through detailed design?

00:03:59:13 - 00:04:13:23

We are happy for them to be completed at detailed design for the outline and scheme of investigation, for the further stages of work which the applicant has committed to. And we are we are satisfied that that that's an acceptable approach.

00:04:14:03 - 00:04:33:08

Okay. And so if uh, when when we received the updated documents from the applicant at deadline three, if the county council could provide commentary on those, those items which they're happy with being resolved further down the line, then that would be helpful to me.

00:04:33:14 - 00:04:35:17

Yes. Yeah. That that is the case.

00:04:35:19 - 00:04:48:14

And could I invite Historic England to give their view on discussions to date, and whether they're in agreement with the work that's been agreed to be done during the examination period?

00:04:50:03 - 00:05:23:14

It's Mr. Tim Allen for Historic England. Need to put the camera back on because I can't do it. Um, yeah. We we've had constructive discussions with both the applicant and the authority. Um, the as, um, the applicant set out the question led approach is agreeable. Um, we've had a constructive look at the detail of further archaeological investigations with them, and that's all moving in the right direction towards deadline three. Um, the will come on to requirement 11 on the next question.

00:05:23:19 - 00:05:30:20

But, uh, yeah, we're content that things are going the right way and should be in, you know, at an appropriate point for deadline for it.

00:05:32:05 - 00:05:48:05

Okay. Thank you. And and again, if, um, when the applicant's documents have been submitted, if a deadline three if you could provide comment on those at the following deadline. Um that would be helpful to me as well. Thank you.

00:05:48:14 - 00:05:49:05

Thank you.

00:05:51:12 - 00:06:30:04

Okay. So let's let's discuss requirement 11 then. So the wording of the requirement was updated in the draft development consent order submitted at D1 which is Rep 1006. So the County Council have provided comment on the applicant's revised wording for requirement 11 in its comments on D1 submissions, which is rep 2025. So first question is to the county council, um, if the applicant's proposed requirement was adjusted to use the phrase no development at all.

00:06:30:06 - 00:06:47:01

Comments instead of the phrases no part of works 1 to 7 may commence, or to reference permitted preliminary works, and for the term substantially to be removed, would the requirement then be acceptable to the County Council?

00:06:50:06 - 00:07:00:11

John Hunter on behalf of the county council, I. There has been a revolt. As I said, there's been a revised draft which uses slightly different terminology. I apologize for not answering your question directly.

00:07:00:17 - 00:07:03:06

So this this is a this is a further.

00:07:03:08 - 00:07:40:16

There's a further iteration which isn't for us today, but which has been shared and is being discussed, which uses words which appear to us to be quite close to. I think the wording at the moment is no part of the authorized development may commence. So it's clearly a lot broader than the draft DCO version that is in the examination library. The term substantially in accordance with is still there, and that's one of the topics on which we are mulling over what's being put to us and whether or not we can reach agreement on that or not, or whether there's still an issue with that, is is one of the points that's still not resolved fully.

00:07:41:03 - 00:07:55:22

Um, but the first one, the prohibition on the commencement of any of the authorized development has. That's obviously moved a lot further towards the position that the county council wished it to be in. Yeah.

00:07:55:24 - 00:08:04:04

So that's now that's now effectively including works work numbers eight and nine within that requirement as well.

00:08:04:22 - 00:08:18:17

This comment for the applicant. Yes. The wording is as indicated. To say no part of the authorized development may commence until. And then there's the list of what has to occur. So yes, we've made that change. And we'll do that in the updated this year. Deadline three.

00:08:18:19 - 00:08:26:01

Thank you. Um, and then in terms of reference to the word substantially is

00:08:27:20 - 00:08:32:01

I will you confirm your position on that at deadline three or is that or.

00:08:32:16 - 00:08:40:07

I think that's the position the county council would like to. It was to reflect what it's been told and and confirm its position then.

00:08:40:12 - 00:08:53:22

Okay. Thank you. You're helpful. And, uh, so to Mr. Allen, does this capture Historic England's concerns with the wording of requirement? Have you also had sight of the further draft?

00:08:55:05 - 00:09:35:18

Yes, sir. Yeah, we've seen the further draft. Um, we've no objection to it in its current form, subject to the applicant and the LPA and their legal advice on the on the exact wording, because obviously that's, that's for them. Um, yeah. Which includes on whether substantial is safe in that context or not. But uh, yeah. The, the overall structure of it where if you have a base document, then further work is done to an agreed specification that provides more information, and then that information update informs the next stage of mitigation work.

00:09:35:20 - 00:09:39:15

That sort of iterative approach we're happy with. It's well structured.

00:09:41:04 - 00:09:42:07

Okay. Thank you.

00:09:44:20 - 00:10:11:02

And that's helpful. So at at nine three I'll just wait and see the, the new wording. And um, the county council's commentary on that. Um, so we can move on to item 4.3, uh, dealing with the setting of above ground heritage assets. Um, and first taking Blankley and square conservation areas. I'll allow for some reshuffling people.

00:10:18:16 - 00:10:49:20

So the county council's local impact report states that the setting of Blakeney and Scott conservation areas are influenced not only by direct views, but their wider landscape context and the kinetic experience of traveling to and between them to and fro between them. At deadline two, the applicant responded um in 2023 to say that previous concerns had been alleviated by offsets along the footpath between the two areas.

00:10:50:04 - 00:11:07:00

So just firstly, could the applicant confirm whether that response is referring to the offset shown in the works plans in the application documents, or is there a further offset that's been proposed in response to this concern in the area?

00:11:08:08 - 00:11:11:22

The applicant I'm going to pass you back to Mrs. Richards to deal with the question.

00:11:11:24 - 00:11:12:14

Thank you.

00:11:14:01 - 00:11:18:12

Jane Richards for the applicant. Um, it refers to the offsets in the works plan.

00:11:18:14 - 00:11:32:03

Okay. Yeah. So there's no no further change? No further? Okay. Are the county council satisfied with how this concern has been dealt with, or do you consider that these conservation areas require further assessment?

00:11:34:06 - 00:12:05:21

John Hunter LCC. Um, there is still concern. Um, and if I could, I introduce this. And this will also apply when we move on to other matters. Um, in the uh report in particular, the the county council submitted drew attention to the requirements of the EIA regulations, and he he had one and one I'd like to particularly highlight is the requirements in regulation 14 at

00:12:07:10 - 00:12:48:14

14 three, that the environmental statement must include the information reasonably required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the development. And I think our position is that's still not the case, because the council, it is accepted that there is an impact on the setting of the conservation areas. It is accepted that the, uh, setting of the of the conservation areas makes a contribution to their significance, but nevertheless they are not part of the assessment within the year because they have been scoped out within the um, desk based assessments and setting document.

00:12:49:02 - 00:13:26:24

Uh, notwithstanding the fact that they were scoped in, uh, in the or at least subject to there being potential significant effects within the scoping opinion. So the position is this that there is within the ES. Obviously, the the requirement requirement for in regulation 14 three is to enable you as examining authority and the Secretary of State to reach a recent conclusion on the likely significant effects. But there isn't the information in the ES to enable you to reach a conclusion on a heritage designated heritage assets, i.e.

00:13:27:01 - 00:13:58:22

the conservation areas which it is accepted there will be an impact on, albeit there is potentially difference of opinion as to the level of significance of that impact. So our concern remains that that this ought to have been included within the assessment in the US. Um, and so far as the sort of detail

and merits of the, uh, judgments as to impact on significance, I'll leave that, if I may, to Mr.. Nitin. Mr.. Mark night in the historic buildings and landscape manager, who is to my left.

00:14:02:00 - 00:14:03:11

Thank you sir. Martin Knight and.

00:14:03:13 - 00:14:15:02

Lancashire County Council. Um, our view is that the wider landscape, uh, does contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation areas and therefore should be included in the. Yes.

00:14:16:23 - 00:14:22:08

Okay. Thank you. Can I ask the applicant to come back on those points?

