

# AUDIO\_BEACON\_FEN\_ISH2\_S01\_121125

Wed, Nov 12, 2025 2:51PM • 1:24:56

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Beacon Fan Energy Park, battery energy storage, landscape and visual effects, Historic Environment, ecological matters, development consent, planning inspectorate, hybrid event, live streaming, technical submissions, grid connection, solar generation, battery capacity, alternative routes, subordinate development.

## SPEAKERS

Speaker 7, Speaker 4, Speaker 10, Speaker 6, Speaker 11, Speaker 9, Speaker 5, Speaker 1, Speaker 3, Speaker 2, Speaker 8

00:06

It is now 10 o'clock, and it's time for this hearing to begin. I would like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing for the beacon fan energy Park Project, an application made by Beacon fan energy Park Ltd, who will be referring to as the applicant. Can I just confirm that everyone can hear me clearly, particularly those in the back. Yes. Thank you very much. Can I also confirm if those that are joining us online can hear me clearly as well? Please. If someone could just give me some indication that online is just heard clearly online, so I will continue. Can I also confirm with production 78 that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced? Yes. Thank you very much for those watching the live stream. Can I also advise that, should we at any point to join proceedings this morning, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. As a result, at the point at which we recommend the meeting will start the live stream, we will restart live stream. You'll need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted stream. Please note this. This should we need to adjourn so join. I would like to welcome you all to this issue specific, hearing two on general matters and the best and the landscape and visual Historic Environment and ecological matters. These, these are linked in this will refer to the order granting clear development consent for the beacon fan mg Park project. My name is Andre Pinto, and I am a charter town planner employed by the planning inspectorate, and I have been appointed by Secretary of State for housing, communities and local government as a single examining inspector to examine this application, I'll be reporting to the Secretary of State for energy security net zero with the recommendation as to whether development consent order should be made. You also hear me being referred to as the examining authority. The case manager for this project is Noel margom. Noel is being supported today by Simon raywood. If you have any queries about this examination process or the technology we're using for virtual events, they should be your first point of contact. The contact details can be found at the top of any letter you have received from us or the project page of the national infrastructure website, you have also been welcomed today. If you joined us online by Stephen Parker, I will now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person, can everyone please set all the devices and phones to silent the closest facilities are outside this room, just to the right, and there are no fire evacuation tests planned for today. Should the fire

alarm sound, please make your way to the nearest fire exit door using the fire doors marked in this room and head outside fire evacuation sampling point is to the front of the building in the car park. Today is a hybrid event, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue, and some of you are joining us virtually, using Microsoft Teams for those people observing and participating through teams. Can't you? Please all make sure that you stay muted unless you are speaking. If you are participating virtually and you wish to speak at relevant point proceedings, please use your hand up function. Please be patient, as we may not get you immediately, but we'll invite you to speak at an appropriate time. We will make sure that however you decide to attend today, you'll be given a fair opportunity to participate. Any questions so far on what I have just highlighted

04:06

no questions. I don't see any hands raised in the room or online, so I assume that there are no questions. In addition to the live stream, a recording of today's hearing will be made available on the beacon fan energy Park section or the national infrastructure planning website. As soon as practicable after the meeting has finished, with this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly, stating your name and who you are representing each time before you speak. If you don't want your image to be recorded, can you can switch off your camera, because the digital recordings that we make are retained and published. They form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the general protection the general data protection regulations, apply, all in the rarest of circumstances, might we ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of us would prefer to keep private or confidential, therefore, to. What do you need to edit the digital recordings? Please try your best not to add information to the public records that you would wish to be kept private or is confidential. If you feel that personal information is necessary, please provide this in a written document that we can redact before publication. The planning specters practice is to retain and published recordings for a period of five years from Secretary of State's decision, a link to the planning inspector's privacy notice was provided in the rule six letter. I assume that everybody here today has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how your personal data is handled in accordance with principles set in our data protection laws. Please speak to the case team if you have any queries on the above. This meeting will follow the agenda that was published on the beacon fan energy Park information page on the third of November 2025 it would be helpful if you have a copy of this in front of you. However, I will go through, in summary, the items that I'm proposing that we cover on today's agenda. So item one will be a welcome introduction, emergence for the hearing. Item two, purpose of the issue, specific hearing. Item three, the battery, energy storage system pass. Item four, landscaping, visual. Item five, Historic Environment. Item six, biodiversity and ecology. Item seven, review of issues and actions arising. Item eight, any other business in? Item nine, closure of hearing. Does anybody have any comments to make on the agenda proposed for today? Please raise your hands online if you have any comments. I don't see any hands raised online or in the room, so I assume that no one has any comments to make. I will aim to finish the hearing today by 5pm taking a lunch break around one o'clock and have smaller comfort breaks during the morning and afternoon sessions, please remember to turn off your cameras and microphones during those breaks. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to. But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or require time to get information requested, then please, can you just indicate

that you need to respond in writing, and I will provide you with a date for best when to best submit your responses, although it is my aim to finish today, as I said, and cover all matters please, please note that that might not be possible, and therefore matters might be referred to written questions. Does anyone have any questions on what I have just set out, no questions online either. Please raise your hand if you do. I don't see any hands raised in the room or online, so I assume that no one has any queries. So I'll move us on to introductions. So I am going to ask now those of you who are participating today to introduce yourselves when I state your organization name, could you please introduce yourself, stating your name and who you are representing in which agenda item you wish to speak on. If you are not representing an organization, please confirm your name, summarize your interest in the application, and also confirm the agenda item upon which you wish to speak. And could you also confirm to me how you wish to be addressed. Can I please start with the applicant?

08:48

Good morning, Sir Ian mark from Herbert, Smith, reels, Kramer LLP, the solicitors for the applicant. So as with yesterday, I'll introduce the other members of the project team who we expect will have a role to play in this morning's agenda, certainly in relation to the best part. And then when we move on to other elements, it might be we have to do some rejigging to the team. So I'll introduce those additional members, then, sir. So to my right is Mr. Leon Kuller, who's also from Herbert Smith, three hills, Cramer, LLP, who are the solicitors for the applicant. Hopefully you've got his name, but let me know, if not, sir. To my left is Mr. Si Gillett, who's a director from humbeet Limited, who are a technical advisor to the applicant. So that's si Gillett. To his left is Mr. James Hartley bond who is the project development director for the applicant. And to his left is Mr. Colin Turnbull, who is a director at DWD, who the planning consultants to the applicant.

