

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Springwell Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4) - Part 3
Date:	17 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: 00:34:13

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:06 - 00:00:41:02

Okay. It's 20 to 2, so we will resume the hearing, please. And we'll come on to our, uh, agenda item in relation to the draft development consent order. Um, so we're going to come to articles 40, um, and 41 first. Um, so in terms of article 40, um, the applicant has proposed to alter the wording to refer to trees or shrubs, uh, within or overhanging land within the order limits. Um, I think the, um, concerns of the local authorities, um, was the slightly different wording.

00:00:41:04 - 00:00:50:04

So I just wanted to check before I run through other questions, whether that tweak of wording is any way overcome your concerns about the county council.

00:00:51:01 - 00:01:00:24

Thank you sir. John Hunter, on behalf of the county council, the tweak to the wording in itself is acceptable insofar as it goes, but it doesn't overcome all the concerns.

00:01:02:06 - 00:01:05:04

Okay. Thank you. And the district council.

00:01:06:20 - 00:01:08:09

District council on position. Same, sir.

00:01:08:20 - 00:01:46:05

Okay. Thank you. Okay. I think that the position is the district council will consider, uh, that the applicant should provide a schedule and map of the location of trees and shrubs to which the article relates. And the county council has also requested that a detailed above cultural method statement includes an updated schedule of trees to be removed as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Um. The applicant is of the view that the requirement for compliance with the approved uh Construction Environmental Management Plan and the Landscape Environment Plan offers sufficient controls in this regard.

00:01:46:15 - 00:02:17:02

Uh, and there is a Vegetation Removal Parameters Plan act appendix two of the Olympe. Um, you can also note that paragraph two, uh, Subparagraph three of schedule 16 of. To do so is relevant, and ensures that the details for approval would not give rise to any material, new or different environmental effects compared to those in the environmental statement. Um, do you have any reply to to those points made by the applicant, please the county council first.

00:02:17:04 - 00:02:58:13

Thank you sir. Yes, Jonathan. On behalf of the county council. Yes, sir. I have a number of points. The first one is, um. It's not clear to us that I think the central premise of the response is that the powers that are sought under articles 40 and 41 are constrained by the requirements relating to the

construction of landscape management plans. It's not clear. It's certainly that's not explicit within article 40 or 41. It's difficult to see how it could be implicit, um, because otherwise it would appear to make those powers unnecessary so that if it is constrained by the contents of the lamp and the camp.

00:02:58:23 - 00:03:29:22

Then. Then it is unclear why they need those additional powers. Um, and as I say, we don't think that it is on the face of those provisions. They seem to be freestanding powers to remove any tree, whether or not they are constrained, as identified in the two documents. Um, the concerns which underlay this are, uh, firstly, in relation to article 40, that, uh, non-protected trees, that this could result in a greater impact than that has been assessed.

00:03:30:02 - 00:04:11:08

So there could be trees that which are not protected are of significance and value, which are removed, which hasn't been part of the assessment. There could also be an impact on the balance of losses and gains in terms of BNG. And so a blanket power, um, that is not constrained seems to us to be inappropriate and also make the point in relation to article 41 that this is a power to, um, remove or fell or lop or cut back any tree that may be subject to a TPO in future, because there aren't any TPO in force at present.

00:04:11:18 - 00:04:54:11

That doesn't appear to us to accord with the drafting advice. Note 15 from pins, which says that trees which are subject to a TPO or otherwise protected should be specifically identified. The power is not appropriate for the power to be included on a precautionary basis, and proper identification of affected trees will enable the examining authority to give full consideration to particular characteristics, giving rise to that designation. The desirability of continuing such protection. This is actually a future proofing measure, which would mean that it seems, on the face of it would mean that any TPO ING of any trees on the site would be ineffective, because they could be automatically overridden at the, um, Applicants.

00:04:55:03 - 00:05:31:11

Um, uh, behest. So, um, as I said, going back to the main point is I don't we're not clear that the central response given by the applicant, that the powers are constrained by the requirements relating to the um, to management documents is correct. And either one solution might be to add a further provision to articles 40 and 41 to say that that the power that is hereby conferred in in article 41, 1 or 41.

