



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Beacon Fen Energy Park
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH) – Part 4
Date:	24 September 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.

Beacon Fen_ISH1_Session4_24.09.25

Thu, Sep 25, 2025 4:51PM • 2:14:33

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

generating capacity, grid connection, solar panels, battery energy storage, megawatt peak, AC generation, DC generation, over planting, flood risk, water environment, traffic impact, construction access, mitigation measures, environmental impact, planning approval, construction phase, public rights of way, non-authorized users, traffic impact, bespoke access road, socio-economic assessment, temporary closures, local roads, construction traffic, public consultation, community impact, tourism attractions, heritage concerns, biodiversity, local impact report

SPEAKERS

Speaker 11, Speaker 8, Speaker 4, Speaker 7, Speaker 1, Speaker 5, Speaker 13, Speaker 14, Speaker 10, Speaker 12, Speaker 9, Speaker 3, Speaker 15, Speaker 6, Speaker 16, Speaker 2

Speaker 1 00:08

Hello again. It's now a quad two, and it's time to resume ish one. Can I just check with the applicant that we now have established a connection, a reliable connection.

Speaker 2 00:24

Thank you so much for the applicant, if you can hear me and sooner than Yes, right?

Speaker 1 00:29

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, and I hope that everyone can hear me clearly as well. So my first question before we adjourned was directed at the applicant, and if I may, I'm going to resume with that question, which is I would like to I would like for the applicant to explain a little bit further how it has arrived to the generating capacity of 400 megawatts for the proposed development.

Speaker 2 01:07

So Ian Mac for the applicant, I'll pass this across to Mr. Hartley bond to talk you through.

01:13

Thank you, Mr. Hartford,

Speaker 3 01:16

thank you, sir. James Hartley bond for the applicant, I'll talk through that. There's a sort of series of stages here, sir. So hopefully it's worth going through these, and we will get to your main questions. Hopefully, as we go through I'll start firstly by with reference to section four of the electricity grid connection statement, which is document reference a, p, p2, 85, and in that document, it notes that we

have a signed grid connection agreement with the national energy systems operator, or niso, which I'll probably use from this point, N, E, S, O, I'll use that acronym again, I'm sure, sir. And that agreement is for 600 megawatts of import and export with solar PV and battery. Energy Storage listed as the technologies that represents the maximum import and export amount the project can provide to the grid, and therefore is the technical driver behind the composition of the project. So as set out in paragraph, one point, 1.1 of the non technical summary of the environmental statement that's document reference, A, P, P 051, the proposed development will have solar generation capacity, approximately 400 megawatts. And the battery, energy storage system, or bespe Double SS, which I'll use for short, will have a 600 megawatt capacity. In terms of how we intend to maximize the generation of the site, sir, I will now turn to the key elements of the proposed development. So for the solar component. In terms of the solar it might first be helpful if I can explain some key terms important to understanding how the generation is measured and calculated. I will try my best to keep this to a lay person description, but do stop me if at any point, if you want further clarification on any of the points raised,

Speaker 1 03:34

get that will be very helpful. Mr. Hot Levon, if we could keep it as as expand layman's terms for the benefit of everyone today.

Speaker 3 03:44

Yeah, I'll certainly do my best. And apologies, by its nature, it is a little bit technical. So the first term to note is megawatt peak. And we reference that with use of capital M, capital W, lowercase p, megawatt peak, it's the measurement of the maximum power output of all the panels installed on a solar project. And if it helps to sort of simplify that, that's what we refer to as the amount of fuel going into the generation that is also referred to as the direct current or DC generation capacity, megawatts. And that's capital M, capital W, lowercase s, that tends to be used for the power figure that can be exported to the grid. I watt comes out the other side of the generator in terms of usable power. This is referred to as the alternating current or AC generation capacity. Critically, to go from DC to AC requires a conversion process, and that is undertaken by using inverters. There are a number of reasons.

Speaker 1 04:55

Yes, apologies, I think just for future. Ref. Difference. It will be my intention that when we are talking about megawatts and generating capacity from this point onwards, now that you have explained the difference, we actually refer to it as AC. The reason for that is because most of the national policies that we have on energy relate to AC, not DC. So now that we have actually explained the difference, if I could ask then, from this point onwards, for us to refer to generating capacity always in AC and not DC, that will be helpful as well. Generally.

Speaker 3 05:36

Happy with that, sir. I think there are a couple of instances here where it may help to refer to both aspects. What it does do is explain why there are two different figures and how you arrive at that AC capacity.

Speaker 1 05:52

No, that's absolutely fine. And if I need clarification, I will ask for clarification terms of a CDC, that's fine. Thank you.

Speaker 3 06:01

Okay, so there's another. There are a number of reasons why the DC figure generally exceeds the AC figure, and that is also recognized in, as you just mentioned, sir, national policy statement. In, three paragraph, two point 10.55, and it's not a long paragraph I may just briefly read this, the installed generated capacity of the solar farm will decline over time in correlation with reduction in panel array efficiency. And also applicants may account for this by over planting So

06:35

solar panel arrays.

Speaker 3 06:38

So along with that degradation, the other main reason for increasing the level of over planting is to manage the variation in generating energy over the course of a year. So what that's really trying to do is, in inclement conditions or over the winter period, is allow a greater greater level of generation over the course of the year. So with that in mind, sir, we have sought to maximize the efficiency of generation from the project within the land available, while staying within the bounds of the ES design parameters contained within the outline design principles, which in turn, is set out within the design and access approach document, which is version two. Document reference, A S, slash 019, sorry, Dash 019, along with the works plans, which is version two dash document reference as dash 006, specifically over planting tends to be considered in terms of the DC to AC ratio, and as a minimum, you would typically see at least a 1.2 to one that's DC to AC ratio, or in other put in Other terms, a 20% oversizing of the panels on the site relative to the AC figure. And that's simply there because the otherwise the inverters would not reach their maximum generating

08:15

output capacity.

Speaker 3 08:19

But typically so we see a variation of between around 1.3 to one and 1.5 to one. So that's that's a 30% 50% oversizing of panels relative to the inverters. And that's pretty commonplace in the UK. So I will caveat that by saying that all projects are slightly different, but we see that, yeah, we see that as fairly consistent across the industry, the schemes of a comparable scale, scale, but it's also preceded in recent decisions in other DCOs. Mr.

Speaker 1 08:58

Hartley bond, apologies. Please correct. Please tell me if you're going to address this point in your response later on, but just for my clarification now, so you mentioned now the over planting that there is a specific ratio that several different projects have applied. Are you applying an over Are you proposing any over planting? And what is the ratio?

Speaker 3 09:33

So, yeah, yes, there will always be. We will always look to over plant for any solar farm, for the reason I gave around maximizing the output from the inverters. We're not setting a specific figure of which we are looking to over plant to, but from our own experience and from where we see this as light. Land is between that 1.3 to 1.5 ratio that I mentioned, right?

Speaker 1 10:07

So if you are not 100% if you're not sure, and you are not proposing to come forward with any specific ratio of planting, can we actually then go back to your anticipated generating capacity in how you have come to the figure of 400 megawatts then,

Speaker 3 10:32

of course, and if you can just bear with me slightly longer, so I will get to that exact point. So if I maybe turn to, if I reference the scheme that we have assessed, sir. So there is an indicative plan, which is figure 1.4 that is the Indicative layout plan.

10:52

That plan has determined that around 536 megawatt peak could be installed.

Speaker 3 10:59

That's based on, as we noted earlier, a fixed tilt south facing system, and it assumes the use of 685

11:08

watt pounds.

Speaker 3 11:10

And we also noted earlier that technology improvements could mean that figure could go up. And that's

11:17

one apologies you said 500

Speaker 3 11:21

end so 536, 536 megawatt peak.

11:27

Okay,

Speaker 3 11:32

so if you use that figure, sir, with the land we have available, so that's, that's essentially what is within the fence line. Happy to give that figure, so it's 1184 acres. Yeah, and then that would give you around 2.2 acres per megawatt peak. And that sits within the range, within en three at paragraph two point 10.17, which notes that a so typical solar farm requires around two to four acres per megawatt of output. It's worth noting that that paragraph does actually go on to refer to the number of panels. So that's why we thought that was particularly relevant to council.

Speaker 1 12:25

Yes, yes, it is. Can I just clarify that 2.2 acres per megawatt peak that is based on the 400 megawatts generation that you mentioned across several different documents in the Yes? Or is it based on the 536 megawatts that you have just explained now?

Speaker 3 12:46

So the final point is, and so this, if you work, we sort of work the other way, in maximizing the seeing what we can maximize on the land here and then we've applied a conservative figure to what is a realistic and going back to the DC to AC ratio range that I mentioned, sir, we think that 400 megawatts is a conservative figure for what could be generated by the inverters and exported to the grid. That would be if so, to give you the calculation, if you took 536, megawatt peak and divided it by 400 you would get to a 1.34 to one DC to AC ratio, and again, that falls within the range that I highlighted

Speaker 1 13:41

before. So okay, thank you for that clarification. The ratio included with international policy statement that you have highlighted, I believe refers to AC. So when you are quoting 2.2 actors per megawatt peak, I would assume, and you have established that relationship within your answer, you are linking that to the ratio that is included with international policy statement. So with that in mind, how did you arrive to the 2.2 hectares per megawatt peak for the whole site? I am still not 100% clear on that

Speaker 3 14:34

Sure, of course. So sorry, James, hardly bump the applicant. Okay, that is, that figure is a calculation that is based on the site constraints. So we took the site and the advice of the consultant team working on the environmental technical considerations and the area that we were then left with. Read. Presents the the fence line that we can work within, so that area of land, so that we were left with, I'll give you the figure again, if it would help, is 1184 acres. And then we use that, and with the help of our design colleagues, laid out a site, and the conclusion they came to was that the site design would equate to that 536, megawatt peak figure. And if you then divide those two figures, you get to the 2.2

Speaker 1 15:40

acres per megawatt peak in the 536, megawatts, which is the value that was fed into the 2.2 acres per megawatt. Peak generation is AC, correct.