09:48

That's all, sir, that's all for now. Thank you very much.

09:59

But no can. I ask the local authorities that are with us today to introduce themselves as well. I will start with North cristifen District Council.

10:11

Please Good morning. I appear for North Coast even District Council. My name is Constanza Bell. I'm a barrister at King's chambers constructed by legal services. Sitting To my immediate right is Miss Sylvia bland. N sit planning consultant at North Coast Stephen District Council, and sitting next to her is Mr. Nick Feltham, who is Assistant development manager. Have I got that job title correct? Development Manager, Mr. Felton, who's a development manager, thank you. And there'll be others. There are others who sit behind me, but I'll introduce them at the appropriate time. Thank you.

10:58

Apologies, Mr. Bell, could you just confirm to me the last time again of your colleague,

11:05

yes, and Mr. Feltham.

11:07

Mr. Feltham, thank you. Now, can I move us on to Lincolnshire county council? Please Good

11:18

morning, sir. My name is Stephanie Hall, H, A double L, and council instructed by legal services Lincolnshire for Lincolnshire county council. To my immediate left is Mr. Dan Moss, who is the area manager from Lincolnshire fire and rescue services. And to my immediate right is Mrs. Foster, who is the infrastructure manager at Lincolnshire County Council. We do have others for other agenda items. Mr. Moss is here for Item three, but as a team, we intend to speak to items 345, and six, and the personnel will change at the table, and I'll introduce them as we go. Okay.

11:58

Thank you very much for that, and I believe that we also have representative from South East Lincolnshire Council partnership, but representing Boston Borough Council, could ask you to introduce yourself please.

12:12

Good morning, sir Gerald Sullivan, representing Boston Borough Council, we would like to speak on items four and six.

12:28

Okay,

12:37

and now can I ask? I'm going to move on to parish councils. I believe that we have councilor Chapman, South Kine parish council.

12:50

Good morning. Yes. My name is Carol Chapman, representing South Kine parish council, and I'd like to speak on Item four, please.

13:01

Thank you very much.

13:08

And now I have also Mr. Paul Locke, good morning. Oh, there you are. You are with us in the room. Thank you very much. Mr. Locke, could you please confirm to me if you are representing any organization in what organization you're representing? Just one moment while we bring a microphone for you to introduce yourself. Good morning. Miss lock if you could then confirm if you're representing any organization, what organization or representing

13:46

please Good morning. I'm here on behalf of the residents of Boston rural community as a Lincolnshire county council councilor. Thank

14:02

you very much. General, much, and welcome, Mr. Locke, is there anyone that I have not called that intends to speak today that is joining us in the room? Please raise your hand if I have not called you and you are intended to speak today. I don't see any hands raised. Can I ask if there is anyone joining us online that intends to speak today, and I have not called your name yet or asked you to introduce yourself. Please raise your hand digitally. Mr. Mountain,

14:37

yeah. Matthew mountain, representing Icj Mountain farms and Leslie and Patricia mountain, my parents, I hope to speak briefly at Agenda Item three and agenda item six.

14:53

Thank you very much. Mr. Mountain is there? Anyone else joining us online that wishes to speak today that I have not asked to introduce themselves? Please raise your hand digitally, if you can.

15:16

I don't see any hands raised, so I assume that I have called all of those joining us today that wish to speak. So can I ask before I move us on to item two, which is the purpose of this issue specific hearing. If anyone has any questions on item one before we move on in the room or online, please raise your hand. No. I don't see any hands raised, so I assume that no one has any questions. Now, may I propose before we move on to before item two, can I propose that we take a quick recess, if everyone is okay with that, for say, five minutes having some technical difficulties this morning, and I just want to make sure that everything is ready. For the next item, please. If that's okay, if that is okay with everyone in the room, I don't see anyone objecting. If you have any problem with that, please raise your hand. No in this room, if anyone has an issue with that online, please raise your hand as well. I don't see anyone that has a problem with that online. So I'm going to mention then this hearing for five minutes while this with some technical difficulties. Thank you.

21:45

And hello. Good morning again. I think that our short break has passed, and the technical problems that I was having have been resolved. So thank you very much for bearing with us. Thank you for that I would before the break we finished item one. So I'm going to move us forward to the next item on the agenda, which is item two. Purpose of the issue, specific hearing. The main purpose of this issue specific hearing is to undertake the examination of environmental matters in relation to general matters, namely, the battery energy storage system, landscape and visual effects, the Historic Environment and matters linked to biodiversity and ecology. Today's hearing will be a structured discussion led by the examining authority. Please be assured that I am familiar with what you have already submitted so you don't have to repeat in length anything that you have already put forward to mean in writing, submissions carry equal weight regardless of the format in which they are put forward. If you refer to any documents this morning, it would be helpful if you could give the correct examination reference number. Please do try to avoid using any acronyms as people who might be watching us might not be

