



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Fosse Green Energy
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Part 2 – Session 2
Date:	12 March 2026

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.

TRANSCRIPT_FOSSEGREEN_ISH3_SESSIO N2_120326

Thu, Mar 12, 2026 10AM • 1:41:29

00:04

30. So a hearing is resuming just before we start with agenda item 3.3. We've received a message via case team that Mr. Gallagher wishes to raise an AOB type matter. Unfortunately, Mr. Gallagher, I think has to leave by noon, so if we can hear what his point is, we'll quickly deal with that, and then we'll head on into agenda item three. Mr.

00:33

Gallagher, thank you. I'm very grateful that you're allowing me to speak on this item. I've I will submit it all in writing to you. But if I can very briefly summarize, my concern is primarily regarding the cumulative traffic impact assessment. One of the documents submitted a P, p1 64 contained minutes for meeting held in December 23 which the names were redacted of the attendees, but to quote from it, if emphasized the need for a worst case assessment of the traffic the during the initial hearings on ice age one session four, the applicant noted that section 2.6 of the n3 sets out that where flexibility is sought, as is The case with this proposed development, applicants should assess the worst case environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposed development. My concern is on the cumulative impact. What has been assessed appears to be a best case scenario. I've made representations to the applicant on on this in rep 1104, a dozen or so points where I believe the cumulative impact assessment was questionable, the applicant responded in rep 2030, making a number of observations on the lines my suggestions would appear to overestimate the impact on the traffic and transport. It's also indicated that sorry, the applicant also indicated that in relation to the specifics, they were not going to respond now, but we just want to see those addressed through the statement of common ground with LCC highways, and as the applicant has already indicated today, there are very few days available for that to be reviewed. But as I said, I made about a dozen comments on specific points where I felt the the applicant had not correctly assessed the position. But I will just illustrate that today, because of the time with just one of them, and that is the fact that the applicant said specifically that they, if the DCO was granted, they would seek to accelerate the construction of the farm, the solar facility. That means, as a minimum, there should have been two scenarios put forward on the cumulative traffic. My suspicion is that the LCC highways were only provided with one set of assumptions. I the most favorable to the applicant terms of minimizing the cumulative impact. So I'm very keen that in the statement of common ground there is a recognition that we should not just look at one single set of scenarios, but a wider range, as was indicated earlier on in the project in 2003 and back in January, and that the statement of common ground on highways should accept that More than one scenario should be considered. Thank you. Thank

04:07

Thank you, Mr. Geller, I doubt the applicant is in the position to make any real response today, because they won't have the relevant witness here. I think all that we can say because it sounds like there might have been a holding type replies given to you by the applicant that we would ask that the applicant, through its transport expert, does liaise with Mr. Gallagher to explain the position, and that perhaps also Mr. Gallagher speaks to Lincolnshire county council as the highway authority to see whether or not their understanding is perhaps the same as Mr. Gallagher's or different, but to make sure the issue is aired, so is the African able to take this point away and make sure that there is more active dialog with the

point that Mr. Gallagher has raised directly with him and. And similarly, can Lincoln should also make sure that there is dialog between Mr. Gallagher and the county council room and

05:10

table for the applicant. Yes, sir, we'll make sure that that's done. Shape.

05:14

Show me shape for Lincoln County Council. So I'm told that that's already been done to some extent. So ongoing discussions already, but yes, of course, Mr.

05:22

Gallo, are you concerned that you know who you might need to speak to, particularly at the county council?

05:27

Yeah. Thank you very much. Yes, I think I've got Justine's email address. I'll send that through to her in the the applicant can get my email address from your staff. Thank you. I

05:43

uh, just to clarify the important point is, of course, that there may be more than one of these construction projects at the same time. We have a dramatic just to be clear. Thank you.

05:53

I think everybody understands that cumulative effects are writ large across not just the consideration, of this application in Springwell, but the odor might be in the background, and there are other projects as well, right? I think we can then move on to agenda item 3.3 so I'll hand over to Mrs.

06:17

Wilkinson. Thank you. And I'll just start by noting down from the applicant in the council side who's going to be speaking on this item. So I'll turn to the applicant first. Please.

06:33

Reuben Taylor, for the applicant, it's Mr. Titley, who's sitting to my right.