Speaker 3 15:57

The 536 is the DC figure, sir, and what that then creates through the inverters at the end of that process. So what comes out the other side would be approximately 400 megawatts.

Speaker 1 16:11

Okay, in what would be DAC value.

Speaker 3 16:19

Sorry to come back. So sorry. So the DC figure is is five, 536, megawatt peak. But the actual AC figure coming out the other side would be 400 megawatts. If that was a question you were asking.

Speaker 1 16:35

Well, yes, but, but it's not very clear to me, because you have just mentioned that 2.2 acres per megawatt peak is calculated on the basis of the 536 megawatts peak, not 400 megawatts peak. If the national policy links to a ratio of hectare per mega peak generation based on AC, then what I really need to know is, based on the AC generation, what is the ratio?

Speaker 3 17:08

Apologies, sir, yes, I see what you're saying. So yes, if you were to work that calculation out on the basis of the AC generation, then you'd be looking at around 2.96 acres per megawatt NAC, okay,

17:29

okay, so we have a 2.6 acres per megawatt.

Speaker 3 17:34

Okay, so sorry. So if you misheard me, it was, it was 2.96 but again, it would be within that and that would still sit within that range.

Speaker 1 17:46

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for that confirmation. Okay, I am clear on this specific point. Now I don't know, Mr. Hartley bond if you would like to continue, or would you like me to just direct you in terms of the questions that I have still on this specific topic.

Speaker 3 18:08

And that's fine. So if you have questions at that point, I was going to pause there and wait.

18:14

Will do Okay?

Speaker 1 18:21

My question, then, is considering, as you have confirmed at the beginning of your response, that connection that you have secured is a 600 megawatt connection. Can I ask? What is the percentage of that connection that you'll be using at peak? And it's non peak according to your calculations. And I know that non peak will probably be subject to what energy you can then put back into the network via the best in the battery energy system. However, I'm sure that you have done some calculations in terms of how you can use that connection. So can you actually explain those calculations to me and how likely it is that you'll be able to maximize that 600 megawatt connection.

Speaker 3 19:23

So we don't have the specific calculations, and they can vary through here. So we'd be happy to come back with more detail and a written note, if that would help.

Speaker 1 19:36

Yes, that would help. Thank you very much. However, I would also like to explore further the issue so the issue of over planting, and just to clarify the generation that you have just mentioned. Patient to me, does that include is that considering the over planting?

20:11

It is, that's correct. Okay?

Speaker 1 20:14

And what is the base of your planting in order to then consider the over planting. So what is your baseline? What is your one unit? Basically,

Speaker 3 20:29

yeah, this, I think the question you're on asking, sir, is in the in the Indicative design that we put forward, that I mentioned before, in that particular design scenario, the figure was 1.34 DC to AC, so an over planting of 1.34

Speaker 1 21:01

int at the so can can applicant, please explain to me and go back to the 400 megawatts generation capacity that is quoted on several documents across the environmental statement, and please confirm to me what does that number actually represent? Then?

Speaker 3 21:38

Yeah, that's the AC generation which we've assumed in the ES parameters.

Speaker 1 21:49

Okay, so that is the SC generation that then, once you divide that for the area, will give you the 2.96 hectares per megawatt peak.

22:01

Yes, that's correct, sir,

22:03

perfect, right. Okay. Now, can you please explain to me the

Speaker 1 22:13

600 megawatt battery energy storage system and how you have arrived to your proposed size and capacity for that battery energy storage system, please.

Speaker 3 22:32

Yes, sir. James, hardly gone for the applicant again, yes, for the battery energy storage system. We're seeking to maximize the grid connection agreement, which is for 600 megawatts of important export, and we've therefore assessed a system which is designed to be capable of exporting but also importing 600 megawatts of power at its maximum capacity.

Speaker 1 22:59

Okay, I understand that, but obviously in terms of how we will look at your proposed development, to propose development will be assessed mainly for its value in terms of generating electricity, not just storing electricity. So with that in mind, can I please ask the applicant to clarify why the 600 megawatt bass is proposed, and what is the value of that size of a battery, energy storage system? Yeah, I

Speaker 3 23:45

Yes, Sir James Hartley, bond for the applicant. So yes, as I said, the reason for it is to maximize the use of the grid connection agreement. And there are a number of scenarios where you could have excess energy stored in the battery energy storage facility, and you could also be generating from the solar farm at maximum output at the same time, theoretically, so you could reach a figure of 600 megawatts of AC output.

Speaker 1 24:20

Okay, have you done any calculations on how likely it is for that to happen?

Speaker 3 24:29

We don't have those calculations to answer, but it's something again, we could come back within the technical information afterwards that we're happy to provide.

Speaker 1 24:41

I Okay, but I would urge the applicant to really consider that specific point, because obviously that goes to the heart of the application and the value of the proposed development. And so I would need. To be very clear in terms of what is going to be the generating capacity of the proposed development and how you are proposing to maximize the connection secured of 600 megawatts. So I would need that information to be made very clear by the applicant.

Speaker 2 25:30

So, yes, I think potentially just just a point of clarification from me here, so I can make sure that we're accurately recording the action and to to understand the specific information you're looking for. And I might just by Mr. Turnbull to make up a couple of comments and observations from the site selection process. Is your is your query? How is it still on the sort of central point that was raised at the outset in terms of how we've sought to maximize the generating capacity versus the grid connection agreement that authorizes up to 600 megawatts. Or is it? Is it how the best elements of that which is capable of aggregating up to the 600 megs of Mr. Hartley bonds has said how that is, how that sort of interacts with the solar elements and then plays back into the good connection step, I'm not totally clear on the specific question.

Speaker 1 26:23

Okay, I think the short answer to your question is both. I would say Mr. Mac however, in order to clarify the situation, what I would need to fully understand and actually be provided by the applicant. Comprehensive evidence of this is considering the connection secured and considering the capacity of the proposed best I would need to actually understand how likely it is for those two energy connection points and and in the best and energy storage would be maximizing how likely it is that proposed

development will be able to feed both those forms of development that you are proposing, ie, how likely it is that the proposed development will be able to maximize the 600 megawatt connection secured, plus generate enough electricity for the best storage unit To actually be maximized on the 600 megawatts as well.

Speaker 2 27:45

Thank you. So I think, I think I understand that better now. So we, we will take that away, and we will endeavor to respond to that in full with the detail that you've you've requested, and might be that's a topic we need to revisit at a future point as well, once you, once you see it, but we'll do our best for

Speaker 1 28:01

that. I Yes, I think, I think that this is a topic that would require significant amount of evidence and work from your perspective, because I would need to be quite certain in terms of how likely it is that both those components of the proposed development are going to be used to the maximum and to the maximum advantage and capacity.

Speaker 2 28:33

Thank you. So sorry. Sorry to labor the point. But just just to explore this a little bit more, to make sure that we're giving you the rights, the right evidence and some response here is, we heard earlier that the submissions from LCC and nkdc about the effectively the nameplate capacity of the best and why, on the face of it, that was set at 600 megs versus the 400 megs AC of the solar is the principal concern here, that that you know the delta between the two of them and and wanting to understand why that for the additional capacity of the best is justified, or is it also or otherwise, whether The solar, the solar array is justified at 400 megs, when the grid connection is for 600 megs. Because I think that's a different points. And I just want to make sure I fully

Speaker 1 29:29

understand, no, I understand in those are definitely Mr. Different points. Mr. Mac. I would want to understand both. So I think that I am coming at this from the perspective of, if we look at connection secured and the solar array panels that you have, my first question and my first preoccupation would be to actually understand how those panels will generate. Um energy, in order to maximize the 600 megawatt connection, this is considering or not, this is putting the best to one side. So that would be one point, and that would be a consideration. So I would need to actually understand how likely it is that that connection will be, that you'll be exporting to the grid 600 megawatts via that connection. I understand that your project seeks to create more than that energy from solar panels, and that energy will be stored in a battery, energy storage system. Therefore there is additional capacity to store, to generate and storage energy that that you are proposing that is justified by both the connection in the battery, energy storage and I need to then understand how likely it is that that 600 megawatts battery energy storage will be also used to the maximum of its capacity. Is that clear now

Speaker 2 31:09

it is. Thank you that was helpful, just in helping at least me, understand the specific focus, and we'll make sure we address that in our submissions.

Speaker 1 31:18

Thank you, and considering how central this point is to the whole application, can I please urge the applicant to provide this information to the examination and to the XA Shortly, and ideally by deadline one, if that's possible.

Speaker 2 31:45

Thank you. So, yeah, I'm pretty confident we'll be able to do that for you, certainly to certainly in relation to the substance of the points. So we'll, we'll take that away and provide it to you, and you'll have the benefits of that.

Speaker 1 31:59

Thank you very much. Right in light of that, then I had some further questions on this specific issue, but I do think that it will be beneficial for us to stop here now and get that clarification from the applicant on that specific point. However, I would like to invite participants in local authorities that have expressed concerns on this specific point to comment as well. So first of all, if I could ask bear with me for one second. I And

Speaker 1 32:45

if I could ask first of all miss Hall to comment on this specific point.