00:14:24:10 - 00:14:56:19

To the applicant. Um, we maintain the position in terms of the, um, conservation areas and the impact there. Um, however, we can add some clarification detail, um, if that's helpful, to address the point in terms of the ES, but the position is the same in terms of that, we say, because there are no significant effects predicted, that it isn't required to be in there. Yes. And it is that ES is fully compliant with those regulations. Um, but we can provide some additional information to assist with that. Um, if that would help in terms of how we've reached that conclusion.

00:14:57:06 - 00:15:05:13

That that would be helpful if you could provide that at deadline three. Is there agreement on the, um,

00:15:07:07 - 00:15:16:03

on the extent to which the landscape contributes to the, uh, setting of the conservation area?

00:15:17:11 - 00:15:20:02

I'll hand you to Mrs. Richards to to answer that question.

00:15:21:12 - 00:15:37:00

Jen Richards for the applicant. I believe we do have agreement on, um, how the setting of the conservation areas contributes to their significance. And as, um, LTC have have indicated, our remaining disagreement is around the level of impact, that that would occur to. Significance.

00:15:37:22 - 00:15:40:14

Okay. Understood. Um.

00:15:42:22 - 00:16:01:01

Yes. So. Okay. And is that does that match your view as the county council, that you agree on the extent to which the landscape contributes to the setting? But it's the scale of effect that. Yeah. Sorry. You've turned to your microphone.

00:16:01:15 - 00:16:03:06

Sorry. Martin I assume. Yes.

00:16:03:20 - 00:16:24:01

Okay. Yeah. So a clear explanation from the applicant at deadline three as to how you've reached the conclusions of, um, the impact on the setting of the conservation areas would be helpful. And then following that, the county council's, um, commentary on that, um, would be helpful to me.

00:16:25:21 - 00:17:00:11

So can I just make the point? John Hunter, on behalf of the county council again, that my going back to the legal point, I think it's it's simply important that it should be put forward as part of the ES, because that is the legal requirement. And there's you be aware of the comments. Many years ago now, Lord Hoffman in the Barclay case, that the the environmental impact assessment process isn't a paper chase. So although the applicant may think, well, we've worked it out privately or we've worked it out in correspondence with you, or we will provide it in supplementary documents.

00:17:00:17 - 00:17:17:08

It's important both for the legal compliance of your report and the decision and for public participation, that it can be the assessment that is being relied on and the reasoning that's been relied on should be set out as a as an amendment or in addition to the. Yes, I think.

00:17:20:08 - 00:17:34:05

That the applicant would um, how how are you proposing to provide this information as a, as an update to the er Chapter or. Yes. What? What were you proposing.

00:17:34:18 - 00:18:06:16

With the applicant? I think that's the point. We need to confirm in terms of where it will actually sit. Um, but in any respect, as I've said already, the environmental statement is required to identify the likely significant effects of the development, which we've done. And these don't fall into that category, but we'll take away the point of the point and obviously understand the case law, um, in terms of where it needs to sit. Um, so we will do that and we'll make sure that's clearly signposted so that people can find that. But um, yeah, the detail of where it sits, I'll just need to take that one away and we can confirm that we'll obviously do do it at deadline three.

00:18:06:18 - 00:18:11:06

And also in our cover letter will confirm where it actually is within the updated documents.

00:18:12:05 - 00:18:12:22

Thank you.

00:18:17:17 - 00:18:58:04

So if we move on to effects on listed on the listed farmhouses and Scott Mill, um, there are a number of Designated heritage assets, where North Kesteven District Council has requested further information on the setting, assessment and further information has been provided and included within the Statement of Common Ground between the applicant and North Kesteven District Council, but I understand that the information provided regarding mill Um and Thompson's Bottom farmhouse, both grade two listed, is not agreed.

00:18:58:06 - 00:19:19:01

It's that um so firstly because um North and District Council confirm is it just these two heritage assets um or listed heritage assets that you have concerns about in relation to the assessment and district council. So I'm just going to pass over to Mr. Matthew Bentley.

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

Who is.

00:19:19:20 - 00:19:23:04

Online. Um, and he's North Stevens conservation officer.

00:19:23:13 - 00:19:24:03

Okay.

00:19:26:19 - 00:19:27:21

Uh good afternoon.

00:19:27:23 - 00:19:40:14

Yes. Thank you. Matthew Bentley from North Kesteven District Council. Yes. That's correct. Um, with regards the designated heritage assets, we're still not in agreement on Iihs, Thompson Bottom Farm and Scott Windmill.

00:19:41:24 - 00:19:53:12

Thank you, Mr. Bentley. And could you expand on your concerns regarding each of these heritage assets and identify in what aspects you disagree with the applicant's position on the impact on the setting of these assets?

00:19:54:00 - 00:20:25:06

Uh, with regards Scott Mill. Firstly, as you mentioned, it's a grade two heritage asset. There are is a solar array to the south of Scott Windmill, which is um, approximately, I believe, for 450m to the to the south of Scott Windmill. Um, due to the scale of the mill, um, it means that there will be a relationship visual relationship between the mill and the solar array, though it is some distance to the south.

00:20:25:20 - 00:20:48:13

Um. This, I believe, will affect the setting. Um, therefore, the special interest of the mill. And as such, um, the level of impact is significant enough for it to have warranted further assessment. Um, in the, um, within the environment and within the EAS. So in the EIA. Sorry.

00:20:51:14 - 00:21:32:08

With regards Thompsons bottom farmhouse, um, further detail was provided by the applicant. Um, mostly considering um impacts on setting to the south of uh, Thompson's Thompson's Bottom farm. Because the facade of the listed farmhouse does directly address south, however, the farm complex is listed as well. There is a independently listed barn with a number of curtilage listed structures as well, and this is mostly related to the impact of the setting of movement between Thompsons Bottom Farm and the A15.

00:21:32:22 - 00:22:10:11

At present, that landscape is a purely open landscape with no enclosure. Pretty much from the A15 until you reach Thompsons Bottom Farm. Um, the proposals for solar array with regards embedded mitigation screening around the solar array in that area will enclose the north side as you're approaching Thomson's Bottom Farm from the A15. Um, that will change the landscape significantly, change the approach to Thompson's Bottom Farm and affect its setting, um, and therefore affect its special interest.

00:22:11:19 - 00:22:40:09

The level and again, some somewhat as with the um, conservation areas there, I think there's there's agreement that there's going to be an impact. The disagreement really, for the most part, comes on that level of impact and whether or not it should be, um, should have been scoped in for further assessment. And potentially that level of impact would have led to bespoke mitigation rather than rather than embedded mitigation.

00:22:41:09 - 00:23:02:15

Okay. Thank you. So just to confirm on with regards to Scott McMillan, is it primarily a disagreement about the extent to which the landscape contributes to the setting? Um, or is it more a case of the interface ability between the two?

00:23:03:09 - 00:23:20:20

Um, Matthew Bentley from North Kesteven. Um, I think there's there's agreement in the Elvia that there is going to be a level of visibility. Um, the the disagreement is regards that impact that visibility will have on the, on the setting and significance of the mill.

00:23:22:23 - 00:23:27:21

Thank you. Um, can I turn to the applicant to respond on those? Sorry.

00:23:29:03 - 00:23:29:23

A few things on that.

00:23:30:03 - 00:23:31:01

Yes, please. Steve.

00:23:31:03 - 00:23:48:21

Yeah. Thank you. Uh, just John Hunter, on behalf of the county council. Just picking up on the last point mentioned there. The the the it is correct that the landscape visual assessment in the ESE identifies indivisibility. In fact, it says that there will be significant effects.

00:23:49:13 - 00:23:50:08

Um, or.

00:23:50:15 - 00:24:29:07

In views from Scott Mill and the farmhouse, both I think in the case of Scott Mill at all stages, construction year on year ten and decommissioning. And I think, uh, at least some of those stages in

the case of the farmhouse and that finding when one looks at the matrix in the LV, uh, in the landscape and visual assessment, it appears to imply that there is either a moderate or a moderate to major or a major magnitude of change in the view, so that the County Council highlights the fact that that's something that should have been looked at in more detail.

00:24:29:11 - 00:24:42:24

It couldn't simply be scoped out if there is such a magnitude of change in the view that needs to be assessed when considering matters from a historic environment perspective. It can't simply be scoped out as it was.