as familiar with those terms, as you are due to the short amount of time between deadline three submissions and publication of the agenda of today, for today's hearing, the published agenda did not include submissions married at deadline three, however, how? However, all efforts have been made to review those relevant submissions before before this deadline, are there any comments that anyone would like to make on item two of the agenda? No. Can I also check that the applicant is happy to take notes of the actions discussed today and circulate those shortly after we close the hearing? Yes. And can I also remind you all that we are expecting submissions, written submissions, of your oral submissions today, by the next deadline, which will be deadline for and this should include any responses to questions posed or allowed by DXA. I'll then move us on to Item three, then the battery energy storage system. So the purpose of this item is to examine the applicant's approach to the battery energy storage system, its scale purpose, and how it will be utilized as part of proposed development. This discussion will be very much focused on the excess procedural decision that's PD 010, and the applicant's response, which is rep 2040, a list of key written submissions that will inform our questions on this item has been included in the agenda published. Instead of going through this list in detail, can I ask if anyone has any comments they would like to make on the list included in the agenda. Please raise your hands if you do. Can I also check if anyone has any comments online that you would like to make? Raise your hands please. I can't see any hands raised by those joining us online, so I assume that no one has any comments to make on. To that list. So I will start with my questions. And my first question is for the applicant, and I would like to build on the applicant's response to XQ one in the exercise rule 17 request that was mentioned before in relation to the battery, energy storage system. And in doing so dx, the DX, I would like to acknowledge, first of all, the response that we have received to our rule 17 questions, both from the applicant, but also from national grid, and particularly National Grid, stating that they are generally satisfied with the arbitrage approach described in that better the battery energy storage system and its response to pricing signals is likely to benefit network and may reduce constraints. So we do acknowledge receipt of that response. However, if I may, I would also like to revisit the applicant's response to ex Q, 1n, E, D, 1.3 and that is in document rep 2040, this question relates to the applicant specification for 600 megawatt battery, energy storage system, and why 600 megawatts is an appropriate level for the for the proposed development, the applicant refers the xi back to rep 1030 as its response. And if we go back to rep 1030 which is written summary of your submissions from issue specific hearing one and responses to action points, the applicant includes in its response to this question that a 600 megawatts best battery energy storage system is needed to maximize the use of the connection, and therefore designed a scheme that is importing and exporting to a maximum of 600 megawatts. And my question is as follows. So at a glance, if we consider the responses submitted previously by the applicant, it seems that the justification for why the scheme should be producing close to 600 megawatts of solar energy is not justification used by the best because, obviously, there is a 200 shortfall, megawatt shortfall, between the maximum capacity production anticipated by the spec, by the applicant, and the capacity of the base. Can the applicant please provide further clarity on that point and why when designing the scheme, your limits and your aim in terms of what informed the capacity of the battery, energy source storage system was clearly the connection To the substation, rather than the panel, solar panel production.

28:22

Thank you, sir. I'll just pass across to Mr. Sy Gillett, who will look to answer these questions in the first instance, please, sir.

28:28

Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Mac

28:33

Good morning, sir. Sy Gillett, for the applicant. Point where I would like to start, if I may, sir, is around clarification on the term capacity, 600 megawatt rating and the 400 megawatt rating of the solar I'd like to provide some additional information which provides context to those different numbers and justifies why the batteries is sized the way that it is in our rep, 1030, action, seven, response, we confirmed that the energy generated by the solar scheme as proposed will very likely regularly fill the battery system as proposed at the size that it is proposed, and that is because the battery system stores energy at a particular rate and has a particular capacity for that energy storage. If I can be tweezer and use an analogy, the battery itself, the physical size and shape of the battery is. Like a bathtub the 600 megawatts or the 400 megawatts is effectively a rating of how quickly that bathtub can be filled or how quickly that bathtub can be emptied. And as we clarified in our rep, 1030, response, 90 minutes of full generation from the solar scheme, 60

30:25

minutes, if I remember correctly, correct sir.

30:29

So in that regard, the size, the physical dimensions of the battery, as proposed, we believe, is proportionate to the size of the solar scheme and the power capacity. That's the megawatt capacity, sir, is merely a if you like, an electronics characteristic which which allows the battery to export more quickly than it could import, as an example from from the solar it's important to note that The the physical effects of that kind of additional capability, there's, there are no, I should say there are no different physical effects, no significant physical effects, different between a best which can export at 400 versus a best which can export at 600 megawatts.

31:38

Thank you very much for that information. Mr. Gillette, I would like to drill a little bit further into the detail of that last point, which I think it's crucial here. So when you say that there are no additional significant effects between the 600 megawatts in a smaller base unit, could you explain the examination to the examination a little bit further on, what you're thinking is behind that and how you justify that, please.

32:09

Certainly so psycho look for the applicant. The best is proposed,

32:18

puts forward a number of battery containers of size and dimension within an area of land, and those containers are principally where the energy is is stored and the



32:44

uh, the export capacity, the power capacity of the of the battery is, has, has a, if you like, a kind of a number of physical attributes to it, one of those being sized the connection within the National Grid land or the national grid infrastructure, the cables that join the battery site to that, that infrastructure and those bits do not, do not change. Effectively, they're in variance to 400 or 600 megawatts from a planning sense, a smaller megawatt s may likely require a lower number of inverters. That is a small, relatively small part of the battery infrastructure, and we have in any rate sir, assess the effect of of the number of inverters required to support 600 megawatts And and that assessment is within the the ES so

34:04

thank you very much for that. Mr. Gillette, that sort of follows that links with my next question, which was, what other alternatives besides the 600 megawatt battery, energy storage system, did the applicant consider? And where is that evidence submitted into an examination by the applicant?

34:30

So yeah, mark for the applicant. Just to give Mr. Gillette time to clarify, can I just double check the focus of the question is on the alternatives, in terms of the megawatt capacity of the best, rather than the kind of physical location of the best? Yes,

34:43

that's correct. Yeah, thank you. I think that in terms of location, I think that we covered that on the first hearing, so I think that that issue has been examined. It's to do with capacity. Thank you. Thank

34:59

you. So slightly. The applicant. So our rep 1030 describes the need for flexibility in the UK's future energy system, as set out in government policy and the Clean Power 2030 action plan. Our response to your question, 1.9 which we made in rep 2040 reiterates the strong UK policy support in place for flexible assets, including those which are co located with solar schemes, and our response to one point 10 in that same rep 2040 explains how we've taken an approach to define the characteristics of the best from a planning and environmental effects basis. And therefore what the applicant has done, the approach the applicant has taken, is to seek to bring forward a scheme which is able to deliver a significant benefit from the available land and from the available grid connection within those parameters as defined for the best for The best area.

36:20

Thank you for that, Mr. Gillette, and thank you for that response. However, what I'm still not hearing is a clear response from the applicant in terms of what different type and what different what different capacity of this the applicant has considered as part of an alternative, if any, it's I understand the response that you have given us in terms of alternatives and how technical components of the best have been considered. However, that's still not an answer to my question.