Speaker 4 32:52

Thank you. So I think we've, we've made our points in relation to to the best capacity and associated developments. I don't propose to repeat that obviously the applicant is, I've taken a note that the applicant is going to answer a couple of your questions, but put both ways, both in terms of the justification for 400 megas against the connection of 600 and the other way around, in terms of the additional capacity of the best. And we look forward to see receiving those comments, and we'll comment in turn. And so the only other comments that I've noted to take part in terms of item four relate to different parts of this conversation in terms of sequential tests and alternative sites with that, with that hat on. So I don't, I don't think we've got anything further to say that we haven't already said in terms of best capacity and need,

Speaker 1 33:42

okay. Okay, that's fine. In that case, Miss Cole. Can I will come back to you then, before I actually close this specific item for you to ask those questions in terms of alternatives. But before I do that, can I just invite mister shake if you would like to comment on this specific point as well shipment

Speaker 5 34:08

shake for North Sea Industry Council. So I don't have anything to add beyond what Miss Hall stated, we'll take the same approach, and we certainly welcome further information in this respect, and then we'll respond in writing.

Speaker 1 34:20

Okay, thank you very much for that. Can I just ask now, Mr. Gordon, I believe that you also mentioned that you would like to intervene on point four, is it about this specific point in terms of energy generation, or is it about at the point. If you could just clarify that?

Speaker 6 34:44

Yeah, Mr. Garden, on behalf of Phaedra energy, it's not related to generation, sir, it's related to the cable route,

Speaker 1 34:50

to the cable route. Okay, fine. I will come back to you as well again on this, on that specific point. Then, Mr. Garden, can I just ask. A final councilor. Chapman, I believe that you have also expressed an interest in perhaps commenting on this specific item. Can I just ask if it is about energy generation now, or is it about another topic of item four? I

Speaker 7 35:24

thank you for including me. At this point, my question has been covered. Thank you.

Speaker 1 35:30

Thank you very much. Councilor Chapman, and I think that that is those are all the requests that I had. Is anyone else on this call today that would like to comment on this specific topic in terms of energy generation that I have not called? Please raise your hand. I don't see any hands raised? Okay, in that case, I am now going to invite comments on the other topics, and I will start again with Miss Hall, please.

Speaker 4 36:13

Thank you. So just on the other topics under item four, need site selection alternatives. We've obviously reviewed the site selection materials included within the planning statement and appended there too. So we will be making these comments within our LIR. So with the interest of looking at the clock and brevity, I don't suppose to go into too much detail. So just to really wave a flag for the applicant that we have looked at the sequential test and we consider that there is additional information that would benefit from being provided, we also will look to provide additional comments on that in writing at further deadlines. So when we've been provided with that information, that's something we, in turn, would like to comment on, we suspect that that's something that the applicant will be potentially asked questions by you, sir about, and we'll feed into those questions as well. But at the moment that the headline is that we remain unconvinced by the approach and methodology taken in the sequential assessment and the site selection data, essentially. So the key point for us is the rationale for choosing a single site and looking only for contiguous blocks of land, rather than splitting up the site into two separate parcels, which is a point that was canvassed earlier. So we note that the applicants reference to the paragraph in the planning statement, but we have obviously got experience in Lincolnshire of other projects which have been subdivided in that way that remain commercially viable. And we note the absence of, obviously, any detailed information about viability. We note the general point, the generality of the point that the more you spend on cabling and disaggregating projects, the less efficient they may be economically. But when you use the term viable that that does suggest that there is a particular cut off in play, and we don't have that information, obviously.

Speaker 1 38:13

Thank you. Miss Hall, I think we have covered that point and an appropriate action earlier on today, in terms of the applicant justifying its approach in a little bit more detail, particularly taking that into consideration, just for my benefit. Miss Hall, you have mentioned sequential approach a couple of times on your comments. Now, do you actually mean that generally, or do you mean that in relation to flood risk?

Speaker 4 38:40

Because obviously so the sequential test for flood risk purposes is wrapped up within the site selection exercise, appended to the planning statement. But particular

Speaker 1 38:50

it will get into that in the items five,

Speaker 4 38:53

yes, which I won't need to make the point again. But the point in terms of flood risk for us is the sequential test part of the site selection assessment,

39:01

that's clear. Thank you very much. Mr. Garden.

Speaker 6 39:09

Thank you, sir. Mr. Garden, on behalf of Fedra energy limited, as I mentioned earlier, Fedra submitted a relevant representation, which is RR zero 20 in respect of the application. And I won't repeat what was said in that but fundamentally, Phaedra is a UK based developer proposing a 1.2 gigawatt battery scheme itself in the vicinity of the substation to which this project connects, and a planning application scheme Mr. Garden. So the scheme is the Hammond Bess scheme. So it's being promoted by by Fedra. The planning application for that scheme, which has a reference of B, 25, 0224, has been submitted and is due to be determined in in November of this year, sir and represents by. Fedra a substantial investment in grid stability. So Fedra already has the benefit of an option agreement dated April 2024, and as part of part of its relevant representation, Fedra submitted a plan which showed the area of that option, but also an area of overlap between the proposed cable route as part of this project and the battery area as part of the feeder project project, so that is included as figure B to phaedras relevant representation. I mean by way of background to feed or they're a major developer, and they've recently reached financial close on the UK's largest battery storage scheme, which is a 1.4 gigawatt scheme in thought Marsh. And their plan for that, for the Hammond scheme, is to similarly fund that, and funding secured through the National Wealth Fund and a consortium of other international lenders. So the primary concern is the interaction between the cable route of this project, the overlap, and in particular the extent of overlap that there is in respect of the grid connection here.

Speaker 1 41:07

Okay, I That's That's clear. Thank you very much. Mr. Garden, I will invite the applicant to address the point, if they can

Speaker 2 41:26

mark on behalf of the applicant, so only, only to note that we obviously have the benefit of the figures relevant representation, which which we noticed, and we will respond to the deadline, one that representation was part of the ongoing discussion between the parties, which has continued since you'll have heard that that application is pending planning, and so there's still some sort of degree of residual uncertainty about the extent of the overlap between our corridor and their scheme, because that's dependent on both our respective planning processes and the detailed design. Those points notwithstanding, there is collaborative discussion ongoing between the parties to understand what potential interface arrangements could be, could be made. And I think it's fair to say the both parties anticipate that an agreement is capable of being reached and with a target for the midpoint of this examination.

Speaker 1 42:19

Thank you very much for that confirmation, Mr. Mac, and obviously I am mindful that we are not necessarily discussing cumulative effects today, but and please advise me if you are not in a position to actually clarify or respond to this question, but can I ask if you are able to provide any information in terms of how this application has been considered this part of cumulative effects. If you would prefer to respond in writing, that's okay as well.

Speaker 2 42:58

Probably defer to rising I'm almost certain the answer will be yes, because of the approach we carry on our long and short list. But if you, if we take that away and respond to you, sir,

Speaker 1 43:06

yes. So if we could actually carry that as an agenda, please, thank you very much,

Speaker 1 43:16

right? Is there any woman else that would like to raise any questions under item four needs site selection and alternatives that I have not called yet. Please do raise your hand.

Speaker 1 43:35

I don't see any hands raised then, so I will in that case, then move us on to Item five, water environment and flood risk. So as promised, the applicant has required, has requested a 10 minute turnaround in order to set up the room for the next two items that will be item five and item six. So if that is still convenient, I propose that we break for 10 minutes now. Would that be okay?

Speaker 2 44:04

Because I know we caused a 10 minute delay before I don't think we'd need 10 minutes. I think five minutes would be it'd be plenty. It's just a quick reject. So maybe,

Speaker 1 44:17

yep, that's appreciated. So I will adjourn now this hearing very quickly for five minutes, and we shall resume at 35 past two. Thank you very much. Thank.

Speaker 1 50:04

So again, it's now 35 minutes past two, and it's time to resume. I sh one. Can I just confirm that everyone can hear me? Please? If someone could confirm if they can hear me clearly or not, that would be helpful.

50:21

We can. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

Speaker 1 50:26

So we before we adjourned, we finished item five, and we're moving now to apologies item four, and we are now moving to item five, water environment and flood risk. The purpose of this item is to examine issues linked to the effects of proposed development on the water environment. A list of key written submissions that will inform my questions has been included in the agenda published in the discussion of these hearings, as per other items. Instead of going through this list in detail. Can I just ask if anyone has any comments they would like to make on the list included in the agenda? Raise your hand if you do, please. I don't see any hands raised, therefore, I assume that there are no comments in the fall. My first question will be for the applicant, and I would like to start by asking the applicant to provide an overview of ES chapter 11, that is a PP 062, particularly focusing on the assessment methodology, the assessment of effects embedded mitigation proposed and any residual effects after embedded mitigation has been considered.

Speaker 2 51:45

Thank you, sir. At this point, I'd like to introduce Anna sage, who is the author for the for the Water Resources chapter, and she can talk you through the questions she just asked.