00:05:31:13 - 00:06:05:10

Three 4141 one are subject to the requirements, but it is in that in that it's not clear why, that it simply can't be dealt with through the submission of an approval of the two management plans, because obviously, provided that's in accordance with the parameters and there's no material Little divergence, as the applicant says they are required to ensure why we couldn't be given at that stage. A list of trees that are proposed for removal in accordance with the parameters, while these additional powers are needed.

00:06:07:22 - 00:06:11:16

Thank you. But the District Council like to add anything before I go back to the applicant.

00:06:12:16 - 00:06:14:24

And district council. I don't have anything to add beyond that, sir.

00:06:15:24 - 00:06:25:03

Okay. Thank you. Um, I think I get the applicant thoughts, particularly about the suggested wording at the end there, whether you'd be content to include that.

00:06:30:23 - 00:07:05:18

For the applicant, I'm just taking the points in turn that have been raised by the county council. And so the first point was it's not clear that all powers sought under article 40 and 41 will be constrained by the requirements relating to the camp. And just to confirm that article 31 says that, um, all powers in the DCO will be subject to the requirements and that should give the confidence that those controls in the relevant management plans will be in place, and specifically in relation to trees. There are various commitments in the camp which talk about avoiding and minimizing loss and tree areas.

00:07:05:20 - 00:07:43:02

And so that should give the county council the necessary comfort. The second point, um, in relation to trees, um, which are not protected, um, being that are of value but will be removed, and how this will be considered in terms of balancing the biodiversity net gain commitment. As you're aware from yesterday's discussion, and we are updating the order to commit to specific BNG percentages. That is an ongoing obligation, and the Landscape and Ecology management plan will ensure that we commit to that on an ongoing basis.

00:07:43:04 - 00:08:27:21

And there will be various monitoring measures in the lamp, which will obviously be approved by the relevant planning authority, and that will give you the commitment that if later on down the line. Certain works are required which perhaps aren't envisaged at an earlier date, then we will keep that ongoing commitment to ensure the BNG levels stay as those committed to, on the face of the order, and including that on the face of the order, does give that extra comfort that obviously it's a requirement expressly and expressly set out on the in the DCO in relation to article 41 and, um, the felling and lopping of trees at TPO trees in the future.

00:08:33:13 - 00:08:34:03

And.

00:08:38:22 - 00:09:12:18

This this is required. And I appreciate your concern in relation to whether there are any TPO trees. Obviously currently there are not any TPO trees, however. Our agricultural surveyor has surveyed the site in detail, and they are of the view that there are trees that are of the potential, value and characteristics that could become protected in the next 10 to 20 years. Um, there are, um, you know, trees which are well established and could be viewed by the local planning authority as potentially needing protection.

00:09:12:23 - 00:09:58:23

It's very important because this is a time limited consent that the Undertaker has the power to carry out works to trees as a last resort, and it's clear in the relevant management plans that that will be a last resort. And to ensure that it can, it can meet its ongoing obligations to operate, maintain and decommission the authorised development. Um, and it's it's essential, therefore, that the power to carry out works to trees that could there is a reasonable likelihood could become protected within that 40 year plus construction and decommissioning period, and that the power is there to do the work so that it can meet all its obligations and continue to deliver the urgent need for renewable energy.

00:09:59:20 - 00:10:13:05

And if there's a particular concern in relation to notification of those works or how you might become aware of them, then that's definitely something we can take away and look at, but including in the relevant management plan.

00:10:15:19 - 00:10:30:24

And in relation to the last point and the proposed wording, apologies, but would you be able to just repeat what the exact wording is that you're proposing is included in the requirement, just so that we're clear and we might need to take that away, but we can just consider that.

00:10:32:08 - 00:10:32:23

Yes, please.

00:10:33:00 - 00:11:05:21

Thank you. John Hunter, on behalf of the county council, I think that was the first point in the last point as well. So it's whether or not there is a need for additional wording in that regard. I hear what has been said, but the the question which still arises. Article three provides that the undertakers granted development consent for the authorised development, subject to the provisions of the Orders and Requirements. Well, that includes article 40 and 41 and the requirements, but it doesn't answer the question which takes priority? Is it an answer? It leaves for interpretation.