06:39

Thank you. And turning to the District Council, please,

06:45

Ben hunt for North Stephen, District Council. To my left is Mr. Burdan, David,

06:52

who is environmental health officer, will be able to answer any questions on his particular discipline, such as noise, air quality, construction, working hours and the like. I may also chip in once or twice on the wider issues of health and well being, but which is probably primarily led by the county council.

07:18

Thank you in turning to the county council,

07:20

please shimmershake for Lincoln County Council. Thank you Marvin Katie cauldron and Sean Thompson who set a few down from the hip from the council's public health team. Thank you.

07:38

So the first question relates to the methodology for assessing effects on human health and well being, and only of what was said yesterday about the notes that the applicant is working on, and that's been shared with the Councils so far, which appreciate may well pick up some of what we're saying. So yeah, I'll be mindful of that. But the first question is tied into our second set of questions, pe 201, about appreciating what the scoping report said about the methodology for assessing health. But can you please, just briefly for us, explain or summarize your approach to assessing human health and well being with the our second lot of questions in mind? So that's really about drawing on what the scoping report said in terms of providing the cross referencing to the other chapters, the good practice guidance that's been drawn on to consider effects on health and well being, and also the consideration given to the direct and direct cumulative effects on health and well being.

08:58

Thank you, madam. Neil tipley, on behalf of the applicant, and to reiterate, reiterate that point, yes, you're correct in that the there was a health and well being summary statement that's been prepared by the applicant, shared by to both councils. I mentioned that yesterday, and we'll look to submit that into the future deadline the in terms of the context behind the health and well being, as you mentioned, the applicant proposed in the EIA scoping report, which is app 118, that health and well being did not warrant its own individual chapter, that it could be adequately covered within the other technical topics. And you'll be very familiar that the planning Inspectorate in the in its scoping opinion at 119 agreed with that, in principle, providing matters and human health is covered in landscape and visual noise, vibration, traffic and transport and air quality assessments, some of those very clearly cover health as you touched on. The receptor is p. Noise and vibration is a clear and obvious example of that, but also traffic and transport and landscape and visual you mentioned specifically in a question, in a deadline to about where within landscape and visual and water environment, health and well being was mentioned, and you asked about the Aima 2022 guidelines, and whether they had been followed. There is more detail on that in that summary statement that will follow, touching on those two issues though landscape and visual assessment, which is document as 117, the receptor is people, so inherently that does touch on the issue of stress and well being and health. We've heard from people about in terms of using public rights away and the visual amenity, and that's elaborated on in that statement that will follow the water environment can sometimes link into health and well being if there's impacts from a development on groundwater, for example, where there's a drinking water abstraction, in the case of the proposed development, that's not so. And so you're right in thinking that chapter doesn't touch on the that the human health and well being, in the sense that other chapters might, because those impacts are not occurring associated with the proposed development. That receptor is not there. In terms of the the IEMA guidance 2022 that's the document determining significance for human health and environmental impact assessment that wasn't specifically mentioned in the ES, but the principles of it are followed. So that guidance document includes a matrix for significance, assessing significance of effects, determining sensitivity of receptor, the magnitude of impact, and using that in a matrix methodology to to assign significance of effect. That's the methodology that the ES uses, in principle, across each of its technical topics, which is elaborated on early on in that es, and then applied topic by topic. So that theme of how to assess human health from that leva guidance isn't is there an essence in that environmental statement?

12:13

I think, is that answering your questions for the time being madam,

12:18

it does, I think being mindful that the notes being prepared and has been shared with the councils, so that's been just a helpful introduction and overview. So thank you. I'll turn to the Councils now just to see whether you've got any comments on the methodology. Again, obviously being mindful that you'll have had sight of the note. Turning first to the county council.

12:45

Yeah, thank you. Yes. I mean, I would first of all point out that as public health practitioners, we're not experts in particular aspects of electricity generation and transmission, etc, we would always defer to the UK health security agency on matters such as that, that said, we do very much welcome the recent health and well being statement that's been prepared that summarizes the position and sets out quite clearly the methodology that's been used. Obviously, the methodology references many national guidelines and principles, etc, and we accept that they are the industry standard, if you like, for that, we do, however, feel that some of the conclusions, I suppose, are therefore rather speculative, simply because there is a lack of evidence out there around the impacts of the solar industry in generally, but we do also accept that, as I say, that evidence base is very limited at present, particularly in the UK setting. We would have continued to call for a health impact assessment, but obviously recognize that that was scoped out very early on in the development, but that would have looked at the physical and mental health impacts potentially. And we think it's the mental health impacts that are potentially more significant with this proposed development, having heard the discussions around landscape and visuals just today, and the scale and extent of not just this development, but the cumulative impact of many developments and the strength of feeling out there in the local population, you know, there is the potential that it could cause population mental health impacts to summarize, I think it is that lack of evidence, and what evidence there is is fairly inconclusive, but we welcome the opportunity to continue working with the applicants on the health and wellbeing statement.