51:57

Thank you, Mr. Mac sage,

Speaker 8 52:03

I'm Sage on behalf of the applicant in terms of the assessment methodology chapter 11, water resources and flood risk environmental impact assessment EIA methodology is set out in Section 11.4, of the ES chapter so that's at 062, in summary, background, surveys and studies are completed to establish the baseline condition and identify hydrological and hydrogeological receptors. These studies included dust based, field based surveys. Sensitivity of receptors to hydrological and hydrogeological impacts were determined potential likely impacts resulting from the proposed development were considered, then the scale of potential effects was determined by assessing the degree of sensitivity of the receptors and the potential magnitude of change from baseline condition. The assessment was undertaken assuming that embedded mitigation set out in Section 11.7, of the ES chapter be implemented as part of the proposed development. Facts that were determined to be major or moderate were considered to be significant in EIA terms, effects that were identified as minor or legible were considered to be not significant. Following the assessment the need for any specific mitigation measures and residual effects are considered. Assessment of cumulative effects was also undertaken. First step of the cumulative assessment was to consider other developments within the same

catchment as proposed development. Second step is to consider if the construction phases were likely to overlap and potential for cumulative effects on water environment. Supporting assessments included the flood risk assessment, which is at 162 and the water payment directive, the compliance assessment, which is at 167 which were both appended to the ES chapter. In terms of the assessment of effects, desk based and field based surveys are undertaken to report the description of baseline in summary, regionally, the order limits lie within the environment. Agencies was loose. IDB drained South water, book drain water body, surface water catchment, and also within the black sluice IDE area. On a local scale, the order limits are split between two surface water catchments, second to know and self water book drain catchment. Within these catchments, there are a number of main furs and ordinary watercourses, including IDB drains, the two local wildlife sites on site with hydro edricological South 40 foot drain and the great value guards geology and hydrogeology, superficial deposits spare. Across the order limits, and those with no groundwater source, such as tidal fat deposits, those considered to be locally important aquifers, the glacial preview icebone type deposits and the sleeve at Sand and Gravel. Bedrock geology, which is the Oxford clay formation and the West autumn formation, is not considered to be a groundwater resource. There are 16 surface water abstraction locations downstream of the order limits, which have been considered in the assessment. And then no registered private water supplies within two kilometers of the order limits, once the baseline condition was described, the potential effects on the water environment were then considered. These included potential effects that may change the hydrological and hydrological food regime, and those that may cause pollution and a degradation in water quality. Details of those are provided in Section 11.7, of the ES chapter, the moving on to embedded mitigation. In summary, the embedded mitigation measures are included in the ES appendix 2.3, embedded mitigation, which is at 076, include design mitigation which will be secured by the draft DCO requirement five document as 008 principles of good practice guidance set out in the outline construction Environmental Management Plan at 077, and the outline decommissioning Environmental Management Plan at 078, in addition, the outline battery safety management plan at 279 sets out embedded mitigation measures relating to maintenance management of deaths, embedded design mitigation measures such as avoidance of hydrologically sensitive areas flood zones being incorporated into the design of the proposed development where possible.

57:10

These include

Speaker 8 57:12

initial layout, which is shown on figure 1.4 dictator layout, big ticketed site layout plan, which is at 195 and the location is the access tracks, including the bespoke access road and auxiliary infrastructure, and they've been designed to avoid hydraulically sensitive areas where possible. The Access tracks within the site have been mooted to make as much use of existing tracks as possible, upgrading these where required, to minimize the requirement for entirely new tracks and watercorp crossings, underground cavelling Will where possible, aim to follow the same route as the access tracks reduce ground disturbance, minimum five meter buffer to all water crossing walked courses and water bodies within which there'll be no development set water crossing at a minimum nine meter buffer to all water courses and water bodies within which there'll be no new infrastructure that would impede access to the Water cross. Water flooding rose. Development has also been designed in accordance with an environment with environment agency guidelines relating to blood risk.

Speaker 1 58:29

Thank you very much for that. Miss. Can I just confirm that on your on chapter 11, you do confirm that no significant effects have been identified from the water environment, and therefore no additional mitigation is required beyond the embedded mitigation, which you have set out as well within the same chapter. That is all very clear. However, I would like us to consider consultation, particularly in terms of the internal drainage boards. And I would like to understand a little bit better how you have involved significant internal drainage boards. And also please clarify, I do have mention and evidence of communication with the black sous internal drainage board. And I also wanted to check if in communication has occurred with South with South 40 foot drain transport or not, and if you believe that that is relevant.

Speaker 8 1:00:08

Yes, in terms of the consultation engagement, there is a summary included in the ES chapter. So table 11.1,

Speaker 8 1:00:22

so the AG, applicant has included EIA scoping and statutory consultation, and in addition to the statutory consultation, has understated direct topic specific consultation with both the Environment Agency and black sluice internal drainage board to inform about the proposed development and to inform the design of that the proposed development, and in terms of the self portico drain, and so that falls under the IDB that Sue's IDB area,

Speaker 1 1:00:58

okay, in terms of meetings and engagement with black Swiss internal drainage board, as you have now just referred to. All I can see within Chapter 11 is actually, I believe, a meeting that was held on the 15th of August 2023 can I just check if any further communication has happened with the IDB,

Speaker 8 1:01:33

and I can confirm that there has been some further communication, and details of that will be included in The statement of common ground suicide.

Speaker 1 1:01:42

DB, perfect. Thank you very much. That's fine. Now, can we actually look at the applicant's approach to flood risk and the assessment carried out? So can I just confirm that flood risk and flood risk assessment has been carried out in line with the latest Environment Agency guidance. Thank you,

Speaker 2 1:02:10

Sir Ian, no for the applicant, so at this point, I'll just switch across to ms Emma Keegan, who's the technical director and the author responsible for the applicant's flood risk assessment.

Speaker 1 1:02:20

Okay, thank you very much. Is it Mrs. Keegan or MS Keegan? Apologies, I didn't catch that. It's Mrs. Keegan. Thank you. Thank you very much. Mrs. Keegan, please. Thank you, sir.

Speaker 9 1:02:33

Yes, the I can confirm the flood risk assessment as submitted was carried out in line with the Environment Agency data sets and guidelines available at the time that it was written. And then, in response to your section 51 advice, we prepared a technical note which is reference as 022 which looked at the Environment Agency data sets that were published at the early part of 2025 and provided comparisons of the mitigation measures that were proposed within the flood risk assessment and assessed whether they were still appropriate based on the latest Environment Agency data sets. And as a point of clarification, sir, the prime primary data set that we're discussing here is the surface water flood mapping updates at the environment and respect to fluvial flooding. Yes, Environment Agency data sets, but also updated. But our flood risk assessment relies on bespoke fluvial flood modeling. In that respect,

Speaker 1 1:03:41

you broke up a little bit at the end there. So could I just ask you to repeat the last sentence?

Speaker 9 1:03:46

Please? Yes, of course. I'm a Keegan for the applicant the the Environment Agency. Data sets were updated in the early part of 2025 for both fuel flooding and surface water flooding. The technical note, which I refer to, which is as 022 focuses primarily on the updated surface water flood risk mapping. And because, with respect to fluvial flood mapping, our flood risk assessment relies upon bespoke fluvial flood modeling that has been carried out for this proposed development.

Speaker 1 1:04:22

Okay, carried out for purpose development. Okay. Thank you very much. Now I would like to invite the Environment Agency to actually come in on this specific point. I'm mindful of the relevant rep that was submitted to examination, which is relevant rep 006,

Speaker 1 1:04:50

so can I ask the Environment Agency if they would like to comment and perhaps present a little bit further some of the. Considerations and issues that were raised in the relevant rep, particularly in relation to water environment and flood risk.

Speaker 10 1:05:07

Hi, sir Sean Holland from the Environment Agency. I'm a flood risk specialist. So would you like us to give kind of a broad overview of our concerns that we kind of laid out in our relevant reps, and then also anything that has happened since then.

Speaker 1 1:05:24

Yes, please. So I'm mindful that you have raised a significant number of issues through your relevant reps. If you could concentrate on any outstanding issues that were mentioned within your relevant rep. I don't know if they are all still outstanding or not. If some of them have been resolved, then that's fine. I would, I would just like a mention of that, but I would like you to really concentrate on the ones that

remain unresolved, just so that I can assess the situation and get back to the applicant on those issues. So yes, please, thank you.

Speaker 10 1:06:08

Okay, so just to start with, none of our concerns raised have been resolved. Additionally, we have had modeling sent through to us, so there has been updates to the model that the applicant has undertaken, because we are still not in a position to approve this as being fit for purpose, for the site or for the FRA This is still outgoing. There are still a number of issues and concerns we have. Then if you'd like these concerns to be given to you in more detail. I do have a modeling colleague that is on the call that can give you that detail, or I can just already say that we're still working with the applicant on this.

Speaker 1 1:06:46

I Thank you for that comment. Obviously I am mindful of some significant issues that were raised within your elephant traps. I am also mindful, from my review of your of your relevant representation, that for a lot of them, the environmental agency comes forward with actually proposed solutions for for some of those issues. However, I would like to concentrate on some more key issues, particularly those that are linked with your comments regarding the suitability of the environment statement and what the applicant will need to do in order for the Environment Agency to be able to be happy with the approach and with the results presented in the environmental statement, including, obviously, The flood risk assessment that was carried out as well, which, as I understand, Environment Agency is still not happy with

Speaker 10 1:07:46

Yes. So fundamental to those problems are that this modeling has not been approved as being fit for purpose, which is then continued into us, not having an agreed design level, which then has influenced many of the aspects of the site. So this is where we are lacking detail in what impacts the proposed development will have on capacity of the floodplain. This is specifically in context to the battery storage site and the solar panels themselves, as they are both looking to be placed in areas that are within the design flood event off of the modeling that has been presented into in the FRA which, again, hasn't been fully signed off yet. So there may be alterations, depending on what additions need to be altered on the model. Following this, we also have concerns about the freeboard that is being put in place on the finished floor levels of both the battery storage system and also the lower edge of the panels, as there is concern they will not be resilient in times of flood, with that addition of climate change and the impact that may have.

Speaker 1 1:08:55

Sorry to interrupt you miss Holland, the free board is that the basis on which, so based on which the proposed development structures will actually sit on, is that?

Speaker 10 1:09:08

So what we asked for is there will be a height of the flood level, so that's the design level in context here. And then we will always ask for there to be a freeboard, so a gap given between that and the lower level of structures, so this will be the finished floor level of the battery storage unit, and also the

lower edge of all panels that freeboard is in place to ensure that any inaccuracies in modeling which do occur, or any kind of impacts of debris being caught on things that may impact the level of flood in these areas is taken into consideration and mitigated for Yeah, that's what we mean in free, broad sense that way. Thanks very much. Additionally, the applicant has not presented the output of a credible maximum scenario and the impacts that this kind of worst case scenario of climate change may have on their development. Addition. They have not presented how they are going to make their site resilience to this credible maximum scenario. Furthermore, we are awaiting more detail on how the applicant may interact with the fences on site. This is both above ground with crossings, so temporary crossings for construction phases or permanent crossings to access the site, and how this may interact with the embankments on site. Additionally, this is looking at the below ground cable crossings and how the crossings may interact with foundations of embankments and other kind of assets on site and through the cable corridor. Furthermore, we are still waiting more information about how the construction phase may impact on flood capacity and these defenses as well. So is there going to need to be storage of materials in the floodplain that may have temporary impacts during the construction phase, and is there going to be mitigation measures put in place to mitigate for any increases that may occur?