00:11:06:06 - 00:11:42:00

Is article 40 a freestanding power over and above not what the provisions relating to the camp and the lamp? Or is it subject to those requirements? So I think there is a need for express wording. If this is to be included, express wording which says this is subject to the um requirements. Um, I think it's relevant requirements. Eight in particular. Um, uh, as for the exact wording, um, I wasn't proposing that what I said was treated as precise drafting, but we could have a think and come up with something specific and put it to the applicant for inclusion.

00:11:42:02 - 00:11:48:02

I'd rather not do that on my off the top of ahead now. It's something I'd like to reflect on. Composing precise words.

00:11:48:11 - 00:11:50:24

Okay. Thank you. Did the District Council wish to say something just before?

00:11:51:02 - 00:12:28:17

Thanks, Steven. So, just two points. The first is that the suggestion of a notification of works is welcomed on our part. We'd we'd, um. We very much require all welcome a notification if there are going to be any replacement trees subject to all the other discussions about, um, whether or not articles 40 and 41 should be amended. And the other point is, whilst I understand the applicant's position in respect of trees, which might in the future be protected, and it's still our view that that would be introduction of article 41 on the basis of a precautionary basis for the future, which is still incompatible with vice.

00:12:28:19 - 00:12:57:09

Note 15 good practice point. Um, six because it's quite clear that precautionary basis shouldn't be the justification for a blanket power. Um, to lock, fell, etc.. Protected trees. So if there are particular trees that are there is a suggestion. Might be protected in the future. Perhaps that could be something which is set out in a schedule. So they need to again be identified. And that perhaps might be a way around. Um, article 41 as it currently stands.

00:12:59:06 - 00:13:02:18

Okay. Thank you for that suggestion. Come to the applicant, please.

00:13:02:20 - 00:13:35:06

Olivia Henshall for the applicant and taking the first point raised by the county council, and we will take away your suggestion. But as a matter of principle, it won't be that there's something in, um, that by exercising a power under the order, we would do something that's in breach of the management plan. So those obligations in the management plans are very much, you know, best practice and mitigation that the Undertaker will be committed to on an ongoing basis and therefore the management plan. And the article does need to be read together, and that should provide the relevant comfort.

00:13:35:21 - 00:13:41:01

It's taking, um, North Steven's point in relation to TPO trees. Is.

00:13:44:01 - 00:14:22:02

Um. That's we we don't accept that. It's, um, on a precautionary basis because there are there is a real risk of this. We can take that away and consider whether we can provide notification of those truths. But that is obviously, um, quite challenging for the applicant to do on the basis that it is the, the local planning authority that has the power to make TPO trees. And so therefore it is in their discretion. And it is very well-established that articles such as article 41 are in a whole host of made orders, and we'd be happy to provide a list of recent made orders that, um, include similar powers, if that would be helpful in art.

00:14:22:04 - 00:14:24:09

Um oral summary written summary.

00:14:24:21 - 00:14:41:20

Okay, yes, I think it would. Um, it sounds like maybe there's a bit more discussion to potentially be had. Um, can I leave the parties to do so before deadline three and maybe sort of update us at that point in terms of where discussions have got to. Okay. Thank you.

00:14:50:15 - 00:15:06:03

Okay. The next question I had was directed towards Network Rail in terms of the, um, dis application of some of the legislation which was of concern to them. Um, they're obviously not here. So unless the applicant can update me on any discussions, I'll.

00:15:07:07 - 00:15:28:24

Um, I have had discussions this week on a few points with Network Rail's lawyer, and on that basis, we have an agreed position to report to you, which is why I think the lawyer isn't in attendance. Um, so on this point, um, we've obviously set our position in response. Um, Network Rail is considering that, and they're going to come back to us shortly just to confirm, um, their views on that. We'll continue discussing with that and hopefully come to an agreed position.