00:24:43:18 - 00:25:07:00

Yeah. Thank you. Could I ask the applicant respond to that, particularly, um, to comment on or explain how a significant landscape and visual effects, um, wouldn't translate to significant effects on setting of the cultural heritage assets?

00:25:09:00 - 00:25:14:03

The applicant I'm going to pass you to Mrs. Richards first to just answer that. That and the other technical points raised.

00:25:15:02 - 00:25:15:18

Thank you.

00:25:16:02 - 00:25:19:19

Thank you. Yes. Jen Richards for the applicant. I should first make clear

00:25:21:15 - 00:25:52:23

the magnitude of change within the setting of a heritage asset is not directly equivalent to the magnitude of impact on its heritage significance. That's something that is set out quite clearly in the guidance, and therefore they're not directly comparable. Um, also that an impact on residential amenity or landscape is not the same as an impact on the heritage significance. They are distinct um, receptors. Um, the heritage asset having a much longer lifespan, as it were, than the residential receptor.

00:25:53:12 - 00:26:02:00

Um, and that is where the difference comes in between. Um, my colleagues assessment of the landscape effects and the heritage assessed effects that I have assessed.

00:26:03:24 - 00:26:06:24

Okay. Thank you. And.

00:26:09:04 - 00:26:12:11

Yeah, I, I follow. Um.

00:26:14:19 - 00:26:15:23

I, I guess.

00:26:18:05 - 00:26:48:15

Maybe just an explanation of how why the effects that are causing the impacts are causing a significant effect on the in landscape and visual terms. Why those aren't, um, relevant to considering the setting of the assessment would be useful, particularly for these two. These two, um, these two assets, which are, um, in disagreement at the moment.

00:26:48:20 - 00:26:51:04

Would that be could the applicant provide that?

00:26:52:22 - 00:26:54:18

Yes, we could come back in writing on that.

00:26:54:20 - 00:26:55:10

Thank you.

00:26:56:18 - 00:27:33:00

So if we go on to, um, effects on Non-designated farmsteads, um, there are a number of non-designated farmsteads that, uh, were highlighted as concern in the county council's local impact report. Um Ashby Lodge. slate House, Glebe Farm Roast and top at The Maltings, Scott Whitlow Field Farm and Sheffield House. Um. The applicant provided its description of how the settings, the setting of the individual farmsteads would be affected in its response to D1 submissions.

00:27:33:02 - 00:27:59:13

That's rep 2023. Um, so if the county council could provide an update on, uh, whether they agree with the applicant's conclusions provided at deadline two, that the effects of the setting of the farmsteads individually would not be significant. Or if, um, you're in disagreement, if you could, uh, give a bit of explanation as to why. Thank you.

00:27:59:15 - 00:28:24:09

Yeah. My note in Lincolnshire County Council. Um, yeah. We've had good, good discussions with the applicant regarding Non-designated farmsteads. Um, and we largely agree that the, um, significance is, uh, is less than substantial. Um, our issue is that the collective value of these farmsteads isn't being considered as part of the assessment process, and we would urge them to reconsider that.

00:28:27:13 - 00:28:28:03

Okay.

00:28:28:11 - 00:28:54:10

Um, could you could you provide an explanation of the way in which you consider that the collective value of the farm would be affected? Is it through the adverse effects on the landscape character that connects them, or, um, is it the individual farmsteads interrelationship with this character, with this landscape?

00:28:56:08 - 00:29:23:07

It would be their interrelationship. So you could argue, to use a metaphor, that individually there is no significance. But when you look at them collectively, there is. So for instance, where we to

individualize, I don't know, a brushstroke on a masterpiece. We may not think that's significant yet. Were we to look at the entire composition, it would be certainly collectively. And therefore we feel that that should be a consideration.

00:29:25:15 - 00:29:26:05

Okay.

00:29:26:19 - 00:29:38:24

Thank you. Can I ask the applicant to respond to that and, um, summarize how the collective value of the Non-designated farmsteads has been taken into account.

00:29:39:18 - 00:29:49:14

It's common with the applicant. Yes. I'll hand it to Mrs. Richards. I understand part of the issue is that there's no real accepted methodology for how one would actually do that assessment. But I'll pass to Mrs. Richards to expand upon it.

00:29:50:24 - 00:30:21:17

Which is for the applicant. Um, yes. Correct. And I believe, um, Mr. Knighton would would agree. There is no, um, there's no methodology available to us to, um, assess them collectively. Um, we're in some ongoing discussion as to how we might, um, address this. Um, I think you're at the moment. It's addressed under the landscape character assessment in the Elvia chapter and particularly section 1.4 of appendix 10.2, which details the historic landscape character baseline for the area.

00:30:22:05 - 00:30:33:06

Um, basically, we're having ongoing discussions with the local authority as to how we might, um, address the collective, the impact on the non listed farmhouses collectively.

00:30:33:18 - 00:30:58:12

So if it's if it's based on the landscape, landscape, character assessment and the landscape character assessment determines that there is significant effects. Um, through all stages of the proposed development. Does that not then imply that there's there is a significant effect on the collective value of these farmsteads?

00:30:58:15 - 00:31:07:12

It's something I'd need to take away. Um, and, uh, respond back in writing with a bit more detail on. But, uh, we need to, um, confer on that one.

00:31:07:14 - 00:31:08:04

Okay.

00:31:08:06 - 00:31:11:10

Thank you. Yeah, that'd be helpful if you could provide that. Uh. Deadline three.

00:31:17:04 - 00:31:17:19

Uh.

00:31:19:18 - 00:31:51:12

So, in the county council's local impact report, they brought up the Greater Lincolnshire Farmsteads character statement as supporting its position. So, um, it be helpful to hear from the applicant how how the guidance in this document has been applied in reaching its conclusions of non significance as well. And I'd be happy for that to be in writing at deadline three.

00:31:53:00 - 00:31:55:09

Yes we can provide that in writing for deadline three.

00:31:55:11 - 00:31:56:02

Thank you.

00:31:57:22 - 00:32:05:11

Are there any more comments from local authorities on cultural heritage matters discussed so far.

00:32:09:24 - 00:32:11:01

Okay. Thank you.

00:32:13:17 - 00:32:27:01

Uh, so that brings us to the end of agenda item four. So are there any, uh, representations that, uh, interested parties wish to make on this agenda item?

00:32:29:24 - 00:32:35:06

No, I'm not seeing any hands in the room, and I'm not seeing any raised hands virtually.

00:32:38:16 - 00:32:43:11

In which case, I'll move on to agenda item five. Noise and vibration.

00:32:50:16 - 00:33:00:00

Okay. If if teams need to swap over, then give time. Or is everyone okay to continue as we are?

00:33:00:07 - 00:33:02:09

Rich Group is the applicant. We would like to.

00:33:02:12 - 00:33:05:06

Oh no, Sorry, I can't see you. All right.

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

Fine. Okay, so just before I come on to agenda item 5.1, which relates to the horizontal directional drilling, and I have a question on the baseline noise data. There seems to be a discrepancy between the baseline survey monitoring results presented in table 12.14 of chapter 12. So that's app 052 and table one of appendix 12.1.

00:33:41:14 - 00:33:44:16

So that's app 120.

00:33:46:04 - 00:34:21:21

And so for example just taking Scott Whitlow Field Farm which is representative location 20. Um in the appendix it. The ambient noise level is 47, whereas in the ES it's 52 and the background's not sound level is 31 in the appendix versus 37 in the ass. And I that's one example. But a number of the a number of the receptors don't seem to match up between the two documents.

00:34:21:23 - 00:34:30:24

So could the applicant confirm which is the correct data which was used in the assessment of impacts, and whether there might need to be any changes made to the assessment?

00:34:32:10 - 00:34:38:24

Thank you sir, I'll pass that question to Daniel Claire, managing director of RSC acoustics. Thank you.

00:34:41:00 - 00:34:53:10

Daniel Clare for the applicant. Um, so there's just a typographical mismatch between the two. So the levels, which are correct are the ones within the the table in the main body of the document. And we can put that back in writing. Have that updated as well.