Speaker 1 1:10:56

Thank you very much. Ms Holland, I understand that. So if I may, I think that most of your concerns actually relate to the applicants assessment in terms of flood and flood risk, what you have explained now. But am I right in assuming that concerns Beyond The Beyond flood and flood risk in the wider water environment, the environment agency is still not happy with and looking particularly in terms of the loss of riparian habitat and loss of connectivity, which obviously is slightly a slightly different issue from the flood risk issues that you have highlighted. Am I right in thinking that those are still outstanding?

Speaker 10 1:11:45

Is it okay if I just pass over to my colleague Chloe snowball, just because I am a budget specialist, where she's more of the planning? Yes.

1:11:52

Thank you very much. Miss Holland. Yes. Thank

Speaker 11 1:11:55

you. Thank you, Sean. Thank you, sir. Yes, we still have a number of outstanding issues relating to the wider water environment. These are detailed in full in our relevant representations, which is document our dash, 006, I don't really want to go into detail into those today, because they're like, I say they're detailed in full in our relevant representations, and they include solutions for resolving those issues. But just to sort of summarize, we had concerns around potential pollution risks to ground and surface water, lack of clarity on water supply, risks to and risks to protected species, and if there are any specific questions relating to those like I said, they're detailed in full in our relevant representations, and it should be fairly clear, but we can follow up in our response to Deadline one.

Speaker 1 1:12:50

Thank you, Miss noble, can you just confirm to me that none of the issues that you have highlighted on irrelevant reps have been addressed by the applicant? So they are all outstanding at the moment,

Speaker 11 1:13:02

they are also outstanding. The only engagement that we've had with the applicant since our relevant representations were submitted as Sian, my colleague, Sian detailed, was the flood Model Review. Okay.

Speaker 1 1:13:15

Thank you very much. If I could ask the applicant to provide the exci with an update on where we are on a significant number of issues and concerns raised by the Environment Agency.

Speaker 2 1:13:31

Thank you, Sethi and mark for the applicant. Set so I'll maybe just give us a general answer to that. I mean, you obviously had quite a number of the outstanding points, which echo most of the points that are raised in the relevant representation which will be responding to it at deadline, one which is the subject of the sscg discussions with the Environment Agency. To assure you, a lot of this hinges, as I understand it, on the resolution of the model, and the model is undergoing its fourth iteration in response to the previous comments made between the Environment Agency, updated by the applicant, etc, so that that is narrowing, I think, and on a path to resolution. And once that, once that is resolved, which I think all parties are confident it will be, it will unlock resolution of most of the other assessment related queries that they've raised, there were obviously other physical design elements which, which hinge on that as well. So it's difficult for us to give you a sort of categorical answer to all of it, other than to note that we're trying, we're responding to the questions that have been raised, and providing the information where we can. But we'll need a little bit more time, I think, to resolve the methodological point, which will then unlock the assessment and the design up. But I think with those discussions are still ongoing. The latest exchange of information was, I think, earlier this month, and so that's that's continuing and but we understand the urgency within this examination, and we expect to be able to provide an update, definitely a deadline, one in respect to, in respect of the relevant representations, and also at deadline. Into as well. So that's a sort of general answer to try and give you a flavor of where we are. If you would like some more sort of micro answers to some of the points. I can invite Mrs. Keegan to come back into to address some of those. But you know what would be most helpful for you at this point? Sir.

Speaker 1 1:15:18

Thank you for that response. Mr. Mac I I don't think that I need a more granular response from his for Miss Keegan regarding this situation, what I would really welcome would be a commitment from the applicant in terms of finding a resolution for these concerns as quickly as possible, you have mentioned that the last communication that you have had with Environment Agency to try and resolve some of these issues were early this month, although that is welcomed, considering where we are in the examination, and the fact that we have not a huge amount of time to resolve these issues, I am a little bit concerned about us being at the beginning of the examination without these issues being resolved.

Speaker 2 1:16:22

Thank you. So Ian, land for the applicant, no, that's that's all understood. And I'm assured from from colleagues that the pace of these discussions with the Environment Agency are are increasing, and so hopefully that will allow for timely resolution, but your point and initial concern is noted and understood.

Speaker 1 1:16:39

Just to explain further my concern, Mr. Mack, it is linked with the fact it is linked with the fact that the concerns that the Environment Agency has actually put forward, in my view, are actually quite significant. They go to the heart of the application, and if they are not resolved, they will present a significant obstacle in terms of moving forward. So I do urge us to find a resolution for this as soon as possible. As you know, flood risk is a key issue that will affect this sort of project and and the guidelines and how we need to look at that issue are very clear within national policy, and therefore I would urge you to really give this specific issue urgent attention.

Speaker 2 1:17:36

Thank you so Ian nicely, again, that's understood. So we are doing so, but we will. We will continue to do so with those words in mind.

Speaker 1 1:17:43

Thank you very much. I would now ask if there is anyone else that would like to make a comment under item five, that's water environment and flood risk, please raise your hand and I will invite you to participate now.

Speaker 1 1:18:11

Mr. Okay, I have Mr. Phillips sale, I believe

Speaker 12 1:18:21

afternoon, sir and Philip sale of the Environment Agency, just to come in on the aspect of the hydraulic modeling, referring back to the applicant, as they've noted, they've undertaken some site specific, detailed hydraulic modeling. We've been through a number of rounds of review, and we recently issued our sort of final comments. And there's the three outstanding matters which we're working with the applicant to resolve and get into technical detail, but just to come back on the point around the modeling, yeah, we are, we are continuing to reapplicant on that to address some of those outstanding concerns.

Speaker 1 1:19:01

Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Sell, I will welcome that if, while you're on the one line, can I ask you, in your expert opinion, how far do you think that you are of a resolution on these issues with the applicant?

Speaker 12 1:19:16

So the key remaining points really around the impact of some of the receiving water courses on the credible maximum water level, which a colleague, Sean, touched upon one of the pumping stations in the model. There's some uncertainty about some of the operating rules for that pumping station. And then there's another issue around climate change, so that they're three. They're the three issues,

essentially, and they should be fairly easy to resolve. They were just thinking some further clarity on that. We're also reviewing a model which looks at the impact of breach of the defenses on the development so the applicant submitted that to us, and we're currently in the process of resuming reviewing that. But that's more around residual risk to develop. On in the event of a defense failure.

Speaker 1 1:20:04

Thank you very much. Mr. South, it's very welcomed in we're showing to hear so thank you very much for that. Can I also invite Mr. Sheik? You would like to comment on this point for North

Speaker 5 1:20:17

Stephen District Council? Yes. Thank you, sir. It's a point that, again, we'll make in our local impact report, but it just refers back to the Springwell solar farm development that's under examination and a suggested amendment to the draft DTO for that examination, in which the examining authority has suggested that panels are removed from flood zone three and so on the basis of the there not being an operational need or justification. So we'll put more detail in our local impact report, but we just perhaps invite the opponent to address that once they've seen our specific point on that matter.

Speaker 1 1:20:56

Okay, that's not it. Very much. Thank you very much. Mr. Shake. Is there anyone else that would like to comment on as any point and the item five, that's water, environment and flood risk? Please raise your hand if you do. I don't see any hands raised, so I would then move us on to item six, access and traffic.

Speaker 2 1:21:31

So just very quickly, again, we just need to slightly rejig in the room, but we can do that while she talk, and we'll be off camera. I won't take us home, but just in case you're about to dive into an immediate question to us until two minutes.

Speaker 1 1:21:42

Okay, that's fine. Yes, thank you. If you're not prepared for the questions, then please do let me know, and I am happy to re reach my question. So we are now moving on to item six. Then that's access and traffic. The purpose of this item is to examine issues linked with the effects of proposed development on traffic and transport, with a particular focus on proposed vehicle access routes and impacts on non motorized users. Agenda published and dispersion of this hearing, again, goes through the list of the key documents. I do not propose to go through this in detail, but can I just ask if anyone has any comments that I would like to make on that specific list?

1:22:37

Councilor Chapman,

Speaker 7 1:22:43

um earlier on, sorry, Councilor Chapman from South Kyne parish council earlier on in the discussion, waste was touched upon. And although the main access route is from the A 17, I'm just very concerned whether or not waste will be taken through our village. We've got, we're a small village. We have a really poor access road in the first place, and we have is a shortcut through the village between the A

17, and I think it's the A 16, and I just want to ensure that you know the route through the village will not be taken.

Speaker 1 1:23:35

Thank you very much. Councilor Chapman, although that is linked to transport but that's not an issue that I was proposing, that I would focus particularly on today, and therefore I will understand if the applicant feel that they cannot provide any sort of reassurance on that. But can I just ask very quickly to the applicant if they would like to comment on this, or is this something that, if you would be addressed via a response to council Chapman's future written representations on this specific issue, which I would urge you to do cost of Chapman and actually raise that Question in writing as well, either way. So if I could just ask the applicant how they would like to proceed on that specific point.

Speaker 2 1:24:29

Thank you, sir. I'll nag for the applicant, I think the latter would be our preference, please. So if we could invite councilor Chapman to make that submission as a recent representation, and we'll respond to that at the appropriate deadline thereafter,

Speaker 1 1:24:42

yes that I accept that councilor Chapman, if I could ask you then to submit that question in writing into the examination, and then the applicant will surely provide you with an answer to that specific point, if there are no further questions on. On the list of documents that I have submitted in advance in terms of items six, and I propose we continue. I don't see any hands raised, so I don't think that we have any further questions on that specific issue. So I would like to start by asking the applicant to provide an overview then of Yes, chapter nine, access and traffic that is ABP 060, particularly focusing on best time conditions and how these were established, and also significant effects that have been identified in how these have been dealt with via mitigation, or how the applicant has established that there is no need for mitigation.