37:01



Sorry, sorry, apologies for this. I was trying to set some scene. Sure. Thank you. Answer that piece. So the proposal for 600 megawatts is proposed to match the capacity of the grid. Because, firstly, a larger capacity could not be accommodated by the grid. I'm talking about the megawatt capacity of the battery. A larger megawatt capacity of the grid could not be accommodated by the grid, and therefore it would not be sensible to propose a larger battery in terms of its megawatt capacity. Similarly, in considering a smaller battery in relation to the megawatt capacity only any such smaller Bess would not deliver the same level of flexibility to the grid in support of the operation of that main solar scheme than a 600 megawatt Bess would. And given the previous points I've made that the environmental effects of a 600 versus a 400 megawatt Bess are very, very similar. It makes little sense to artificially constrain the power capacity of the best to a lower number when there are no additional or very slight additional effects of that increase.

38:51

Thank you for that, Mr. Gillies, so I understand by your response clearly why the 600 megawatts was, for all intents and purpose, distilling of what you could consider. I accept that, however, my question is, did you consider any other capacity besides the ceiling or not?

39:17

So cycle it for the applicant, we did not consider a lower capacity for the reasons I've given.

39:23

Thank you. That's that's I just wanted to establish that, that there were no further alternatives considered. Besides that, I accepted you have a justification for that reasoning, but I just wanted to establish that so no further alternatives or considered. That's fine. Thank you very much. I would now invite the host local authorities to comment on the applicant's approach to the battery energy storage system. We have received several representations on this issue. And first of all, I would like to invite Lincolnshire county council. Please, Stephanie

39:54

Hall, Lincolnshire county council, so thank you. We've obviously received quite a bit of technical evidence. It's for Mr. Get it there. So I don't have a grid expert on my team, and certainly not in the room, so I'm quite limited as to how I can respond to that today, obviously we'll take this away and we'll consider it. I think our headline coming in to this hearing today, sir was that what we'd seen in writing from the applicant was was sort of informative, but didn't actually answer the core question that we had, which was in line with the guidance as to the scope of associated development, whether it meant that obviously there are benefits to having a larger best. And it may be that you know, larger is better, in a general sense for this, but that's not the answer to the question which is whether you sir, and it is for the Secretary of State to decide on a case by case basis whether those that guidance is satisfied, and I think we're still lacking in a clear answer to that particular part of the guidance.

40:55

Thank you. Thank you very much. Miss Hall. So for the record, could you please explain a little bit further what Lincoln's position is in relation to the associated development and how they believe that this matter should be considered? But Secretary of State,

41:13

so at the moment, we don't think we've got sufficient evidence to conclude with any degree of clarity that the proposed best in the scale proposed is subordinate to the the operation of the solar Generating Station. We obviously understand it's connected. We understand that there's a functional relationship. We understand the benefits of all of that. And that would be true for any co located best, there are benefits associated with that, and there is guidance supporting that as a matter of principle. However, there is then some tension, we say, between the scale of the best proposed and the definition of associated development as set out in the Secretary of State's guidance on this, particularly with a with a reference to it being subordinate to the principal development. And what I'm not able to interrogate, sort of live today, is whether the explanation given technically in terms of megawatt capacity answers that question or doesn't. I think we may need to go away and have a look and decide whether there's whether we have sufficient information to interrogate the relationship between megawatts, megawatt hours, number of best containers, land take and effects on that basis, because it's, it's probably just beyond what I can achieve on my own without, without an expert in I accept that.

42:44

So the key question here is actually how we are viewing subordinate, and it's subordinate in relation to what and what aspect of the best, I think that that's a fair representation of your of your main concern is that case it

42:57

is. Yes, I'm not, at the moment, convinced we have sufficient evidence about that, because I'm not sure megawatts on its own is the right metric to be looking at, obviously, a number of other components to that consideration. Okay.

43:12

Thank you very much for that. I believe that the applicant has actually replied in writing to this issue throughout the examination so far, but however, I would still give the applicant the right to reply to miss Hall's concerns.

43:25

Please. Thank you, sir. No, that's appreciate Miss hall that they don't have the technical expert here today, and they'll take away the the submissions that Mr. Gillis is providing, which we'll put in our whole summary. So if I may, just try and I think, focus where we're, where we're reaching, in terms of the principle of of our best as associated development. I think it might help just to see what we've got common ground on, at least between us, and so we can focus the debate thereafter. As you know, as we've all kind of acknowledged, we've submitted a number of additional pieces of evidence since this massive was first discussed. At ish one in response to submissions that were made. And so we won't go back into those. But I think where we're reaching is the continued challenges to the megawatt rating of the best versus the solar array, and the fact that the megawatt rating of the best is larger somehow precludes the inclusion of the best in that form as associated development. And so taking a step back, I don't think the function of the best. I think, well, the function of the best relative to the solar array, is consistent with and typical of all such co located developments of this nature. And there were a number

of DCO precedents that establish that and support the function of best as a principle as associated development. And indeed, policies is supportive of that as well. And all of that is covered in our our response to action point seven. So in that context, I don't think we understand there to be an issue with the principle of the inclusion of the best, nor its proposed functioning in this context. So I think both of those are common ground, which helps to narrow the focus. Because really, then what I think we're discussing is whether the additional megawatt capacity proposed by the six. 100 Meg best in our scheme, as opposed to, for sake of argument, a counterfactual, 400 Meg best, which I suspect wouldn't attract the same question causes an issue in planning and EIA terms. And so when looking at the core principles listed in the government's guidance on associated developments in that context, which the Secretary of State will consider when determining whether or not the best is associated development. In this context, we don't envisage that. I think Ms Hall confirmed that anyone would take issue with the direct relationship principle. Similarly, in terms of the cross subsidization principle, the guidance states that development should not be treated as associated development if it is only necessary as a source of additional revenue for the applicant in order to cross subsidize the cost of the principal development. And quite rightly, we haven't understood that there is any suggestion from any party that that's why the best proposed in this instance wouldn't be ad and indeed, in any event, the level of cross subsidies is acknowledged as being permitted in that guidance. So I think what that leaves is the principles of subordinates and proportionality, and those have been the main principles that have been rehearsed in the submissions to date. So I think just looking at those principles in a little bit more detail. So firstly, the principle of subordinates, so associated development should not be an aim in itself, but should be subordinate to the principal development. And then secondly, associated development should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the principal development. So I think it's clear that the first principle about subordinates is to do with the aim and purpose of the associated development in that context. And the second is about nature and scale. And if we could just look at those again, just in a bit more detail and see whether we can establish some common ground and focus the debate thereafter in terms of the scale and physical sizing, which I think is the language we're talking about here. And we can come up to scale of megawatt rating, but I think they're different things. If we look at scale and physical sizing, the best as proposed, is considerably smaller in footprint than solar array. That's self evident on the works plans as 006 you can look at the overview plan, and you can demonstrably see the pink area versus the residual blue area. It's it's noticeably smaller, and that's the best at its full extent. The lay of the best of a lower megawatt rating, as we've heard from Mr. Gillette, would not be smaller than that at the best as proposed in terms of sizing and configuration, and so there were no greater adverse effects associated with the best as proposed and assessed when compared to those when compared to a hypothetical configuration from a lower megawatt racing. So I think the concern must logically then be focused not on the physical sizing or the infrastructure considered, but the simple principle of the name plate capacity of the best being greater than the solar array approximate capacity. So we've explained in our submissions to date why we've proposed the capacity we have, and we've explored that still further this morning with Mr. Gillette in response to your question. So we will, no doubt continue, but we're not aware of any identified adverse impacts having been identified by any interested party the results from the proposed megawatt capacity of the best. And there's nothing in the guidance which specifically states that the megawatt capacity of the best must be the same as or lower than the solar array. And it's it's plainly not desirable we'd consider to artificially constrain, or limit the best to a lower megawatt capacity, simply for appearances sake, and to not exceed the megawatt capacity of the solar array. To propose such a limitation would constrain the performance of the