00:34:53:13 - 00:35:00:20

Okay. So none of the assessment conclusions need to be updated. That's correct. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

00:35:02:10 - 00:35:33:13

So, uh, moving on to 5.1. Horizontal directional drilling. So in response to our first written questions, the applicant advised that for each location that, um, horizontal directional drilling HDD, I'll just say HDD. From now on, um, will be required. The duration of works will be one week, and at any point in that week, HDD may need to take place out of normal working hours. So questions to the applicant.

00:35:34:11 - 00:35:54:23

Um, an assessment of the impacts of out of hours HDD was not has not been undertaken because it has not been confirmed as required. However, is it not a worst case scenario that should be assessed in the ES? That HDD works will be taking place out of working hours?

00:35:58:00 - 00:36:30:05

Daniel Clare for the applicant. And so just to almost as a starting point. HDD is or any of the construction we've proposed here is not unique or bespoke to solar to this project or solar in general. So HDD is a well-established construction methodology. And for the the works being proposed at the moment it is set as daytime hours. And we've undertaken a worst case assessment for those particular periods where there is a provision or where there is a requirement to undertake anything different from those methods provided in the EES chapter.

00:36:30:20 - 00:36:46:06

Is there is a mechanism within the the sample, the outline set up at the moment to allow for that. So any changes to whether it's duration to plant locations would be undertaken through a consultation and a new assessment, potentially with the local authority.

00:36:46:23 - 00:36:47:13

Okay.

00:36:47:19 - 00:36:48:12

But so.

00:36:49:00 - 00:36:49:15

To.

00:36:49:17 - 00:36:50:07

Expand on that.

00:36:50:09 - 00:36:52:08

In paragraph 2.8.5.

00:36:52:18 - 00:36:55:06

Of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan.

00:36:55:18 - 00:37:01:06

Which is the control of noise. Um, if, um, HDD is.

00:37:01:10 - 00:37:07:01

Carried out outside of the, uh, agreed hours, then um.

00:37:07:03 - 00:37:10:20

It states at paragraph 2.8.5, the horizontal directional.

00:37:10:21 - 00:37:11:11

Drilling.

00:37:11:13 - 00:37:28:18

Plans would be installed and operated such that noise levels do not exceed a level of 45dB at the closest neighboring noise sensitive location. So you have that certainty as to what that maximum noise would be, which is controlled in the outlying camp. Then obviously the future final camps.

00:37:31:16 - 00:37:33:21

Okay. Um.

00:37:34:13 - 00:38:00:21

My experience with HDD is it can be quite a noisy process from other projects that I've worked on. Um, 45dB is a fairly low reading. Could you provide maybe some an example where mitigation at a

sensitive receptor could be achieved? Um, and the distance that might be involved from a HDD to to be able to do so. Just to give us some comfort that it would be achievable.

00:38:01:04 - 00:38:35:11

Okay. Thank you. Daniel Clare for the applicant. So at the moment for the daytime. So if you assume the daytime predictions would assimilate for nighttime levels at the moment the levels for HDD are unmitigated. So daytime as we're shown we can meet the daytime limits through and with no mitigation in place is with HDD. It's the graphics location. So you've normally got an entry and an exit pit or a reception pit. And those locations are quite different or very defined in terms of small locations where the actual noise emissions will happen. So a low HDD activity might go through a linear or appear on a map.

00:38:35:13 - 00:39:11:04

To go through a linear location is the actual noise. Sources are very fixed and small, so from a noise control point of view is preferential through hierarchy of noise control is to apply noise mitigation at source and in these locations the source is easy to control or easier to control through barriers or through enclosures and good. Barriers around these. And because again a lot of the noise sources is below ground level in the pits is there's already a level of protection from the actual ground itself. And by applying barriers in a good location, close a source will provide anything up to 15 decibel reduction.

00:39:11:14 - 00:39:26:15

If we need to go further, you can then apply a noise enclosure which can reduce 20 to 30dB through construction. So it does help us in terms of although it might be a noisy activity compared to some, it is controllable because of the almost a confined space of where we're looking at.

00:39:29:11 - 00:39:30:06

Yeah. Thank you.

00:39:32:22 - 00:39:48:06

Thank you. Um, and so in terms of, uh, confirming the need for how to how is HDD, um, it's that would that occur in detail design prior to construction or

00:39:50:01 - 00:40:03:11

during construction as required. Um, and can you explain, uh, if it is during construction, how the how the approval of that would work with the relevant planning authority?

00:40:03:14 - 00:40:37:03

Daniel. Clare. Um, for the applicant. Um, so in line with, um, we've got section 2.8, which looks of the same, which looks at the way things would be mitigated or the process of mitigation. And then section four, this is the implementation of that mechanism of how we go about that, which talks about the consultation with the local authority. And normally what would happen is when there's a change in a construction methodology, which often is the case or can be the case through an early stage, is through down to the detailed design. Once you have that construction methodology outlined is there would be an update.

00:40:37:05 - 00:40:43:22

So whether it's an update to predictions, update to locations that would then be communicated with the local authority for approval.

00:40:45:17 - 00:40:51:18

And sorry, the reference 2.8. That's to the outline construction Environmental Management Plan.

00:40:52:24 - 00:41:21:05

Paragraph yes 2.8 The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, which is um, um, wrapped two hyphen 015 and paragraph 2.8.5 um states um that where HDD could be required outside the assumed daytime construction hours, then that would be agreed upon with the relevant planning authority prior to those works. So it actually expressly states the need for us to agree it with the relevant planning authority.

00:41:21:12 - 00:41:29:00

Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Can I ask if the local authorities are satisfied with the applicant's approach on this?

00:41:30:02 - 00:41:35:17

Uh, John, on behalf of LCC, we have no comments on that. Okay. Yeah.

00:41:37:20 - 00:41:39:09

Stephen. District council. So we don't have.

00:41:39:11 - 00:41:40:01

Any further.

00:41:40:03 - 00:41:41:02

Issues that we've raised in respect.

00:41:41:04 - 00:41:41:19

Of noise.

00:41:42:17 - 00:42:24:00

Okay. Thank you. So I'll move on to, uh, 5.2, um, users of public rights of way. Uh, so taking construction noise first. I want to start by questioning the position that as users of public rights away are transient users, they don't need to be assessed as sensitive receptors. Uh, so in Rap 2-027, an IP provides an example of a circular walk in Springwell East, which circles fields containing solar developments and also passes fairly near by a primary construction compound.

00:42:24:10 - 00:42:46:04

So questions to the applicant. In concluding that users of public rights of way would only be subject to construction noise levels which exceed the existing average ambient for a matter of minutes, has the applicant considered that a circular walk, uh, could keep you in fairly close proximity to sources of construction noise for a more extended periods of time?

00:42:48:11 - 00:43:19:08

Daniel Clare for the applicant. So I think it gets back to the we need to understand the context. So regardless of the whether it's a circular walk or a linear walk is there's still a transient nature to the, the activity itself. And there's a transient nature of the people actually using that. But also we need to understand this, that there's a transient nature to the actual works themselves. So these most of these works are not fixed in location except from the HDD, but most of them are a mobile source. The way we've undertaken the prediction for construction is a worst case scenario.

00:43:19:10 - 00:43:56:07

So assuming you've got an activity with a certain number of plant items all happening in a certain location. So there's a lot of variables which need to occur for levels to be audible or to be at a higher level and on a transient nature. So there's so many variables in place. So like I say, the impacts, whether it's a transient or linear, it might be for a greater period of time. But there's a lot of variables in there to determine what the levels would be. That's if it were to be a high sensitive receptor, which we wouldn't want it to be because all the guidelines, whether it's construction or operationally, is do not outline a public choice of way as a fixed or a highly sensitive receptor.

00:43:57:16 - 00:44:07:24

Okay, I and when I talk ask some questions about operationalized, I will come back to the sensitivity of the receptor. Uh uh,

00:44:09:12 - 00:44:33:08

but I you mentioned that the sources of noise are transient in nature as well. And what about the primary construction compound in that example that's given that, what are the are there noise sources that are more fixed um, and constant in the, in the construction compound areas.