14:56

Yeah. Thank you. Does the district council have anything over and above what the county council said? Yes.

15:05

Ben hunt, North Cuban District Council. So a general point about the technical note that's been circulated, also we haven't had a full opportunity to respond to it yet on the sort of wider issue of health and well being. One comment I would make from an initial reading of the document is that it in common with the environmental statement topic chapters doesn't reference things like linkage walking strategy and North Coast Stevens active travel strategy, both of which we have raised in connection with my favorite topic of stepping out walks at paragraphs 722, and 725, of our written representation, which is rep 105, sevens, I make that sort of general point. I invite Mr. David to comment on the approach to his relevant topics in the environmental statement, and his view from that perspective on the technical note that's being circulated because he has seen that

16:22

virgin David, environmental health officer for North Stephen District Council, yeah, I can confirm I have seen the document in terms of noise and air quality. I have no shoes to raise. I does

16:51

the applicant want to come back on any of the points that the councils have made for you?

16:59

Reuben Taylor, for the applicant. I think we're looking forward to a response to the to the document that we've provided, and to continuing discussions in this particular area.

17:16

Okay, I'm just going to turn to construction hours now and now so the District Council in its local impact report, which was paragraph 2.19, on page 73, of rep 10056, you have identified a preference for Your standard working hours which would be slightly shorter than what the applicant has set out in the framework construction environmental management plan. So the applicant responded to this really along the lines that the proposed noisy construction works would be in line with the council's guidelines, with any deviation subject to a section 61 agreement under the control of Pollution Act 1974 so just turning, first of all to the applicant, then just to ask, what difference would it make to construction activity or the construction program if The council's guideline hours of working were to be adopted as your core working hours.

18:29

Neil took me on behalf of the applicant, if I may, if we can spin that the other way around and just explore the difference first, just to make it clear, and just to double check with the council as well that I've understood this, right? So my understanding of the council's guidance. Guidance is the working hours during Monday to Friday, seven till 6pm 7am to 6pm the applicants proposing seven to seven, so an extra hour in the weekday. So starting on that point, first of all, the extra the benefit. There's actually a benefit, we would say, for the extra hour, in terms of taking the traffic leaving the site at the end of the day outside of the shoulder hour of the peak traffic. So it's not, wouldn't coincide with the peak traffic hour in the afternoon, but the next busiest hour, the shoulder hour, it The advantage is that extra additional hour in the weekday moves that traffic into a baseline situation which is slightly lower. There's more headspace on the road network to accommodate that traffic. So we don't anticipate an additional impact from that extra hour and it but it has that added benefit of a lower impact from the the departure of the of the vehicles. Just to point out as well, that the applicant, as well, notes in chapter three the proposed development of the yes rep, 1015, that's the that those hours during the weekday do. Limit the percussive piling work. So it's likely that the the solar panels themselves, would use percussive piling where they are hammered into the ground. There's different ways we've explained before where they can be screwed in. For example, that is a quieter method. These detailed design comes later depending on ground conditions. That percussive piling, with the noise associated with it is limited within 400 meters of residential properties during that final hour of the day. So that only occurs between the construction hours that align with the council's eight to six. There's not the noisy hours do not occur in that final hour of the day. The Council guidelines as well state the working hours on a Saturday is eight to one, 8am to 1pm on a Saturday with no noisy works on Sundays or public holidays, the applicant has proposed a working hours of nine to one on a Saturday, with all activities except Except the percussive piling, and then in the afternoon, one till six, which is the extended hours I assume the council is thinking about, that is for excluding the noisy work. So there wouldn't be the HTV deliveries, there wouldn't be the percussive piling, and there wouldn't be the hGD works within those later hours on a Saturday, the Sunday and the bank holidays. I believe there's agreement there that there's no working within the Sundays and bank holidays, with the applicant noting the exception that in the unlikely event, HDD so horizontal direction drilling works have begun and they haven't managed to finish in time, it's difficult to pause that halfway through, so that the construction contractor would always plan to finish that, but in that unlikely event, they can't, they'd be able to carry that on into that Sunday or the bank holiday hours. So from the applicant's point of view, it's it's similar. It aligns sufficiently, in our opinion. Thank you.