00:15:29:16 - 00:15:37:13

Okay. Thank you. That's useful. Okay. Turning to schedule 16. Procedure of discharge of requirements. Now, please.

00:15:39:02 - 00:16:16:08

The applicant has made some changes to time scale and fees. In reply to comments from the local planning authorities and the Environment Agency. However, the examining authority understands that there is still some disagreement between the parties on paragraph three. Paragraph six, a uh, the applicant stated that uh ten working days is considered appropriate and proportionate. Uh, given the importance of the delivery of the proposed development, and is consistent with the timescales included in other made circular orders, including Packington Fen, cotton, West Burton and East Yorkshire.

00:16:16:24 - 00:16:23:06

Um, the local planning authorities like to reply with anything to the applicant's position.

00:16:27:12 - 00:16:28:24

Uh County Council. Thank you.

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

Okay.

00:16:29:18 - 00:17:01:06

Um, Justine Foster for Lincolnshire County Council. Um, the, um, our main concern regarding this particular part of schedule 16, um, is that it relates to where there is a requirement consultation. So, um, where we where we consulted a consultant and they come back, um, requesting additional information that has to be done within ten working days. Um, I appreciate the applicant's position that lots of the May dsos all contain ten days.

00:17:01:19 - 00:17:32:02

Um, this has come out of our experience, um, of dealing now with some discharge of applicant, um, discharge applications, requirement, discharge applications where there is a requirement consultation. And in practice, we have found that the ten days is very difficult to achieve to provide the

information to the requirement consultation. We give them just ten working days to then review the whole suite of documents, and then come back to us with any requests for further information.

00:17:32:13 - 00:18:02:23

Um, I think what needs to be appreciated is some of these discharge requirements Applications are quite large. They contain large numbers of documents. They're probably the size of an average town and country planning application in some instances, in terms of the amount of documentation there may be to read. So ten days is very difficult to achieve. And potentially that could be unworkable for some of the larger requirement discharges. So therefore it does come out of our experience and practice. Um, now we have progressed to discharge requirement phase with a number of our other DCO schemes.

00:18:05:12 - 00:18:07:05

Thank you. And the district council.

00:18:07:07 - 00:18:43:05

Shall we say? Steven. District council. Yes, sir. Obviously echo the points made by the county council. And we're grateful for the amendments that have been made to the draft echo in line with our comments and the point about, um, paragraph three, subparagraph six A is that it currently is inconsistent with paragraph three, subparagraph two, because as it stands, there's been an amendment to allow 15 working days for further information if the relevant planning authorities are not consulting, but under six A, there would be only ten working days for consultees to request further information.

00:18:43:07 - 00:19:02:01

So, in line with the reasons why we think we need 15 working days if we're requesting further information, that applies probably more so for consultees. And given that that they are likely to require slightly longer having us ask them the question. So it's a consistency point as much as a practical point.

00:19:03:06 - 00:19:06:00

Okay. Thank you. Turning to the applicant, please.

00:19:06:19 - 00:19:49:24

Come with the applicant. Um, we have set out the position, um, which says you've summarised, I think what it would just be helpful to understand, um, from the authorities is so we've already extended the period of time in which they need to come back to us to request for further information. So it's 15 days where there's no consultation and 20 days where there is a consultation. So I suppose if the ten working days was to extend to 15 working days, when a consultant needs to go back to the relevant planning authority. Is that intended to be absorbed within the new timescales, or is other consequential amendments sought as a result? Because I think from our perspective, the overall point is that the timescales are stuck to, particularly with the ten weeks and the overall period in which we're asked for the information.

00:19:50:11 - 00:20:09:05

So if it's the fact that it just means that they have less time to pass on the request to us, and it can be absorbed within the timescales and nothing else changes. And I think that's probably a point we can take away and have a look at. But it would just be helpful to understand, um, if there are consequential amendments that are also sought if that time frame is extended.

00:20:10:12 - 00:20:13:03

Okay. Thank you. Is that possible please.

00:20:14:24 - 00:20:27:00

Steven. District council composition. So we're happy that it's absorbed. So we're not seeking extension of the other timeframes which have already been extended. It's literally just that amendment sub paragraph six a okay.