proposed development, reducing the valuable contribution we've established it would make to the UK's decarbonisation targets and to the resilience to the grid, which and jet have acknowledged themselves for not dissimilar reasons. It's not a feature of energy and sips to prescribe a ceiling on the generating capacity, and they're instead principally controlled, as is the case for this development and application, by the physical parameters which inform the actual impacts that results. And would suggest that's an instructive comparison for this debate. So, so that's just sort of general scene set in an attempt to kind of know where I think we are. And again, I appreciate us all seeing some of these, at least these, expressed in this term for the first time. So I'm not expecting a direct response, but it would help, I think, in submissions going forward, if we could just be clear on I think where the the argument in debate is here, which is around the megawatt capacity and the relative sizing of that, rather than the physical infrastructure itself, and whether that offends the principle of associated development, which, for the reasons we've stated, We don't consider it does, but we welcome the challenge and consideration on this. Thank you.

49:37

Thank you very much. Mr. Mac I agree in terms of clarity, as we heard on the interpretation of subordinate and in relation to what I think that Ms Hall has made it very clear that you are willing to submit, that it's part of your original representation to us that would be at that line for I would then expect applicant to offer. Still reply to that specific representation by deadline five. So I believe I agree, in terms of clarity on that. I believe that we are within the examination. Still be time to to address that issue within those parameters. Thank you. I would now like to invite North Chris Steven District Council to comment on S and their concerns in relation to the battery energy storage system. Please.

50:35

Thank you very much, sir. Yes, Miss Bell for Christ Steven, we echo and endorse the comments made by Lincolnshire. We share the concerns that have been articulated, and would also like to reflect further given the further technical information we've heard this morning, we do note, and we think it's a point of particular interest that the schemes that the applicant has referred to all have a capacity which is no greater than the solar generating capacity in terms of the best. So we hear what is said in terms of, you know, is this just simply a question of megawatts? But we think the question of megawatts is integral to a proper assessment of whether or not the best can properly be considered associated development or truly subordinate. I mean, you know, ultimately, that is its purpose. It goes, it goes to the essential essence of why it's there as part of this development in the first place. So we don't see that as being a point of detail. We see that as being fairly fundamental to understanding what the best is and whether or not it's subordinate. But we will reflect on what we've heard and develop that point further in written communication, if we may.

51:41

Thank you very much for that. In terms of next course of action, I think that I would ask North Quincy even to have similar course of action as they can share so submission in writing of those concerns by the next deadline, deadline for in then the applicant to reply. However, we do have a little bit more detail in terms of what concerns are, in terms of subordinate attending these in terms of capacity. So since that is a slightly different question than we heard earlier, in terms of they can share, I would ask the applicant if they would like to address that directly or or if they would just prefer to address it in writing.

52:26

Okay, so I might just invite Mr. Gillette just make a very few short submissions on the principal subordinates, because it may help the respective before I think submission.

52:35

Thank you, Mr. Gillette, please.

52:36

Simon Gillette, for the applicant, being more in numbers than a word person. I looked up what subordinate means, and there are two possible definitions, and the first is lower in rank or position, and the best will be subordinate to the solar, because the solar will discharge its energy in preference to energy that is stored in the best the reason for that is a pure kind of economic sensible reason, which is that if the best was to discharge to the grid and stop the solar from discharging, the solar energy be wasted, and Therefore any future need for energy onto the grid could not be met by the energy stored in the best because it's been exported and the alternatives of the solar has been lost. So the solar will always dispatch first, not only at this size, but at any co located solar and storage site. So in that regard, I would argue, sir, that the solar is higher in rank and position than the best, because it will always discharge first when the sun is shining. The second definition was treat or regard as of lesser importance than something else. And I would argue that there's a thread here to pull as well, sir, because although storage is an essential part of government's plan to match supply with demand to create and sustain a zero carbon electricity system, clearly, sir, in extremis, a collection of battery storage facilities on the grid will only support a low carbon grid if there is low carbon generation in excess to fill it to fill it with so in that regard, it is the solar scheme which is Delivering megawatts to the grid to help decarbonise our energy system, and the battery, which is supporting that by providing the flexibility around balancing supply with demand. And in that regard, I think so there's a there's a thread to pull, at least in my mind, that the battery is therefore subordinate. Us to the renewable generation with which it is co located.

55:07

Thank you, Mr. Gillette, for that.

55:14

Does that? Can I just ask if North Quincy has any follow up questions on that specific issue?