00:44:33:20 - 00:45:06:04

So Daniel Clare for the applicant. So the what we have assessed um for fixed receptors. So if we take a step back the way we've assessed compounds or fixed compounds for the construction Activities. Although they're fixed, they're still fixed on a short term basis. When we compare construction regulations and construction guidelines versus operational guidelines, we've assessed and predicted the impacts of the construction of a compound. Because the construction of a compound is a higher impact than you would get from the operation of a compound due to the number of plants and a type of plant being operated.

00:45:06:11 - 00:45:30:24

So when you look at the actual operation of these compounds in, particularly in the closer proximities, you have got quieter activities than construction. And when we look at the construction itself, as in the construction of one of those compounds, they are still compliant with the construction limits, even though we don't have limits for the public right of way. We are lower if we were to apply those limits. So it has been assessed from a from a fixed point of view.

00:45:31:19 - 00:45:42:17

Okay. So just to raise a similar point in in relation to operational noise. So sorry.

00:45:44:17 - 00:45:54:10

Which part? I think it's also important to highlight table nine of the Outline Extraction Environmental Management Plan, which highlights that, um,

00:45:56:01 - 00:46:29:00

that, um, there'll be the commits us to advise the community of any potential noisy work that take place, um, including respect to public rights of way. Um, the idea being that, um, if we know that there's going to be HDD at a particular close to a public rights way, that communication, um, through the community liaison group that's secured in the DCO, uh, would kick in, that could be advertised. And so people can make decisions on actually, I won't walk that route on this week.

00:46:29:02 - 00:46:47:12

Ah. Because I recognise that. And then the following week has gone back. Um, the construction, the construction, uh, elements have moved on somewhere else. So that's, that's a commitment in the outlying camp to keep the public eye notified off of any particular noisy elements of the construction program.

00:46:48:12 - 00:47:25:00

Okay. Thank you. Um, so just to go back. Sorry. Move on to operational noise. Um, so table 12.12 of S chapter 12 states that are rated noise level of between 41 to 50dB would constitute a major magnitude of impact for operational daytime noise in Springvale East in particular. There are a number of sections of public rights of way and permissive paths that lie inside the 40 decibel contour.

00:47:25:23 - 00:47:56:12

Um, and that's shown on the figures in EP 068. So users of public rights of way could spend a fair bit of time experiencing that medium magnitude of impact when walking these paths and if the receptor was of high sensitivity. As is the case for users of public rights, of way, for visual impact and the effect would be a significant moderate adverse effect.

00:47:56:20 - 00:48:08:14

Why is the approach taken for noise impacts that transient users of public rights of way are not sensitive to impacts? When if we look at visual impacts, users of public rights away are considered highly sensitive receptors.

00:48:10:02 - 00:48:43:09

Daniel Claire for the applicant. So the the significance criteria you're looking at there is for is fixed residential receptors, not outdoor spaces. So you can't apply that same criteria. And if you were the only, um, the only item you could look at if you were to apply a noise criteria to this is you look at W.H.O. World Health Organization guidelines, which looks at outdoor spaces. So for any outdoor fixed space, such as a garden or a balcony, you would apply a an upper level of 55dB has been an assumed or a correct or a good environmental standard.

00:48:43:17 - 00:49:03:24

So the closest thing you could apply if you were to identify it as a high sensitivity would be a garden then, which is potentially frequented a lot more by the same person on a daily basis. And therefore, if we applied that to a public right away, the 55 limit then would apply. And we're predicted to be across all public rights of way through operation below the 55.

00:49:05:21 - 00:49:12:16

Okay. Thank you. Understood. Um, are there any comments from the local authorities on this matter?

00:49:14:13 - 00:49:16:20

No. Thank you. Thanks, sir.

00:49:17:10 - 00:49:29:23

In which case I'll ask for comments from interested parties. I noted down that Mr. Frost wanted to speak on this item. Uh, could we have roving microphone brought forward?

00:49:39:22 - 00:50:19:14

Thank you. Uh, Paul Frost. Um, from Scott Peck. So the agenda asks about the experience of users, of public rights, of way during both the construction and operational phases. It's my view that the pleasure of walking the public rights away will be ruined, and the character and views will be spoiled in so many ways, with construction noise being one of them. Views of the open farmland and the large skies and horizons will be replaced with views of fences, construction compounds, construction, roadways, electrical infrastructure, solar panels, battery storage units and screening hedges.

00:50:20:10 - 00:50:59:11

It's not possible that these components can be introduced on the scale proposed, and the experience for users of public rights away be improved by them. So it must be the case. The experience will be worse than that enjoyed today. Additional intrusion of CCTV and lighting, along with dust and noise from construction and operational plant, will undoubtedly further spoil the experience, being marshalled by banks, men across construction, roadways and being diverted or have in the path closed off so as not to inconvenience plant and lorries can only possibly be a negative experience.

00:51:00:09 - 00:51:35:24

The fact the applicant proposes to add further paths and to improve some of the surfaces is no mitigation at all. Just don't spoil it in the first place. Who wants more paths of the type just described? The hum or buzz from inverters, transformers and cooling fans along with the noise from increased traffic, construction and decommissioning? All has a detrimental effect on health and well-being of humans. This is particularly true in and around Scotland, which is a rural area where there is already a low ambient noise level.

00:51:37:01 - 00:51:49:06

Many wildlife species, including birds and bats, have been shown to be affected by increased noise where their communication and navigation processes are hindered. Thank you.

00:51:50:18 - 00:51:54:08

Thank you, Mr. Frost. If you could pass the microphone to Mr. Williams.

00:51:58:03 - 00:51:58:19

Mark Williams.

00:51:58:21 - 00:52:00:04

Springwell action Group.

00:52:02:12 - 00:52:39:10

I'd like to thank the applicant, actually, for telling you, the local inhabitants that they can, you know, they can go for alternative walks. Um, if the applicant knew anything about the, um, the local inhabitants of Scotland and Kirkby Green, he would know he was dealing with a significantly older population, an older population who have constantly walked, uh, certain footpaths Walk footpath for certain reasons. They lost their husband in an area, so they enjoy memories, being told that they can't.

00:52:39:12 - 00:53:12:16

They can no longer go down that footpath because there's going to be drilling or there's a diversion or it's been fenced off. That again, it's disgraceful. You know, the this is an area that has been used by the community for years, and the applicant needs to appreciate what they are proposing for this community. Okay. I go back to this whole concept of, um, you know, it's not a long term project.

00:53:12:19 - 00:53:46:18

40 years is a [REDACTED] long time to stop people from enjoying this countryside. Um, and at the end of that 40 years, it's still going to it's still it's going to be ruined. Um, but there is, you know, the noise and vibration is something we really need to consider. Um, I would like to ask the applicant, at what point would you need to be working outside of, um, normal business hours? I see no, absolutely no reason why you would. I mean, we we I think we we mentioned in our first submission, you know, I think it was 7 a.m.

00:53:46:20 - 00:54:03:13

until 7 p.m. again, we questioned why you need to be working from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.. Normal working hours is 9 to 5. Um, so, you know, then saying you need to do outside of those hours. Um, I think, again, um, raises some significant questions.

00:54:07:23 - 00:54:09:06

Thank you, Mr. Robertson.

00:54:09:21 - 00:54:48:00

Thank you. Mayor. Thank you. Mary Ann Overton, chairman of the village's social Sola Action Group. Just a very small point to add, if I may. And that is about the impact on the economy. And the tourism is a separate issue, but some of these sites would have bigger knock on impacts than just the. The sound can have a long term and a bigger impact on health as well as tourism. But the important the point I wanted to raise is that with the horizontal directional drilling, I'm not sure I would like to know whether the substrate is properly taken into account.

00:54:48:14 - 00:55:19:00

If you've got a drill sliding gently through nice, thick, um, soil, um, you know, which is, uh, soft enough and goes through, I imagine it would be quite quiet, but I'm not sure if the applicant has taken into account the fact that this has a very small amount of soil on top, and below that it's solid rock. And then, of course, water aquifer. So I think I just wonder if the sound, if that's been properly taken into account. Thank you.