Speaker 2 1:25:51

Thank you, Sir I'll mark for the applicant service, but I'll introduce Mr. Ian cruncher, who is the author for that chapter, with us, and talk you through that information.

Speaker 1 1:26:02

Yes, that's fine. Thank you. Mr. Crenshaw, hello.

Speaker 13 1:26:06

I'm Ian Crenshaw. I'm technical director of transport and mobility planning at SFR consulting, and I'm speaking on behalf of the applicant. The assessment started with data collection to determine the baseline conditions. Baseline conditions for the assessment were based on the following data collection as reported in ES appendix 9.1, transport assessment, part one, a PP, 155, sections, 3.1, to 3.6 a series of site visits during the first half of 2023 to make initial observations of the highway network. This informs scoping and early route assessment work geometric orders of the local highway network, including vehicle, pedestrian and cycle network during July 2023, seven day automatic traffic count surveys in July 2023, summarized in table 3.17 day automatic traffic count survey of ask Garvey Road

in February 20, 24/7 day automatic traffic count survey on Carter plot Road in January 2025, a review of traffic count data on the A 17 from multiple sources, including the Department for Transport, DFT, 2021, Lincolnshire county council, LCC, 2021, and heckington fence solar farm. ATC, 2022, collision history within the study area, from crash map.co.uk, period 2019 to 2023, and a seven day occupancy survey of the A 17 lay by to the south west of asgharve, a summary of the assessment NAS chapter nine, accessing traffic a PP 060 section nine, point 10 identifies the effects of the proposed development and the mitigation proposed to avoid or reduce adverse effects. As follows, the document reviews the existing highways and traffic conditions and predicts future traffic levels during construction and operation of the proposed development. This review highlights that the A 17 is the principal and busiest road in the vicinity of the proposed development with existing traffic flows on average of approximately 18,000 vehicles a day, of which circa 16% are heavy goods vehicles. It's estimated that traffic on the A 17 will grow to 19,000 vehicles per day, 20 by 2028, it describes other local roads as being predominantly rural and unclassified, with considerably lower traffic use, pedestrian, cyclists and equestrians on local roads are considered as vulnerable and sensitive receptors in the assessment construction access to the proposed development is identified as being primarily from The a 17 by the dedicated bespoke access road with a left in, left out arrangement. The level of construction traffic generated by the proposed development is estimated to be an additional 160 68 vehicles annual average daily traffic, including 36 hdb's on the A 70 on the A 17 each day. Once the bespoke access rate is in place, this equates to a naught point 9% increase compared to the baseline, which is significantly below Yuma guidance recommended 30% threshold for significance, additional construction vehicles accessing the cable Route Corridor compounds in better fence substation on minor rural roads in the study area, including carsport Road and great hell drove are very low in absolute percentage terms, traffic levels are below the unit guidance recommended 30% change threshold for significance The Highway Authority, LC. See in the relevant representation, 002, states. The methodology for the assessment was agreed at pre application discussions with the applicant. Volumes of traffic estimated for construction period seem reasonable, and it's agreed that there would not be a capacity issue on the local highway network resulting from these proposals. I'm just going to pause there, sir, before I go into my summary of the effects, just to check whether you want any clarification on anything.

Speaker 1 1:30:33

No, that's that's that is understood so far. Mr. Crenshaw, so please do continue.

Speaker 13 1:30:43

Okay, yes, chapter nine, access and traffic. Section nine, point 10 summarizes the access and traffic effects of the proposed development as follows, during construction has been negligible and not significant. Operational phase effects related to on site employment, estimated up to six staff at any time. The traffic impact that is concluded negligible, negligible effects in relation to equipment replacement, and it's concluded that's not significant, and residual and cumulative effects are concluded is not significant, the cumulative assessment in Section nine, point 9.3, of the transport assessment includes consideration of heckington fen en 010123, development, which also relies on the A 17 insane locality for construction access both the proposed development and heckington fen are estimated to generate negligible change in traffic in relation to background traffic when taken in aggregate for the situation that the construction periods overlap, therefore there's no likely effects

resulting from the cumulative impacts by schemes, and no further assessment is required. Detailed explanation.

1:32:02

Sorry, please continue.

Speaker 13 1:32:06

Okay. Detailed explanation of the potential cumulative effects is in Appendix J of the transport assessment and identifies there are no overlaps in terms of study error or construction period that lightens the results in significant effects and no further assessment was required. The ES chapter outlines the proposed monitoring and embedded mitigation measures, which includes construction access to the site from the A 17 with a left in, left out only arrangements, construction traffic will be managed and monitored through detailed construction traffic management plan and delivery management plan to be agreed with LCC, Boston Borough Council and North Kesterman District Council, this must be substantially in accordance with the ICT, MP, A, P, P, 159, and a secure pursuance of requirement 13, a schedule two of the draft DCO a, PP, 038, requirement 13 states that the ctmp must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. Such approval to be in consultation with the relevant Highway Authority. This allows for detailed measures to ensure construction traffic uses the prescribed routes, a detailed abnormal loads DMP will confirm detailed abnormal indivisible load specifications, movement times and vehicle configurations. This will be subject to agreement with the relevant Highway Authority and police through the electronic service delivery for abnormal loads. System, a construction staff travel plan, based on the outline construction staff travel plan will minimize effects of construction staff travel to and from the site and maximize the use of collective collective transport, particularly mini busses. This construction staff travel plan, delivery management plan and abnormal load delivery management plan will form part of the detailed ctmp, the ES chapter concludes that there are no significant residual, cumulative effects in relation to excessive travel.

Speaker 1 1:34:18

Thank you very much for that explanation. Mr. Croshaw, now I would like us to explore, in a little bit more detailed, proposed connection from the A 17 to the site, the bespoke and proposed access as you may know from my unaccompanied site inspection, I have actually visited that, that specific point, and having visited it, I wanted to ask how the applicant. Patient has assessed what works need to be done to the junction between the proposed access, access with a 17, the bespoke road in the 17, taking into consideration the existing layout of the lay by. Does that make sense? Mr. Croshaw, sorry, I'm not really sure that I was very clear with my question. If you would like me to rephrase Duncan,

Speaker 13 1:35:32

I think I understand the question. So geometric audit of the of the lay by was undertaken, and we also undertook a usage survey to identify how it's used by existing vehicles. There's a mixture of heavies and light vehicles currently use the lay by. We came to the conclusion, following analysis of that survey, that in order for it to function properly as the primary access for this site, it needs to be suspended from general use through a temporary, temporary stopping up order for general traffic so that it could be used specifically for site traffic. As I mentioned before, the bespoke access road will have a left in, left

out arrangement, which is similar to how the lay by is currently used by existing traffic, very deliberately. The design of the bespoke access road doesn't look to change that layout because it's considered a layout, a safe layout that deals with relative, relatively significant volumes of traffic already in terms of visibility.

Speaker 1 1:36:49

That's, that's, that's clear. So two questions on that specific point. My first question is, in that case, where will the current use of delay by being displaced to have you had any conversations, or have you done any work in terms of the impact of that? Can you explain the point further?

Speaker 13 1:37:10

Please, yes. In the transport assessment, a, PP, 155, there is a section where we outline the alternative lay by locations their distance from the lay by that we're seeking to close and their capacity. And it identifies that there are alternative locations where that traffic can be displaced. As a mitigation measure, we have identified that signage warning drivers of the distance to the next lay by should be introduced as a mitigation measure to allow them to make a judgment as to where they start.

Speaker 1 1:37:56

And I am assuming that in making those proposals, some sort of conversation with either national highways or the local highways authority, has happened to agree that

Speaker 13 1:38:16

yeah in front sure from the For the applicant? Yes, it was brought up in meetings with Lincolnshire county council. They didn't raise any concerns regarding the use of those like lines. I didn't suggest any alternative.

Speaker 1 1:38:36

Okay? I will, I will go to Lincolnshire County Council under this item, just for comments on that specific issue. But thank you for clarifying from your perspective that that specific point, my other part, my other question in relation to what you have just highlighted, is to do with how the applicant has factored in or calculate the need for the acceleration of HGVs with the space that is available on the lay by I am particularly curious to know how that assessment has been carried out, particularly considering that that specific stretch of the A 17 has one line of traffic in either direction, and therefore what calculation has been done by the applicant in terms of the space that is needed for HEV vehicles to the accelerate in order to be able to turn into the bespoke road of the A 17. My question is for the applicant.

Speaker 13 1:40:01

Ian cruncher, on behalf of the applicant, we haven't done a specific deceleration length calculation. The fundamental principle is that it's an existing lay by that's used for that purpose by HGVs, and there's no accident record that suggests that that's in any way unsafe. We have proposed as a measure, alongside using this a temporary reduction speed limit to 40 mph to assist the turning of vehicles during the construct during the construction period, and that's a complimentary measure to mitigate the intensification of traffic turning movements at this location,

Speaker 1 1:40:51

and that reduction to 40 miles per hour. Is it going to be applicable to just the stretch of road within the lay by, or actually, the A 17, isn't continuation of traffic from the lay by on the on the A 17, if I'm making myself clear,

1:41:14

yeah, it's, it's on the on The main carriage, right

Speaker 1 1:41:18

on the main carriageway. And I'm assuming that how is authority or national highways have also been made aware of this proposal.