55:37

Thank you, sir. Nick Feltham for North Coast, even District Council, just to pick up on a point that was made there. The point was effectively about the solar generation would effectively bypass the Bess and effectively enter the cable be directed to bigger fence substations. The benefit attained from the solar generation going directly into the cable, into the grid network and bypassing the best itself. So I suppose it comes back to the question then about why, then isn't the solar generating capacity higher if that bypassing ability remains? And I think this comes back to then the balance of the megawattage of the solar scheme versus the megawattage of the best storage element, because ultimately, so we are dealing with an N SIP for a generation project and not a storage project Exactly. Thank you, sir.

56:29

Can I ask if the applicant would like to

56:34

comment on that? Simon Gillette, for the applicant, I don't think I used the word bypass. I think I used the word prioritize and explained that it is commercially and

56:46

operationally. I believe that you use the word discharge

56:49

first, correct, correct. I don't think I use the word bypass. I think the point that it's made is more around proportionality than around subordinacy, sir. So I don't think I have anything to add on in response to that, in terms Okay, ordinacy,

57:05

I gotta I I share some of the confusion that Mr. Felton has expressed now, because for me, it was quite interesting that you mentioned that the solar panels will discharge first and then, because they will discharge first only when they're not discharging. Would one would assume that's when the best unit would be absorbing the energy generated by the solar panels? Is that the case?

57:38

So sim Gillett, for the applicant, the applicant, the and I think we, we mentioned this point again in our action point seven, rep one, there are a number of ways that this configuration and any co located solar and storage system can work. Yes, a number

57:58

of Mr. Gillia, just, just, just to help and assist in this situation. I review that, and I don't remember in any of your responses, they being mentioned that the solar panels will discharge first. I don't think that that was part of the list of ways that you have submitted that you are expecting the development to function. I don't recall seeing that

58:26

no, so I think that's a cycle for the applicant. That's a fair point. So that wasn't written in that response. However, hopefully the explanation I provided earlier around why using something which otherwise would be wasted would be always rational versus using something which has been stored and can continue to be stored for later use. And that's what I mean around that prioritization of dispatch and therefore subordinate see.

58:54

But I think, I think that we are cutting around this issue now on several different hearings and on several different questions, and I think that it all comes down to one very specific point, which I think that we are struggling to get a straight understanding of what the issue is. And that in that issue is linked with the

fact that the maximum capacity of production from solar panels is 400 megawatts. You are proposing a 600 megawatt death unit, which is obviously higher, 200 megawatts higher. Your connection is 600 megawatts. So at any point in time, this one would assume that solar panels will always be producing energy that can be transferred into the network and the grid. Now, I understand that that might not always be convenient for either the operators or for the applicant. We understand that however, I think that what we are struggling to understand is what is their. The justification for 600 megawatt bath unit when it does appear that the solar panels will not be very frequently in a position to use the maximum capacity of the soul of the best. And this is then linked with, I think the concerns that we have heard from the representatives of North Coast, even in Lincolnshire, linked with the whole concept of being subordinate, in auxiliary to the main proposal, which is the solar panels. So I think that, in a nutshell, I think that that is the issue. And I have to say that I don't think we're getting a very straightforward answer on that, or addressing that head on, and I would ask if there is a way that we can actually address that concern.

1:00:52

So do you mind bearing with us for one minute, just whilst I confer if Mr. Gallatin and we'll look to answer. Thank you. Bye,

1:01:45

thank you, sir. I think for this, it might help if we go to one of the responses we provided to ish action seven and one of the sub paragraphs. And specifically the sub paragraph, or apologies if it was framed in the numbered form, but the it was framed clarification of how likely it is that the full capacity of the proposed Bess will be used when it appears that is unlikely that the proposed solar array will produce, even at peak, excess energy in excess of that which it can export via the connection to the bickerfen substation. Because certain correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that's that's principally, at least tangentially, related to the main issue you're talking about here, isn't it?

1:02:29

Yes, I believe so that is my interpretation of what I have heard today. Can I just ask you to confirm to me please, the reference of the document that you're going to quote from again, please. IT

1:02:39

IS rep 1030, and it's E page 55 on my screen, you'll recall and respect in relation to ish accent seven, there were a number of bullet points listed under that action, and I think it is the penultimate bullet that starts with clarification of how likely it is.

1:03:06

Okay? Yes, thank you.

1:03:08

I'll just ask Mr. Mr. Gillette to potentially walk through that response, and then we can maybe pick up by exception the the any ancillary queries that come from that so, and we'll see how we get go with that. Thank you.



1:03:19

Thank you, Mr. Mac, Mr. Gillick,

1:03:22

so I get it for the applicant. Thank you for your question, sir, and hopefully I'll be able to provide a bit more clarity on on on this within the written answer which we provided at that reference, rep, 1030,

1:03:51

we explain and you, you remember the point, sir, that that the at full in full sunlight, the solar facility at 400 megawatts and would take 90 minutes to fill a one hour 600 megawatt system. So it would take three hours to fill a 600 megawatt two hour system, because although these are capacity rating is a maximum capacity, it is possible to charge and discharge below that rating. An electric car is a really good example of that. So in the faster you go, the quicker the battery discharges, the slower you go, the slower the battery discharges. So that's a that's a kind of a factor of how batteries work, which means that this is not a binary ON, OFF or charge discharge. There are, there are kind of points in between. I think the key, the key point that that, I think we need to. Make here is that, is that the solar scheme, at 400 megawatts of solar generation over the course of a day, sorry to reiterate, will regularly fill the energy capacity as proposed, of the best so and potentially up to up to twice over on a very sunny day. Those will mainly be on the sunny days, clearly, but they will also that will that can occur at any time during during the year.

1:05:32

Okay, Mr. Gillette, I am mindful of the time, but I will ask another question on this specific topic. So how does that match with solar panels being discharged first? So if at 12 o'clock on a sunny day, the solar panels were producing a maximum of 500 megawatts, your connection allows you to export into the network 600 and they will always discharge first. Where is the extra megawattage coming from that will charge the battery?

1:06:08

Cycle it for the applicant. If we take a situation where the battery is empty, it's 12 o'clock, the solar is generating 400 megawatts, and the grid needs the power the solar will discharge in in a different situation, where the battery is full and and it's 12 o'clock and the solar is generating 400 megawatts, and the grid needs 400 megawatts, the solar will discharge first and The battery will not discharge. Battery may top up to 600 megawatts, if the bat, if the grid needs that power, but that's the point I'm making around solar discharges

1:06:49

first. Okay, thank you. And I think, and I think that that has made clear, but can I just reiterate point, just to make sure that we actually understand this? Then what, what I believe that you have just explained to us, Mr. Gillette, is that it will discharge first as long as the grid requires the energy. Is that what you are saying?