00:55:20:03 - 00:55:45:10

Thank you. Um, and on tomorrow's agenda, There will be looking at effects on tourism and health and wellbeing, and we've got questions relating to the use of the public rights of way in relation to those items tomorrow. Uh, is there any more interested parties that wish to speak on this? In which case would the applicant likes response.

00:55:46:09 - 00:56:17:10

Thank you, Sir Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. I mean, as you've just mentioned on the that last point, I think a lot of what Mr. Frost said, um, uh, would be covered in the population agenda item tomorrow. Um, the applicant has submitted a health and wellbeing statement. Rap one hyphen 067 and Inequality impact statements app. Hyphen 0151 to cover off the point of regarding. I think Mr. Williams made the point on older the older population. Um.

00:56:17:20 - 00:56:28:02

And I'll pass. I see Mr. Ingham. Um, sorry. Um, Mr.. Mr. Clare would like to respond on any of the noise aspects raised by Mr. Frost, Mr. Williams and Councillor Overton.

00:56:29:03 - 00:57:01:20

And your Clare for the applicants. Um, so I think first to address Mr. Frost's points, I think in terms of the construction noise, is the noise associated with it. It's hard sometimes to deal with magnitude of noise, um, because it's very subjective and it's very emotive subject. And I think understanding different levels. And I think the noise associated with the construction plan, given the temporal nature of this, is the magnitude as in the emission, how much the noise comes out if it is generated. And the character of these is very similar to what we get across these areas from an agricultural vehicles.

00:57:02:04 - 00:57:37:11

So from for example, the noise emitted from a combined harvester is very similar to the noise emitted from a dump truck. Um, you've got noise associated with a tractor is very similar to the noise associated with an excavator. So when we're looking at magnitudes in our British standards, they give us guidelines, they give us levels. So these aren't ones which we've gone out and measured ourselves, but there in the British standards and you can actually assimilate the two together. So we have got levels which are similar. So in terms of the magnitude going through the period of say, harvest time, the noise levels from some of the activities are going to be very similar of what you hear and how loud you hear those.

00:57:38:06 - 00:57:58:21

And can I just ask you on that? So if the magnitude is the same, but if the character of the noise is different, is it more perceptible and does it what is the experience of that noise different? Even though the magnitude of the noise might be the same.

00:57:59:10 - 00:58:35:02

For the applicant. So again, because we are talking about large vehicles, the actual character as well is no difference. So when you look at a um, an excavator, it is they're using very similar, um, power outputs for the engine and you're looking at very similar slow moving vehicles. You look at dump trucks, they're all very similar in terms of the character. And when you consider character From a noise point of view is you can consider those, um, the tonal elements, the impact elements. But the

farm machinery use in these arable areas are very similar to what you'd expect from a standard construction through the earthwork activities.

00:58:37:21 - 00:58:38:16

So on.

00:58:38:18 - 00:58:39:08

The.

00:58:39:12 - 00:59:10:12

Um, on the temporal nature, it is it is very much temporal. So we are looking at, um, very much that the transient nature of the works and even within compounds, you are looking at transient nature. There's not many plant which is fixed. There's not many plant fixed on a daily basis in a certain area. So it is very much movable vehicles. When we talk about, um, almost the hum and buzz of a, the operational phase is what we need to be minded is that these levels are in the 40s in this room.

00:59:10:14 - 00:59:42:01

Now, me talking from an amplified voice is going to be in the 50s, 60s. So an unamplified voice in a an open plan office is you'd normally be looking between 40 and 50dB. So we're not looking at these long term hum or buzz, because the way the site has been designed and the mitigation employed across the operational phase ensures there is mitigation in place there to reduce the noise. And it has accounted for the characters. So when we talk about the hum, the buzz, those tones, you might hear from certain emissions, those have been accounted for through our modeling.

00:59:43:19 - 01:00:15:10

So hopefully that addresses the points, Mr. Frost. Um, in terms of Mr. Williams, I think I understand and I fully appreciate the alternative footpaths, but there's there will be notifications. So we do provide within the the guidance and in the operation of the construction management plan, notifications of where there will be noisier works because we're not saying at any stage works will not be audible. We're just saying there won't be the magnitude which would be of significance. So I think when people are using these, they will have the opportunity to walk through these pathways still.

01:00:15:22 - 01:01:00:09

Um, but again, is the and the character is like I said, is you walk through these pathways and if you walk through during harvest periods where you might have, um, combined harvest, you might have multiple tractors working between sunrise and sunset. You're working through a long period of time, which is longer than the standard construction hours, and which kind of takes me on to almost the construction hours themselves, which are set in average standards, a normal 9 to 5 working day for a normal 9 to 5. Type of profession is very different from construction, where construction is in terms of trying to get the most out of it and also trying to to compromise between how long the works go on for over a longer period and trying to to push them into shorter periods to try and reduce it.

01:01:00:11 - 01:01:32:07

So instead of a ten year project, you might have a four year project by trying to make sure that you're maximizing the time you can during a day. And there's a lot of those periods. It's not designated noisy activities. Normally, when you're looking at those, say, the early hours of the seven or the shoulder

periods between morning and or early morning, nighttime to the actual starting works, or the nighttime or the evening periods. These are very much periods of normally start up and shut down. So whether it's getting plant ready, get materials ready, doing the early toolbox, talk to talk through the actual construction staff or the methodology for the day.

01:01:32:15 - 01:02:02:22

These are not normally the intensive work hours, and I think vibration was mentioned there as well about making sure that there's a there's a significant or perceived significant impact of both noise and vibration. Is vibration hasn't been identified of significance anywhere in this project. And I think from the final points we we discussed about health concerns is all our British guidelines are based through W.H.O.. So World Health Organization we implement those as part of our standards.

01:02:03:09 - 01:02:38:23

And when I discussed about outdoor space that is based on World Health Organization guidelines. So the levels we implemented across the UK are based on world health taking into account well-being. And in terms of the kind of the final point, which is interesting coming around the almost the geotechnical nature of the ground and how that does it change the noise emissions from, say, HDD. And what we've got is the way the HDD works. We have got a source and we've got the so the source goes in a pit. The source will typically have a vacuum pump or something to suck out any of the remnants which comes out from the tunnel exercise.

01:02:39:05 - 01:03:11:06

And then you've also got something which moves the actual, um, the rotating device of the drill. The drill operates how it is. What normally happens is the interaction between the the stone, the rock or the the soil. And the drill is that's where you might perceive or say a change in noise level, but that is buried below the ground. So you've got dense ground between the actual the noise that part of the noise source and any receptor. So that itself is not going to be a source for, for noise or a source for us to, to quantify in order to deem an impact.

01:03:13:15 - 01:03:16:01

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

01:03:18:03 - 01:03:20:02

Do we have a roving microphone?

01:03:35:22 - 01:04:07:14

Mark Williams, Springwell action group. Can we get some clarification from the applicant on the horizontal directional drilling? Where will that be? Is that across huge areas of the application so. Or is it just in certain areas because you reference things like combine harvesters. A combine harvester is in a field for probably an hour or so. Does his combining and then moves on to another field. So, um, he's very transient.

01:04:07:22 - 01:04:31:15

Um, if you have a machine or a machine that is drilling underground horizontally. I'm guessing that machine is going to be in a field probably for quite a period of time. If you're putting cables in

attaching panels to inverters to compounds. So realistically you're going to be in a in a location for a significantly longer period of time than a combine harvester.

01:04:33:15 - 01:04:36:17

Thank you, Mr. Frost.

01:04:43:18 - 01:05:14:07

You mentioned, uh, a moment ago. I think the gentleman over here, um, talked about the fact that there's been no consideration at all of vibration. Um, a number of points have been raised on vibration. Um, and they talk about specifically this, um, uh, this horizontal directional drilling and the vibration having an effect on the drainage systems and breaking those drainage systems. So dispute that. That hasn't been raised.

01:05:14:18 - 01:05:19:21

And I do think it should be taken into account for that particular reason. Thank you.

01:05:23:10 - 01:05:27:03

Thank you. Could the applicant come back on those two points? Uh

01:05:28:21 - 01:05:32:07

uh. What first, miss. Miss Overton. Thank you.