00:20:27:02 - 00:20:28:05

And the county council.

00:20:28:11 - 00:20:32:23

Justin Foster for Lancashire County Council. Yes. That's our position as well that it would be absorbed.

00:20:33:24 - 00:20:35:01

Okay. Thank you.

00:20:36:16 - 00:20:45:03

That's helpful to understand, I suspect. I strongly suspect on that basis will be able to make that change at deadline three. But I'll confirm that. But that's helpful to have the confirmation.

00:20:45:19 - 00:21:13:07

Okay. Thank you very much to all parties in that regard. Okay. The German authorities note that the applicant has referred to ongoing discussions with the Ministry of Defence around wording of some of the requirements in the draft ECA, and suggested a new one for electrical noise. Um, could you provide an update on those discussions? Um, and have you had any feedback from the Ministry of Defence or not?

00:21:14:04 - 00:21:36:00

Thank you sir. Miss Coleman, for the applicant. So the drafting that is included in the DCO is a result of a bit of back and forth before that point with the Mod. And so the drafting that you've seen does reflect, um, discussions. Um, we have had some further feedback from the Ministry of Defence, Defense, and I understand that we should. Hopefully we're hoping to have those requirements in agreed form for deadline three.

00:21:36:10 - 00:21:44:09

Okay. Could you maybe just explain why an electrical noise requirement has been added? What's the reason behind that with the Mod?

00:21:56:22 - 00:22:18:02

Thank you sir. Um Miss Common for the applicant. So it's in response to the, um, representation from the mod about concerns, um, of any EMF interference with sensitive equipment on their part. Um, and that's drafted, excuse me largely or quite closely with what they've asked us to include for that, to give them that comfort.

00:22:18:11 - 00:22:19:11

Okay. Thank you.

00:22:22:20 - 00:22:37:07

Okay. Moving on to the next question. Um, the district council has requested that, uh, the UK HSA be added as a consul team, uh, for requirement seven. Is the applicant happy to do that?

00:22:39:00 - 00:23:22:05

For the applicant. And the applicant has engaged with the UK HSA on this request. And they have confirmed that as they do not hold any regulatory powers, um, they would not want to be added as a consul T for the approval of the Battery Safety Management plan under requirement seven. On this basis, the applicant does not consider that they need to be included as a consultant for the UK health. In addition, the UK role as a statutory consultant in the planning process generally finishes once consent is granted. The UK HSA has approved the Outline and Battery Safety Management Plan, as evidenced in the Statement of Common Ground, which you will have seen submitted into examination at deadline one and as per requirement seven.

00:23:22:07 - 00:23:51:10

The Battery Safety Management Plan must be substantially in accordance with that outline plan and this should give the UK Health and Security Agency and others confidence that it will be within the scope of the earlier agreement. Of course, in approving the battery safety management plan, the relevant planning authority. Um, there's nothing stopping the relevant planning authority. Consulting other parties, other bodies? Um, in doing so, just because they aren't expressly listed on the requirement.

00:23:54:03 - 00:23:56:09

Okay. District councils thoughts place.

00:23:56:24 - 00:24:14:10

For Norfolk District Council. So we're content with that approach. And of course this has been mentioned. Uh, firstly we're not the discharging authority for that requirement. I think it's the county. Um, but if they wish to or if we suggest that they should in any event consult with UK, HRSa, they can do so despite it not being part of the requirement.

00:24:15:12 - 00:24:20:24

Okay. Thank you. Nothing from the county council. Are you concerned with that approach?

00:24:21:24 - 00:24:22:17

Yes. Thank you.

00:24:23:13 - 00:25:06:15

Okay. Thank you. Okay. Let moving on to the next question. Uh, which is part two. Principal powers article six. So this is a bit of a long question, so you have to bear with me. Um, examining the authority, remain unconvinced that the combined effect of section 115, subparagraph five, and section 33, subgraph one of the Planning Act 2008 is to prevent planning permission being granted for, or in some way related to, Associate associated development already consented by a DCO, as opposed to having the effect that planning permission is not required by law or in such circumstances.