1:07:12

So I go through the abstinence, correct?

1:07:16

Okay, thank you for confirming that. Okay, right. So, if that is the case, if that is the case, then am I right in assuming that when calculating the capacity of the best that was needed for this development, what you took into consideration, in addition to the capacity, generating capacity of solar panels was actually how likely it would be, or not be that the network would require the energy that you are producing. So sorry,

1:07:54

again, if you just give us one minute to make sure we get the specific answer for you here. Thank you so

1:08:15

so can I clarify so I get it for the app, and can I clarify your question again, that was in relation to the solar array or the or the best?

1:08:25

How you calculate the capacity of the best? I Yeah,

1:08:29

so that's so I get it for the applicant. We explained previously that the grid connection was for 600 megawatts, and therefore the configuration of the best has been sized to take advantage of and fill effectively that grid connection of the I should explain of the megawatt capacity of the Bess, right.

1:08:58

I'm mindful of time, so I will urge us to move on from this specific topic. But before I do, can I just ask if there are any final comments that anyone would like to make on this specific item of the agenda. So that would be the battery energy storage system. Raise your hands, please, in the room or online. Yeah. Mr. Mountain,

1:09:30

yes. Matthew mountain, for Icj Mountain farms limited Icj M IcjM supports storage in principle, our alternative best site is on the IcjM land east of the car dike, which is in flood zone one, and it is expressly paired with the IcjM hybrid cable connection route shown as the yellow dash line in rep two, Dash 051, on page 15, and that's fixed 580 One meters east of the cardike. We treat the best and its grid connection as one system on IcjM measurements that pairing to the point of connection is 5.8 kilometers versus 13 kilometers under the chosen configuration with materially less trench, less fragmentation and less local wildlife site adjacency, and it sits on grade three, non best and most versatile land, which is in accordance with our 30 year cropping history and the AGR three agricultural land classification. Outcome, we have a single ask for the agenda three record IcjM asked the panel to minute and direct that the applicants comparative matrix must use LC James rep two, Dash 051, page 15, diagram, as shown by the dotted yellow line, which is fixed 581 meters east of the car dike as the Icj M comparator With no car dike aligned or other substitute variants matrix mechanics remain under your CA, compulsory acquisition, hearing one direction. Thank you.

1:11:12

Thank you very much. Mr. Mountain, apologies. Could could you just clarify to me please what specifically is the link between what you have just set out for us in the battery energy storage system, please.

1:11:26

It's the Express pairing of the alternative route that we talked about yesterday and the battery site, which we can also was part of our six, 618 acre offer in August 2023, so when we talked about the matrix yesterday, it's important that with the applicant and myself are talking about the same corridor, which is expressed by the yellow dashed line on rep two, Dash 051, page 15, which was exhibit deadline to number 11.

1:12:03

So Mr. Martin, am I right in assuming that that your point in your question is linked, is connected to the link into cable connection between the battery and the substation, rather than the location or the capacity of the battery energy storage system itself,

1:12:21

it's linking the alternative cable route with with the battery, with the battery alternative site.

1:12:29

Okay, so it is about the cable route, not the battery, energy storage system itself.

1:12:36

I'm tracking them as one unit together.

1:12:40

Okay, can I ask if the applicant would like to comment on this specific point? Please?

1:12:48

Yes. Leon Kuo, for the applicant, it would be useful just for the applicant specters to clarify with Mr. Mountain precisely what he's just submitted. I understand what he's saying is that for the purpose of the action that the applicant took from yesterday's ch one hearing to consider what further analysis could be undertaken in relation to the applicant's cable Route corridor and Mr. Mountains alternative proposal that he wishes us to now disregard the proposal that was submitted in his previous submissions, and solely consider the new as I understand it, route which was put forward in XD two, dot 11 at page 15 of his rep, 2051,

1:13:26

thank you for that comment. I believe that Mr. Mountains comment was clearly in addition, I don't think it was disregarding what was agreed yesterday. If that helps in your answer.

1:13:42

Do Thank you, sir. It might just be helpful if you were able to just clarify that with Mr.

1:13:46

Mountain. Certainly. Mr. Mountain, can you clarify that if it was in addition, or if it was instead of what was agreed at the hearing, with yourselves, with yourself and the applicant yesterday,

1:13:58

it's in addition, um, if it might help, if we look at the actual

1:14:01

Thank you, Mr. Mountain, you, Mr. Martin, it's in addition. Thank you.

1:14:12

Sorry. So just, just to labor this point, can I just make sure so the it's in addition. So there were two alternative routes that we're being asked to consider the feasibility of my comparison to the cable corridor that we've got in

1:14:24

our application. I believe that that was Mr. Martin's question. Yes, okay. Would you like me to clarify? Mr. Martin? No,

1:14:30

that's okay. It was just to make sure that instead of you,

1:14:50

is the Mac for the applicant? Do you have an answer, or,

1:14:55

sorry, an answer, in terms of whether we'll consider both alternative care?

1:15:00

Rules in relation to the best? Yes, I believe that that was Mr. Mountains question. Okay,

1:15:05

sure. So I think there are two elements to this, and I'll pass across to Mr. Kuo in terms of the second element. So first, a useful clarification in relation to the scope of the action from yesterday. So we'll now make sure that we factor in both of those alternative routes to the alternatives exercise that we discussed and have taken away as action point one from yesterday in so far as the secondary element, which I think is the alternative best sighting that Mr. Mountain is proposing, which is linked to but slightly different part for the purposes of today's agenda for the best I'll just pass across to Mr. Cooler, who can provide some summary submissions

1:15:40

on that, sir. Okay. Thank you.