01:05:34:00 - 01:06:08:01

You're part of what I was going to say has been said, so I won't repeat it. The thing I wanted to pick up was about the directional drilling as to whether it was a recognition that whilst the rock is dense, actually dense air carries sound more strongly in the water. It carries better under water than it does in air. So I'm not sure that the density would actually reduce. Well, I think may actually enhance. And certainly I used to live in a basement flat in London. And when the, when the, uh, um, trains went by, I was sure noisy woke you up in the night, I can tell you so.

01:06:08:03 - 01:06:11:01

It certainly carries a lot in in the earth. Thank you.

01:06:12:03 - 01:06:20:14

Thank you. Any more interested parties that could the applicant respond on those those specific HDD related points?

01:06:20:22 - 01:06:54:02

Uh, Daniel Clare for the applicant. So when I'm talking about a combined harvest, for example, this is in pure relation to mobile plans and those mobile activities. And as you said sir before about how we mitigate noise from HDD, it's a lot easier to mitigate because it's a it's a fixed piece of plant or it's a fixed location. So we can mitigate that far easier through barriers and through enclosures if we need to. At the moment, we've said in our report for all, um, the fixed residential receptors, we're not showing significant impacts based on unmitigated scenarios, but we have got that benefit.

01:06:54:04 - 01:07:29:07

If we need to, we can go down the mitigation. Um, in terms of the, um, the vibration is this was scoped out and through Northcoast um counsel Steven Council, We scoped this out vibration as a whole. And because to us and across projects and vibration, there is no construction source on this project, given the locations which would generate enough vibration to be perceivable or to be an issue or of any significance at any sensitive receptor. Um, and in terms of the the final points, the, the ground itself acts as there's two ways noise will transmit.

01:07:29:09 - 01:08:01:03

One is through airborne to airborne. Sound like I'm speaking now and the other way is airborne sound. If I stood another side of the room is my sound going into the wall, the wall, then regenerating the sounds. The same happens from the earth. So. But the earth as well is not only has it potential to regenerate sound, but it also acts as a barrier from airborne sound. So the ground, when you've got the HD happening underground, the airborne nature of it is completely removed because the sound is the earth is so dense, and the amount of Earth you've got takes away that airborne element.

01:08:01:09 - 01:08:31:23

So all you're left with is the structural bond element. And because the ground itself is not constant hard rock, you've got different layers, different materials and different geotechnical material or different geotechnical layers. The interaction between each layer reduces certain levels of sound as well. So the noise, the vibration you'd feel above the ground would not be perceivable or perceptible to levels which would be of significance. And in terms of taking to account of the density of air, is our the way we model any sounds.

01:08:32:01 - 01:08:47:22

We take account of a designated air and a designated density of air, and the changes to that based on activity below ground would not change. This significantly would not change the level. So the assessment we're comfortable is worst case for HDD.

01:08:48:22 - 01:09:11:12

Okay. And the question was also raised about the timing and location of the HDD drilling. I believe it's the for each location it would works would be one one week. Um, if. Can you confirm? That's correct. And, uh, if you could also confirm the locations where this would be taking place as well.

01:09:11:14 - 01:09:43:06

So, Daniel, Claire for the applicant. So although I'm not a HDD specialist, we work with HDD. As I said before, it's a it's a common construction method. So we were involved in these lot. And the HD on this project is primarily for road crossings. And the reason this is undertaken through HDD, rather than say open trenching is because it is a mitigation measure in itself, because HDD is typically quieter, quicker and has less intrusive on other disciplines such as heritage such as um, closing roadways, closing for pedestrian ways.

01:09:43:08 - 01:09:52:08

So actually in itself is a mitigation measure for a number of other specialisms. Um, so at the moment it is therefore primarily for road crossings.

01:09:52:19 - 01:09:56:21

And is that everywhere where there'll be cables crossing roads?

01:09:56:23 - 01:10:22:23

I think at the moment we've allowed for I believe it's I think it's nine crossings across the area and primarily road crossings. But again, this would be, as we've said earlier, any changes to the methodology we've assumed at this stage of the project, any changes to locations, the activities, durations would all be done and undertaken through the mechanisms we've outlined in the the construction management plan, and that would all have to be approved through the local authority.

01:10:24:06 - 01:10:33:14

And can I just jump in in terms of when sort of night time working might be required, is that generally in an emergency when the drill could break, for example?

01:10:34:05 - 01:11:04:11

Typically, in my experience, as I said, I'm not HDD specialist, but typically the way I've seen it is normally it's for safety reasons. That's the only time normally is you'd have this. So where if you've got such a long crossing or there has been an incident in exactly the same way with any other construction activity or any other general operational activity in life, if there's an accident or there's an emergency, sometimes things happen and things times have to progress, but that would be on a rare occasion, but it wouldn't be on a up front. So if it happened, it'd have to be reported to the local authority.

01:11:04:13 - 01:11:08:17

The reasons why? But it would be one off incidents which we couldn't account for at this stage.

01:11:11:08 - 01:11:11:23

Thank you.

01:11:20:16 - 01:11:30:00

Yes. If we just do one more round of interested parties commenting, if we accept. Mr. Crampton. Yeah, first.

01:11:33:22 - 01:11:46:05

Thank you. We're talking about directional, horizontal directional drilling. What about vertical drilling? Is there some vertical drilling involved in this site, which I suggest would be have a greater impact on noise levels than horizontal drilling?

01:11:48:08 - 01:11:50:18

Could you pass the microphone to Mr. Williams? Thank you.

01:11:52:00 - 01:11:52:15

Yeah.

01:11:52:17 - 01:12:20:01

Can I just check with the applicant? Okay. So the horizontal Drilling, that is, to essentially get under roads, etc. to avoid digging up roads. Um, where we're looking at on the actual site where the solar

panels and the inverters and converters, etc. are, um, is that open trench, um, digging to, to allow for cabling in those environments? I just want clarification on that.

01:12:21:14 - 01:12:27:04

Thank you. Uh, is there someone from the applicant team who can answer those two questions?

01:12:28:16 - 01:12:58:20

Daniel Clare from the applicant. So in terms of drilling the, um, the we've assessed it, it turns what the, um, almost the vertical drilling is defined as and if it's defined as piling, then piling has been accounted for across the project. And we've again, we've assessed this across the sides for foundations for solar panels. And we've shown non-significant impacts, um, on in relation to the, the trenching or the um, the provision of trenches or HD across the cables is.

01:12:59:05 - 01:13:12:05

It's going to be because we're working primarily in agricultural arable land, which has already been turned over softer grounds. So the trenching activity will be a lot quieter or a lot similar. So it will in the main be trenching across those open fields for cables.

01:13:13:06 - 01:13:27:21

Okay. Thank you. So sorry, Mr. Williams. The answer is that it went horizontal. Directional drilling is not proposed in places other than where there's road crossings. Does that answer your put

01:13:29:13 - 01:13:35:06

that. Could you wait for the microphone. Because otherwise people on the recording don't don't get to hear.

01:13:40:17 - 01:14:15:11

A significant amount of the site where within about a foot and a half you're talking about hard rock. So you know whether it's open trenching Ensuring or or or piling or, um, horizontal drilling. You're going through really hard rock and solid rock. Yeah. And the concern we have and again, Mr. Frost raised this, uh, one of the concerns we have with piling and drilling is the vibration impact on the clay drainage.

01:14:15:18 - 01:14:33:19

Um, but it's exactly the same concern we have with open trenching. Um, the applicant, I don't believe, knows where all the clay drainage is. And how the hell are they going to, um, avoid damaging clay drainage pipes that are under the ground? Um, you know, so that's a real concern.

01:14:37:17 - 01:15:16:17

Daniel Clay for the applicant. Um, in terms of vibration on and drainage. So what will happen is at this stage, obviously there's a root in line. And what will happen is normally when they get down to almost the micro site and geotechnical service will be undertaken by buy any reputable engineering firm to understand where the drainage is. So you. On any construction project, you don't dig before you know what's down there for for safety reasons primarily, but also gas mains. Water mains are highly important. And so we work on countless projects where we've been asked to be brought in,

where they've identified a risk on a project through the microsite, in that there's either a gas or water main or something there, which is a concern.