00:25:07:09 - 00:25:37:15

The examining authority therefore, think that article six, subparagraph five, uh development could include not only non CIP development that has not been consented under the DCO, but also non and development that has been consented by the DCA. Therefore, the examining authority are not of the view that the applicant has justified the need for the article to apply to associated development consented by the DCA, or to non and development that has not been granted by the DCA.

00:25:38:23 - 00:25:41:17

I wonder if I could get the applicant's thoughts on that one please.

00:25:42:18 - 00:26:03:11

It's common for the applicant. Um, thank you for that. So um, obviously I think it was in response to the question on this. We have set out the position there. And is it perhaps for us to take away the drafting to make it clearer in terms of its application? I think at the time we added some wording to the expansion memorandum to clarify the issue and perhaps use that whenever.

00:26:03:13 - 00:26:06:21

I think maybe we have a slightly different interpretation than you do.

00:26:06:23 - 00:26:11:04

I think yes, within itself is a reason to make it clearer. So, um. Yes. Take that away.

00:26:11:06 - 00:26:13:07

Okay. Thank you. That would be appreciated.

00:26:14:23 - 00:26:35:17

Okay. In terms of part six, miscellaneous in general, um, article 49, having considered, um, the evidence again, I don't have any further questions on that article. Um, so I think unless there's anything else that maybe the local authorities wish to raise, that's all the questions that I have.

00:26:36:10 - 00:26:46:13

So just on that article, um, the Crown consent article, um, happily, I can confirm that about an hour ago, we've received the Crown consent from the Ministry of Defence, so I understand, will be able to submit that at deadline.

00:26:46:21 - 00:26:48:07

Okay. That's useful. Thank you.

00:26:50:23 - 00:26:53:02

Okay. Anything else from the local authorities?

00:26:53:20 - 00:27:03:19

No, Stephen. District council. So I don't know if you've asked already a question at agenda item 6.6, which is force majeure event and whether we're happy. Would you like us to address that?

00:27:04:04 - 00:27:17:14

Um, I think it was, I think I, I moved the question because it did come up in terms of decommissioning discussion, and there was sort of some an agreement. So I didn't ask the question. But if you'd like to, to clarify, that's that's fine.

00:27:17:17 - 00:27:29:17

Um, North Sea District Council. So I think the short point to that is we're we're happy with the addition in the operational environment management plan, which which satisfies our concerns about early cessation of energy generation.

00:27:31:06 - 00:27:34:07

Thank you for that. Okay. Anything else from the county council?

00:27:35:01 - 00:27:35:16

No thank.

00:27:35:18 - 00:27:37:14

You sir. Okay. Anything else for the applicant?

00:27:38:01 - 00:27:39:07

No thank you. That's noted.

00:27:39:21 - 00:27:48:17

Thank you. Okay. In that case, uh, is only interested parties who wish to say anything on the, uh, what we've discussed on the development consent order.

00:27:50:20 - 00:28:05:06

Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. We're going to have a short adjournment now just whilst we reviewed action points. Uh, and then we'll come back just to deal with, uh, seven and eight on the agenda. Okay. We'll come back at 22. Thank you.

00:28:38:16 - 00:29:18:02

Okay, it's 2:20, so we will resume the hearing, please. Okay, so I'm just going to run through each of the action points. Um the first one is for uh, the district council, uh, to provide an update on the scoping opinion for the National Grid Navi substation. Uh, at deadline three, second applicant, uh, to provide revised outline construction traffic management plan to include figures showing the local good vehicle routing and to remove the text in paragraph 4.18, which still says based on these routes, it is not anticipated that any time restrictions will be required.