1:15:42

Thank you, sir. Lancillo, for the applicant, I'll take your lead, sir, because I'm conscious that you did mention earlier that obviously the questions of citing of the best in a different location to the solar area were considered previously and were not anticipated to be kind of discussed in detail in today's hearing. But if you'd like me to make light, yes, overview submissions on that, then I'm happy to

1:16:01

I'm happy for you to make if you are ready to do that. However, I'm very much willing to accept for the reasons that you have highlighted that you might wish to respond in writing after Mr. Martin has submitted his submission in writing, which obviously I have informed at the beginning of the hearing that that is expected. So I would, I would ask, I would be willing to accept either course of action from the applicant.

1:16:27

Thank you, sir low and killer for the applicant, I'll just make some some summary submissions in that case, in relation to the assertion that the applicant should situate additional a Bess on Mr. Mountains land, or indeed relocate the best, we must take a step back and consider what that request means. In practice, it's clearly not feasible for the applicant to fundamentally redesign the scheme or move or add in a best midway through the examination in a completely different location, to the extent that the inevitable result from what Mr. Mountain is saying is that the scheme should be withdrawn and redesigned. That does not accord with his comments and his submissions that he supports the project in rep 3015, and is not attempting to block it in rep 1043 and more importantly, it runs contrary to the urgent need for this critical national priority infrastructure, which the government intends to be progressed as quickly as possible from en one para 3.3 point 63 the applicant would submit that such an outcome would be an affront to this policy and the urgent need identified for new energy infrastructure. So to the extent that the Mr. Mountains inference is the proposed development should not be granted consent, because there has been a deficient consideration of Mr. Mountains, purported alternatives for the best. This likewise runs contrary to the purported support for the scheme and the national policy that I've just cited. The applicant would reiterate that there is no basis in law or policy to conclude that the design of the scheme has been in any way deficient, and the applicant has explained how it's fully complied with law and policy on the consideration of alternatives in response to action point six, in its written summary of oral subs from ish one, rep 1030, and just briefly on that en one, is clear that given the level and urgency of need for new energy infrastructure, The Secretary of State should be guided by the principles that consideration of alternatives should be carried out in a proportionate manner, and only alternatives that can meet the objectives of the proposed development need be considered. And the Secretary of State has directed that in considering alternative proposals must be guided by whether there is a realistic prospect of the alternative delivering the same infrastructure capacity in the same timescale as the proposed development. And at the time that Mr. Mountain made his offer to relocate the best onto his land, reworking the scheme would have added significant program time and hindered the achievement of the project objectives.

1:18:58

Thank you, Mr. Cobber, thank you very much for that. Can I ask if there are any further questions on this specific item or can I move us on to item four? Are there any further questions on item three? Yes, I have hand raising room. Mr. Parker, is it apologies? Mr. Locke, please. Can I ask a microphone to be provided to Mr. Locke, please? Thank you.

1:19:29

Thank you. Councilor lock, on behalf of Boston rural community, I wonder if it would help those in the room for an analogy or a real world example from a personal system would that be? Would that be okay and welcomed,

1:19:45

certainly. Mr. Locke, please. Thank you. Okay?

1:19:47

So I have PV solar. I have battery storage. My battery storage is 40 kilowatts. My Solar is 24 so I have a very similar, smaller PV to battery size system. In So, in reality, what happens in a day is the sun shines. The PV generates. The PV sells back to the grid for a premium rate during the day, the batteries do not export to the grid. Currently, because of grid capacity, what the batteries then do is either take surplus from the solar if it if it if it is there, but the value of that export is far higher. The batteries then charge at night, where the grid power is lower. So if there's cheaper energy at a different time of the day, those batteries can take that energy whilst leaving the solar export at the higher rate, if that makes sense. And then during the day, the batteries serve to keep, keep my demand on that cheaper energy at night, whilst maximizing the profits from the from the solar generated energy. So so that, in reality, is what will happen, and then, if the grid demands more from the batteries, the batteries are capable of discharging to the grid. So that's probably the kind of, if that helps understand how these systems work. It will be a grid trade of price. It will be to maximize profit. I know the demand is there from the grid to have low carbon energy, but in reality, that's, that's the driving force to scale the size of the battery system.

1:21:16

Thank you very much. Mr. Lock, that's, that's, that's a very useful point. Can I just ask if the applicant would like to briefly comment on that?

1:21:25

So I get it for the applicant. It can always be instructing to see how other systems work, including domestic or private systems with behind the meter batteries, behind the meter storage, behind the meter solar, but also behind the meter demand. So while there are potentially some analogies that would read across to a grid connected co located system, there are some which which may not read across quite so well. But the principle is, and Mr. Locke used the points on on price, ultimately, the grid needs to balance supply with demand, and prices are products of that balance. So when energy prices are expensive, that is because there is not enough supply to meet demand, and a battery system is a way of saving energy, storing energy when demand is lower, so that it can be used to discharge when demand is then higher, and that has the effect of reducing the price, the wholesale market price of power at that time. So I think we're kind of, we're talking about a similar thing here, but the driver is to

balance supply with demand from renewable generation supply and variable demand from houses, businesses, etc.

1:22:47

Thank you, Mr. Gillette, are there any further questions on this specific item?

1:22:55

I don't see any hands raised, so I will move us on then to Item four, which is landscape in visual sorry.

1:23:02

So just just very quick, we've got to only so we've got musical chairs our own to bring in a couple of experts, if that's

1:23:08

certainly I was going to actually introduce the item, if I may, and then I was going to actually break very quickly, maybe we can use their time. Thank you. So a list of the key written submissions that will inform our questions has been included in the agenda published in suppression of this hearing. Again, it is a long list, and I do not propose to go through it in detail, but can I ask if anyone has any comments that they would like to make on the list included in this item, I don't see any hands raised online in the room. Apologies any hands, and please raise your hands online if you'd like to make any comments. I don't see any hands raised online, therefore, I assume that there are no comments on the Documents List, as I have mentioned. Specific purpose of this item is to question and examine the applicant's approach to landscaping visual effects in how these have been dealt with by the applicant. Also, I am mindful of time. It is now 1124, and we have been we have been in a hearing for nearly an hour and a half. So I propose a quick break, giving also an opportunity for the applicant to call its witnesses on this specific item. So can I propose a 15 minute break? Perhaps, is that? Is it okay with everyone? If you have any concerns about that, can you please raise your hands online or in the room? I don't see any hands raised. So that will be 1140 then will resume at 1140 Thank you very much.