Speaker 13 1:41:34

Yes, it's, I believe it's in the construction traffic management plan. A P, P,

Speaker 13 1:41:47

159, and find the exact

Speaker 1 1:41:53

that is okay. I I can move on from that specific point. Mr. Crumshaw, I don't need the actual reference. My question will then be, if, what sort of, if any, what sort of work has the applicant done, if any, to model the impacts of the reduction of speed on traffic, on da or on da 17

Speaker 13 1:42:22

in Ian contra on behalf of the applicant, no specific modeling on journey times, for example, has been undertaken as part of that. There is a it is relevant to note that there's an existing, fairly recent reduction in speed limit on the A 17, just beyond the site access. And it's an extension of that recent reduction in speed limit that we're proposing, not a particularly lengthy new speed limit on the A 17.

Speaker 1 1:42:55

Okay. Thank you very much for that. In terms of my initial point, in terms of how HEV vehicles, which I assume are going to be the type of vehicles that you're going to use in order to transport materials for the construction stage, at least, of development, my initial question in terms of the acceleration In the use of delay by if I am interpreting the information submitted to the examination on this, I believe that the bespoke road will have an access from the middle of the lay by with space for HV, for any vehicle To turn light, to turn left and access and go up the bespoke road, or turn right and go straight into the A 17, considering the location of that access point, has the applicant looked at how HEV vehicles will not be able to use the whole length of delay by as it stands at the moment, but actually just half of it, because obviously they'll have, they have half space that they have now in order to decelerate and then turn into the bespoke access. If I'm making myself clear, but perhaps I'm

Speaker 13 1:44:19

not. No, I understand the point. So with our usage surveys of the labor, we identified that there were up to six vehicles behind the lay by at once. Now with that number of vehicles, in order for vehicles to stop

and park up, with that arrangement, they wouldn't be able to use the whole length of the lay by for deceleration. The whole length of lay by wouldn't be available for that purpose, and we've not identified a specific safety issue with regards to the use of lay by,

Speaker 1 1:44:57

okay, that's acceptable. Thank you very much. Mr. Croshaw,

Speaker 1 1:45:09

one specific point that actually I just wanted to clarify very quickly with the applicant in terms of access to the whole extent of the proposed site. I'm thinking particularly in terms of the solar array area, it will all be done via that same bespoke growth and access point. Is that correct? There will be no other access points to the site proposed, at least for the construction. I'm talking about the construction phase, not operational phase

Speaker 13 1:45:40

for the for the most parts of the construction phase. That's true. It's noted in the ctmp that preliminary works, as outlined in the draft eco would be excluded from using the route and the bespoke access road, and could be carried out at the same time as construction of the bespoke access road, primarily because these preliminary uses generally generate light vehicle traffic in relatively low quantities.

Speaker 1 1:46:14

Thank you very much. One last specific point that I wanted to actually write is to it construction hours and access to vehicles. Obviously, I believe that it moment to propose development includes Monday to Friday access to the site from seven in the morning 7pm so that's 19 and Saturdays from eight to one. Can I just ask why those hours are being proposed, particularly access on Saturdays.

Speaker 2 1:47:02

So that's slightly beyond the sort of traffic chapter, so I think Mr. Contra was best place. I also don't want to give you what I suspect might be a sort of a general answer when I suspect we can do more detailed one if we follow that up in writing.

Speaker 1 1:47:17

Yes, that's that's fair enough. Sorry. That question came out of my review of the access documents and construction the camp as well, but that's fine. I accept that it's slightly off the topic, so that's fine. I will include that question as part of my written questions. Back to you, okay, I would like us now to move to public rights of way and impact of proposal on non authorized road users. So, Mr. Cronchoy, you have actually mentioned link how you have considered the impact of proposed development on non authorized road users. Could you just very clearly highlight your main conclusions on that in terms of impacts, particularly in terms of access to key assets via particularly interested via public rights of way?

Speaker 13 1:48:19

Ian Crenshaw on behalf of the applicant. So our baseline analysis in the s chapter nine, access and traffic a, PP, 066, identifies that there is no dedicated highway infrastructure on the A 17 for pedestrians and cyclists and the vicinity order limits. This reflects that there's little non motorized user activity on the

A 17, with none observed during site visits. Notwithstanding the absence of material non motorized user activity on the A 17, the development traffic impact on the A 17 is negligible. Therefore, even if the A 17 was used by non motorized users, there's no significant impact on severance, pedestrian delay, pedestrian immunity, fear and intimidation, or access accidents and safety, any non motorized user activity on the highway network in the vicinity of the site is likely to take place on lightly trafficked, unclassified rural roads or the prowl network. The assessment identified that the magnitude of change on traffic on unclassified roads negligible and not significant. Embedding mitigation in the form of the bespoke access road assures that the majority of construction traffic does not use the unclassified rural road network, as agreed with the planning inspector es scoping, the primary assessment of the proud network, public rights of way network, sorry is included in the socio economic chapter. And I invite my colleague, Ms rain to summarize that assessment.

1:49:53

Yes, that's fine. Thank you very much. Ms Wayne

Speaker 14 1:49:58

Susan rain, for the applicant. So. So yes, chapter 15, social economics, a PP 066, consider the effects of post development related traffic on local communities, potential impacts on non merchandise road users and impacts resulting from restricted access to recreation, including public rights of way and cycle routes. Baseline surveys are potentially affected public rights away, and including site walkovers and qualitative interviews with landowners identified low usage of public rights away. Network meeting was also held with Chairman of UOB and Eden parish council, who reported that walking north solo array area due to a well developed network footpaths, and that cycling is popular in the area. And there will be temporary closures, public rights way within the bespoke access corridor and cable Route Corridor during construction, resulting in short term, nine year adverse impacts to uses for these temporary clothes. These temporary closures, signs or posters will be installed on the relevant public rights of way, local walking groups, as well as relevant parish councils and district councils will also be notified about any temporary closures through the community liaison officer. The A 17 is generally not an attractive cycle or horse riding route due to existing traffic flows and speeds. It's therefore assumed that the majority of cycling and horse riding in the vicinity of DTO order limits is on low traffic, local routes. Low traffic, local roads. The construction phase access strategy requires the majority of development traffic to utilize the A 17 and bespoke access road to access the main solar area and cable come. Cable route compound one, thereby avoiding local roads, cable route. Compounds two, five and six are also accessed via private access roads, directly from the A 17. Therefore the only local roads that will be used to access construction sites are Carter plot road. Great Hale drove for access to the cable route. Compounds three and four, and Vicker drove and vicarage drove for access to thick fence substation, as set out in chapter nine, access and traffic a, pp 066, the construction traffic impact on these local roads is not significant, and construction traffic flows will therefore have no significant effect on when motorized road users amenity or safety. First step, Appendix, 9.3, outline construction traffic management plan. A, PP, 159, aims to minimize the impact of construction traffic on local roads through measures such as providing staff mini busses for travel to and from construction compounds, additionally, due to a phase construction schedule and construction compounds being placed along the route of cable Route Corridor, traffic impacts will be dispersed. Changes to traffic flows will therefore be negligible, meaning there'll be no perceptible change for non motorized road users. Finally, traffic

marshals will be responsible where necessary for managing interactions between site traffic and vulnerable road users passing the site where necessary marshals will stop site traffic to allow slow moving vulnerable users, such as equestrians, to pass before releasing traffic. And finally, a meeting was held with the Economic Development Manager of nkbc in June 2023 to discuss tourism, recreation. The three key tourist attractions are the heckington windmill, the heckington village show, and the Scotland vintage show combined with egg throwing championships. These shows take place in summer, usually in the last week in July, and are over two kilometers from the solar array area boundary. Most workers in construction traffic will be concentrated around the solar area, or not affect local roads south of the A 17, near heckington, where the two shows take place. There will that be national impact on construction traffic on these tourist attractions?

Speaker 1 1:53:58

Thank you very much for that. Mrs. Wayne, I have now shared one of the applicants documents that actually shows identified public rights of way within the area and how they are intersected by the proposed development. I'm particularly interested in the applicant's view in terms of accessibility and impact on local communities, particularly of those public rights of ways that are linking specific communities within the area. I am looking particularly at KK LT, forward slash four. Forward slash two. That is the one that I am highlighting now with my cursor here, and also KK, LT, point 6.1, both of those close to as Gabi and linking it to kerbula for considering the considering that these are. A key public right of way that link different communities. Has How has the applicant looked at the impact of the proposal, even if it is temporarily, and has the applicant look at any solutions or alternatives for the impact during that time, particularly during construction and while the proposed access will be in place. So

Speaker 2 1:55:40

bear with us for one moment. If you wouldn't mind, we're just we're just deliberating as to who's best place to give you this answer. So show us one moment.

Speaker 1 1:55:47

And can I just stress that it is always a possibility to defer these to written questions if the applicant feels that it's not in a position to reply at the moment.

Speaker 2 1:56:16

So we we might ask Mr. Turnbull to give you an initial answer from from the sort of planning perspective, we've also got Mr. Conjure and give you sort of an answer from how it was assessed in the technical perspective in the transport chapter, which played into the kind of wide associate element that Susan Miss rain just addressed. There's a bit of a combination answer possible, but we might just see how Mr. Turnbull's answer lines first for you, and perhaps it's something we could then follow up in writing afterwards if

Speaker 1 1:56:43

you'd like more. Yes, that's fine. Mr.

Speaker 15 1:56:45

Turnbull, thank you. Colin Turnbull, for the applicant. So we received a number of suggestions for public right of way, linkages, rest, creation of Miss creation pro W probably right away where there are existing missing links. I think you can tell from the map, in, in on the screen now that there are actually some, some sort of missing links, effectively, in certain locations in the pro W network. We received a number of suggestions on those from Lincolnshire County Council at the statutory consultation stage. We have described, I believe it's in the consultation reports, but I can follow up with confirmation of that. But we've, we've described the consideration of those points in our consultation report, or certainly in other documents as well. So we'll give you the references afterwards. But in In summary, we evaluated those suggestions, and we felt that for a long term but time limited development like this, which is for around 40 years of operation, it would not be merited to create permanent PR, W, in perpetuity on third party land, and that the so on the solar ray area, We are creating a permissive path the duration of the solar array. So that's the 40 years that permissive path is several kilometers long. It will provide a new link between UOB and the areas to the north east. So it links with public rights of way to South calm, very nearby. So we believe that will give you know that will go some way towards the overall point that I believe you're making, which is about linkages between communities.