00:29:19:22 - 00:29:36:01

Action three for the county Council to provide a response for how movements of vehicles during the proposed embargo period at the junction of the A15 and B1 202 junction could be controlled, enforced

00:29:37:18 - 00:29:59:11

at number four for the applicant to respond to the question regarding whether the wording for Highway Highways agreement with the County Council, routing and movement numbers should be a requirement in the DCO or in the Outline Control and Traffic Management Plan, with reference to the precedent set in the Sheringham and Dudgeon Development Consent Order

00:30:01:04 - 00:30:13:11

number five for the applicant. Provide updated cumulative traffic modelling to include the proposed Avon Bee substation, following the scoping opinion being issued, hopefully for deadline three

00:30:15:00 - 00:30:28:08

um similarly uh 3.6 for the applicant. Revision of the cumulative traffic assessment to include the Navy, Bess and Oda, along with any other relevant developments at that time. Deadline for.

00:30:31:01 - 00:30:52:11

At number seven for the applicant again to consider the suggested updates to the Public Rights of Way Management plan set out in the County Council's Local Impact Report and Appendix B, uh, and including um, the requests for the dedication of public footpaths and bridleway rights in the Traffic development consent order itself.

00:30:54:03 - 00:31:01:14

Uh, number eight is the applicant again. Uh, and to update the statement of common ground with the Environment Agency. The deadline three.

00:31:04:10 - 00:31:17:13

Uh, number nine is for the applicant, the county council and the district council. Uh, to provide an update on ongoing discussions regarding, uh, articles 40 and 41 of the draft of Development Consent Order.

00:31:19:14 - 00:31:50:03

Number ten for the applicant to confirm with the local planning authorities a proposed change for the timescale in paragraph three. So paragraph six of schedule 16, uh, whether that will be made in the draft consent order for deadline three. And uh, number 11, uh, is for the applicant to consider the drafting of article uh six, subparagraph five to make it sufficiently clear. Again at deadline three.

00:31:50:08 - 00:31:56:09

Uh, and finally, for the applicant to submit the information in terms of Crown consent. Uh, deadline three.

00:31:58:05 - 00:32:03:07

Okay. Are there any others that, um, aren't picked up on that list?

00:32:03:19 - 00:32:23:13

There's not another one. Sorry, but just in terms of the, um, question about article six, um, paragraph five, which I understand the point, but it'd be quite helpful if we're going to have maybe via the case officer, the actual question that you read out, um, which we thought between us we had. We haven't completely captured it. But I understand the general point, but we just want to make sure that we've got.

00:32:23:15 - 00:32:29:03

Absolutely. Yes, I think very carefully read it out. But I do do appreciate it was a fairly complicated question.

00:32:29:05 - 00:32:29:20

But yeah.

00:32:29:22 - 00:32:31:09

If we could have that in writing, that would.

00:32:31:11 - 00:32:32:01

Be.

00:32:32:03 - 00:32:32:18

Helpful. Okay.

00:32:32:20 - 00:32:33:10

Thank you.

00:32:33:12 - 00:32:34:02

Thank you.

00:32:34:05 - 00:32:38:21

Okay. Any other wins? Okay. Thank you.

00:32:41:01 - 00:32:45:12

Yes, Mr. Gallagher? Sorry. Could you just wait for the microphone? Sorry.

00:32:54:17 - 00:33:04:11

Uh, but would it be appropriate for you to ask for further information on some of the points I raised on the cumulative traffic, for example, uh, the assessment of the cost of disruption, etc..

00:33:04:18 - 00:33:22:01

Okay. We will obviously go away and consider everything that's been discussed at all of the hearings. And ultimately, if we do need to ask anything further, we've got our second round of questions, where we can ask or see all the parties, any questions we consider necessary. But obviously we'll need to go away and reflect on everything as well. So thank you.

00:33:24:15 - 00:33:58:17

Okay. Thank you. We'll come to agenda item number eight in closing remarks. So can I remind everybody, um, that post hearing notes, documents and answers prepared in response to the post hearing actions should be provided by deadline three unless indicated otherwise. In the list we've just read. Um, so I now proceed to close the issue of specific hearing. Uh, thank you again for everyone that's contributed. Um, over the course of today. It's always greatly appreciated. Uh, and the time is, uh, 225 and the hearing is now closed.

00:33:58:19 - 00:34:07:09

Um, we will be back at five. Uh, sorry. 330, uh, for the compulsory acquisition hearing. Uh, and I'll probably see some of you there. Thank you.