01:15:16:23 - 01:15:33:12

And companies like myself, we will undertake vibration once and during that. At this stage of the project, we've not identified anything which has observed that concern, but it would be for the local engineering team to do that because it's protecting for a safety side of things, let alone environmental damage. It's purely for safety as well.

01:15:40:15 - 01:16:07:01

So would you give some for the applicant? There is the outline camp that controls the noise level at 2.8.1 One. You're referring to section 2.8 of the camp, and that includes some construction noise should not exceed a level of 65dB during the core hours. I think that's the overarching. No, it's not vibration. That's the noise impact. But that's the overarching point. I think you've got that control mechanism.

01:16:07:10 - 01:16:08:17

Okay. Thank you.

01:16:13:08 - 01:16:15:03

Yeah. So

01:16:16:24 - 01:16:18:06

sorry, Mr. Crampton.

01:16:20:08 - 01:16:47:19

Sorry. One more final question. The question about drainage. I don't think you actually answered the question. So it was about land drainage. It's quite a common principle that in a construction site, you will not dig until you've established what's there. Electricity, water, gas, which can be quite dangerous. The gentleman was talking about land drainage, which exists in the land which is probably not marked. And what what was suggesting is, how are you going to protect that, that that is going to be damaged during this process?

01:16:49:17 - 01:17:30:02

So which goes on part the applicant, um, obviously the whole um, commitments, uh, uh, um, project commitments, uh, is looking to minimize as best we can. Damage. But if there if there were to be, um, uh, damage during construction of land drainage. Table eight, uh, of the outline construction environmental management plan, page 40 um, provides that we will during that construction, then reinstate uh uh um divert if need be, that equivalent drain, um, to ensure that they are put back to how they work.

01:17:30:04 - 01:17:39:02

So there's that commitment in the in the camp. But obviously we don't want to get to that position in our, in our investigations. But if if we did then that's the commitment.

01:17:40:13 - 01:17:41:22

Thank you. Understood.

01:17:43:13 - 01:17:47:04

Okay. Yeah. One more, Mr. Frost and then.

01:17:52:04 - 01:18:09:14

Thank you. It's good to have that assurance that it would be put back and repaired. But I think the question that we have and we're concerned about is, how do you know you've broken it? Yeah. So this is this is underground clay drainage. And we're saying vibration might break it. And

01:18:11:04 - 01:18:21:18

once it's broken, how do you know it's broken and therefore have to do any work to repair it? I don't see any mechanism to identify where it's going to be broken.

01:18:23:14 - 01:18:33:11

It will have a significant effect on the surface water problem that Scott Brick has and is well documented. Thank you.

01:18:33:23 - 01:18:54:13

Okay. I'm slightly mindful that, um, the water environment isn't being discussed today. It's going to be discussed on Thursday. Which subjects on which days. But yeah, I think it's Thursday. So when the applicant might have an expert here who can probably help us a little bit more. So I think maybe we can park that for the applicant to, to cover on that day.

01:18:56:03 - 01:19:33:07

Thank you so much. On the applicant. Yes. Obviously with that technical question. Yes, I think there is the just try to find the paragraph in the outline, but there is an obligation on the applicant anyway to regularly monitor the site, uh, site walkovers, um, particularly to inspect the site during the construction, to carry on, um, to identify areas that might need remedial work. I haven't got the paragraph in front of me. Um, so it's section five of the outline camp. Um, provides for that. Um, but in terms of the specific details, we have to either put that in writing without or deal with it at the land and soil section.

01:19:36:04 - 01:20:02:03

Okay. Thank you. Uh, so if there's no further comments on noise and vibration, Session will turn to item 11 of the agenda. Procedural decisions for review of actions and next steps. So I'll now take us through the action points from today. These actions will be published on the project web page of the Planning Inspectorate website as soon as is possible after the hearing. Um.

01:20:06:01 - 01:20:06:16

So.

01:20:11:15 - 01:20:14:11

So action point one,

01:20:16:00 - 01:20:49:21

uh, which is for the applicant, uh, to provide overall percentage figures of area of solar development and a revised plan, three of appendix two of the applicants response to ask one for all combined solar development within the relevant landscape character areas. Central plateau LCT that's Sorry. That's the central part of LCT and LCA seven and LCA 11 because it's already been provided for the national character area.

01:20:50:20 - 01:20:51:10

Um,

01:20:53:08 - 01:21:21:03

action point two for the applicant. Again, uh, to provide a written response to to explain the design process that has been undertaken to determine that the color and material options for for the larger elements of infrastructure, such as the satellite collect, satellite collect compounds, are appropriate. It's deadline three. Um, action point three. Uh.

01:21:23:14 - 01:21:40:12

This is proposed for the applicant and LP's. So to discuss the materials and as it relates to the last point, to discuss the materials and colors set out in the design principles. Um, and if if you could do that and provide an update at deadline three, That will be helpful.

01:21:43:03 - 01:21:57:00

Action four for the applicant to provide a photo montage for viewpoint 28 showing that mitigation the Clinton glare mitigation hoarding at year one. Deadline three.

01:21:59:17 - 01:22:40:07

Action point five for the applicant again to confirm in writing um, which of the vegetation growth heights is correct in the applicant's uh response within this, in the statement of Common grounds with North Kesteven District Council ref 15 two. There's two lots of vegetation heights that are referred to and it's just clarification over which one. That's action point five. Action point six to provide further explanation of the consideration of effects on the blankness and conservation areas within the ES at deadline three.

01:22:42:15 - 01:22:54:08

Uh. Number seven for the applicant to provide further explanation of the effects on the settings of Scott Wick mill and Thompson's Bottom farmhouse. Deadline three.

01:22:56:11 - 01:23:09:19

Uh, number eight for the applicant to provide a similarly to provide an explanation on the effects of this of of the collective value of the Non-designated farmsteads.

01:23:11:19 - 01:23:48:03

So deadline three. Um, number nine for the applicant to explain how the guidance in the Greater Lincolnshire Farmsteads character statement has been applied in reaching its conclusions on non significance of affecting the collective value of the farm. So action points eight and nine can be combined together. And then Action point ten for the county council to confirm their position on the proposed wording of requirement 11, in relation to the use of the word substantially.

01:23:49:12 - 01:23:50:02

Um,

01:23:51:22 - 01:23:58:03

those, uh, those are the action points that I've got. Are there any comments or questions on those action points?

01:24:00:02 - 01:24:04:04

Mr. Frost sir. Microphone coming.

01:24:11:12 - 01:24:24:05

Yeah. Thank you. I just wonder if you could add the, um, action point, uh, about this, um, play piping and Vibration that that will be discussed at the meeting on Thursday and added to the agenda for that, please.

01:24:28:00 - 01:24:44:02

Yeah, we absolutely will. Um, but it's not necessarily an agenda item for the action points from from this hearing. It's kind of a metaphor for that hearing. So it's very much noted, and I'll certainly make sure that it is discussed on the day on Thursday. Thank you. Thank you.

01:24:47:06 - 01:24:48:19

Uh, district council. Yes.

01:24:48:24 - 01:25:21:15

Thank you. Session for North District Council. It's just a request in respect of the first action point, which is the percentage areas of the, um, scheme in terms of AES, AES, etc.. And it would be helpful, if possible, to have reference to whether the other schemes that are shown on that plan and those maps are existing and or proposed. We're aware of a number of tcpa schemes that are proposed that just be helpful to be aware of whether the plan presently shows those, or only the existing Tcpc schemes, in addition to the n CIPs.

01:25:23:06 - 01:25:29:16

Yes, that that would be helpful if the applicant could add that to action point one. Thank you.

01:25:32:02 - 01:25:33:21

Any other questions?

01:25:36:08 - 01:25:36:23

No.

01:25:39:23 - 01:26:10:06

Agenda item seven. Uh, closing remarks. So may I may I remind everyone that post hearing notes, documents and answers prepared in response to these post hearing actions should be provided by deadline three. And that's the 12th of August. Um, so I will now proceed to close this issue specific

hearing. Thank you for participating today. It's been very helpful. Uh, it's the time is now 10 to 3, and I close this issue specific hearing.