Speaker 1 1:58:56

Thank you very much. Mr. Turnbull. I don't necessarily disagree with what you have said in terms of proportionality, and obviously I'm very mindful of that. However, I think that my question comes from, comes more from a point of view in terms of how that impact has been assessed and taken into consideration by the applicant for the different phases of the development and how the impact on local communities has been assessed, particularly in terms of public rights of way, which is the example, which is the issue that we are debating now, at the moment, during construction phase, the fact that that is temporary, then that is something that actually the applicant can then explain and take further as part of its overall assessment of the merits of the proposal. However, I'm still curious to understand better how the applicant has considered the. The effects of the proposed development on public rights of ways and accessibility for different communities during the construction stage. How limited that construction stage might be or not. Does that answer my Does that clarify my perspective on this specific issue? Mr.

Speaker 15 2:00:19

Turnbull? It certainly does. What I would propose is that we hand back to my colleagues in the room with with Ian Mac, because we have consideration of that in the socio economic chapter of the ES. So I'll hand back.

2:00:40

Okay. Thank you very much.

Speaker 2 2:00:43

This will be an underwhelming response in that context, other than to confirm that it has been captured within the socioec assessment chapter, which is chapter 15. But I'm reluctant to give any more substantive answer, because rather just check and confer that specifically with the office. We can give you the detailed response so I can, I can assure you that it has been but I don't want to miss close and so we'll, we'll respond in writing afterwards, if that's it.

Speaker 1 2:01:11

That's fine. That's fine from from my perspective as well. Mr. Mac, I think I must clarify that to go role of public rights of way in the way that it has been identified as an issue is actually included within traffic and transport from an accessibility point of view. So obviously, I do understand that the applicant has sort of divided its assessment terms of the issues in slightly different way. However, in terms of traffic and transport, we are looking at this specific issue, I the role of public rights of way from an accessibility point point of view, obviously, public rights of way will be looked at from a series of different angles, including visual and landscaping packed from users of public rights, of voice, so on and so forth. So I think it is important for us to have this distinction in our minds as we go through examination.

Speaker 2 2:02:15

Thank you, sir. Agree, and that's understood, and we'll, um, we'll clarify the position in our summary.

Speaker 1 2:02:22

But I understand that you would want to, you might not be prepared for that at the moment, and you will want to check that with the review of socio economic chapter. That is absolutely acceptable. That's fine, right? I would now invite other by piece to comment. Can I ask if any of the local authorities present today would like to comment on any of the points discussed now on item six? Mr. Sheik,

Speaker 5 2:03:02

thanks. For North Stephen District Council. So it's a point again we'll raise in our LIR in detail, but we obviously welcome the extent to which the proposed proposed routes might offer a circular route for those wanting to use the public right of way network. And a point raised on behalf of the council's public right of way officer is whether or not there might be opportunity to upgrade their status that they're stepping out part of the stepping out walks network, which is also a relevant point, not just for connectivity, but also for tourism impacts. So it's a point we'll raise, but it's a point that obviously we'd appreciate the applicant's consideration of, and we'll give some further thought as to what specific things we might look for, signage for for instance, as to what, how, how and whether that status could be achieved.

Speaker 1 2:03:50

And I am guessing, Mr. Sheik, that that will be also part of your local impact report assessment submission. Yes, that's correct, sir. Thank you very much. Miss Hall.

Speaker 4 2:04:04

Thank you, sir Stephanie Hall for Lincolnshire county council. So again, this is something we'll address in our local impact report. So just to give you the headline, we are there's a blend of paths where we're content with the closure. We understand that that's a sensible and necessary arrangement in order to facilitate the project. However, there are a couple where we will be objecting to the closure of the public rights of way without a diversion or other means. Um, so and particularly so that one of the ones that you'd highlighted earlier, kk, LT, slash four, slash two is one of the ones where we do objects, and I think it's probably going to be proportionate for the applicant to just wait to receive our LIR, where we have a table set out of the proposed closures that we object to in our rationale for why as against each

so I wouldn't propose necessarily to raise the details, but. Us by footpath in this forum, because it's going to be provided in writing in short order.

Speaker 1 2:05:06

That's fine. Thank you very much. Ms Hall for providing with those comments, I'm sure that the applicant will then review your suggestions as part of the local impact report and reply accordingly. Can I ask if anyone else would like to comment on this specific item? Please raise your hand.

Speaker 1 2:05:39

I don't see any further hands raised, so I don't propose to invite any other IPs to comment on specific points before I move us on from item six. I would just like to highlight to the applicant that obviously I am aware of relevant trip, 014, from the national highways, which expressed some comments in terms of access points and proposed construction routes, particularly along the strategic road network, which I am sure that the applicant will reply to in due course, so I will reserve any further questions once those comments have been addressed by the applicant. In addition to that, is, there anyone else that would like to make any further comments? One item six,

Speaker 1 2:06:51

I don't see any hands raised, therefore, I propose that we move on to item seven, which is review of the issues and actions arising. So as you have noted, I have asked the applicant to take notes of the actions that have that have been requested today as well. Is discussed by all of us as well. I have been taking notes as well. This will then be issued by the exci after being reviewed. Can I ask if the applicant feels that it might be beneficial for us to go through these actions now, or should, or that won't be beneficial, because those are clear enough for the applicant at this point in time, I

Speaker 2 2:07:34

think somewhere between both of those. So if you win, we've got a sort of a combined note between the people in the room, which I think it would just benefit from us internally, conferring on first and then emailing the case officer on afterwards. I'm confident that we've captured all of the the actions that were directed but, but know that you look at them and think we've, we've missed something, then you will, you will clarify that, but hopefully that won't

Speaker 1 2:07:57

be required. Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Mac that's, that's, that's fine, as as I have mentioned, it is up to the exit to actually issue those, those actions, so I'll definitely be reviewing them. But then, if you could actually, amongst yourselves, do a compiled list from your perspective, particularly, considering that most of the issues are for most of the questions are for the applicant to take forward the actions that will be useful. And I will then review those, and we'll publish them as soon as practicable after that review and after today's hearing. So I will then conclude that concludes item seven. Then I will move us on to Item eight, which is any other business. So I have not been notified of any other matters that people would like they would like to raise today. But can I just ask very quickly if anyone has any matters that they would like to raise under any other matters aobi? Councilor Chapman,

Speaker 7 2:09:06

I think mine's more of a question. So biodiversity, will that be covered somewhere else? Or what do you decide by diversity?

Speaker 1 2:09:16

So biodiversity is one of the topics that has been identified as one of the key or one of the principal issues that we will be looking at during the examination. I am not in a position at this point in time to actually confirm if a hearing is going to be held on that specific issue or not. That will become clear with as the examination progresses. However, that issue will be certainly addressed via written questions. So if there are any specific issues that you have or would like to raise and. And the biodiversity and the impacts of development on biodiversity, I urge you to do those and submit those to us in written form.

2:10:10

Okay, that's lovely. Thank you.

Speaker 1 2:10:11

Thank you very much. Can I ask if anyone else would like to raise any of the matters? Yes, I have another hand raised, Mr.

2:10:24

Haley. Oh, hi there. Haley James, on behalf of his

2:10:30

directing apologies,

Speaker 16 2:10:32

Miss Haley, sorry. Okay, that's fine. It's just similar to councilor Chapman. Obviously we haven't covered heritage or archeology as a particular topic. And what I just wanted to note for the session is that we do have a session upcoming with the applicant in regards to the statement of common ground this week, but we do have some substantial issues that we would like to discuss with the applicant, but we hope that we can get to a point of agreement, at least make a way towards that other meeting on Friday.

Speaker 1 2:11:06

Thank you very much for raising that specific question. So I am afraid that the same answer that I just gave to council Chapman applies to this specific issue as well. We are not in a position to confirm at the moment what sort of hearings we will be having or not. That depends on if I feel that issues are better explored in a forum like this, or if they are actually better addressed via written representations. However, however, what I would say as well is that we do have another week of hearings programmed and anticipated for week commencing the 10th of November, and I will be publishing agendas and giving notification of those in due course. So please do bear that in mind as well, also. Finally, I just wanted to highlight that I believe that similar concerns on the topic of archeology and heritage have been raised earlier on today. So the fact that more than one IP has concerns on that specific topic has been registered with

2:12:29

me. Perfect. Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

Speaker 1 2:12:33

Can I ask if there is anyone else that would like to raise any other points and the item eight? AOB,

Speaker 1 2:12:48

I don't see any hands raised, so I'll move us on to item nine, then closure of the hearing. I would like to thank you all for contributing so fully and usefully for this meeting, and I have found this very helpful. So thank you very well. Thank you everyone for contributing so so well. May I remind you that both notes and a digital recording of the proceedings today will be made available as soon as practicable on the project page of the national infrastructure website? May I also remind you that I'll be publishing the final timetable in the exercise, first written questions as soon as practical after this hearing, and this is likely to be next week, and that I am expecting post hearing submissions, including written summaries of any oral submissions or representations made today by deadline one Tuesday the seventh of October 2025 I am also expecting local impact reports to be submitted by local authorities and any requests to be heard at future open floor hearings by the same deadline that will be deadline one. In addition to this, I would like to confirm that obviously, because I am closing this issue specific hearing one now there will be no need for us to use the time that was reserved for the continuation of ish one tomorrow. So I can confirm that. So it is now 1559, and this issue specific hearing for beaten for beacon fan energy Park project is now closed. Thank you very much.