22:17

Mr. Tetley, within these hours, particularly the extended hour, would some of the activity be more of a closed down, start up type, rather than active construction work? I mean, I come across projects where an extended hour, either at the beginning of the day or the end of the day, is sought, but that is largely for mobilization or demobilization of the works that day rather than active works? Or are you looking potentially more at active works during the additional hours?

22:54

Neil Topley, on behalf of the applicant, that level of detail is obviously not available at this moment in time, but going off the back of other solar developments that we've been involved in, and how construction contractors have dealt with that that final hour does tend to be avoiding noisy works. It's sometimes in seasons as well. That final hour is dusk or beginning to darken, so things like percussive piling is not happening like you suggest, it is almost the dismantling of activities during that day, not the arrival of new HGVs, not the beginning of new activities. It's the closure of the activities in the day. Thank you. Do

24:16

Thank you, Mr. Tipping, and I'll just turn to the District Council now, just in terms of what you've heard from the applicant, but also it would be helpful to have your view on what the applicant's position is in terms of that their core working hours and the procedure that would be involved with section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act, whether that that the combination of those would provide an appropriate mechanism to control noisy operations that affects on local residents.

24:49

David environmental health officer, North Coast, even District Council, yep, in addition to what the applicant said, I think having those additional hours will reduce the overall length construction. Is taking place, which is obviously a benefit for the community. It sounds like there are safeguards in place. So avoiding noisier works in more center sensitive hours. It's there's nothing really we can really add to that.

25:20

So I'm getting the impression that you're not too far away in terms of the operating hours,

25:25

assuming there's no noisy works between six and seven, I think I'll be okay. Do

25:44

does the county council have anything that they want to add about construction hours?

25:50

Sean Johnson, Public Health Manager for county council now just to point out the obvious, that constant noise can have impacts on health, but if it were out of hours or hours when people might be trying to sleep. And obviously, sleep deprivation can lead to significant impacts. But from what I'm hearing from the agreement of North East Industry Council, that shouldn't be a significant issue. We would just ask, though, and I realize you can't have no noise at all hours of the day, but whether the applicant would look as the operations go forward if they do at people who do have to sleep through the day to work shifts. NHS is a large employer in the area, and that's the first one that springs to mind, people that will actually be trying to sleep during the daytime. But we don't have any data as to exactly where they live, exactly,

26:55

just one final point on construction hours. Would these also apply to the preliminary, primitive preliminary works in advance of construction or not.

27:13

Neil Titley on sorry, bear with me once. Neil Titley on behalf of the applicant, apologies just prior to that question, just to thank you for the councils for their comments, I had referred previously to the chapter in the environmental statement in terms of the secured documents, the working hours you'll know already, but they're secured within the framework construction Environmental Management Plan, which is rep, to 013, so just wanted to point that out that is it is secured your question, madam. So if you don't mind

27:52

reminding me, yes, it would be, it's what working hours would apply to the permitted preliminary works that have been identified in the draft development consent order and also the maintenance activities that would take place during the operational phase.

28:07

Neil Titley, on behalf of the applicant, thank you for the reminder. We've picked up on some of the comments about those permitted preliminary works, and we're just currently discussing as an applicant team some amendments to that framework, construction, environmental management plan, rep, 2013, to word it. So those working hours I mentioned would apply to that earlier stage of works. The hours I referred to were construction working hours. So it wouldn't necessarily apply to operation and maintenance. The operation and maintenance by the very nature, if there were an identification of an issue, let's say a maintenance staff wanted to visit a substation that could occur during night time. That's not necessarily noisy, works. It's an inspection. It's for safety reasons. So there's different a big range of operational activities during that operational stage, ranging from cutting edges, maintaining the landscaping through to general inspections. So I don't believe we therefore limit the operational hours to allow that flexibility. And just to reiterate, those hours that we mentioned were relevant, therefore, to the area construction phase. Thank you. Thank you.

29:35

It's just a quick question to the Councils on the maintenance side of things, as applicant stated, there's no reference to those in the framework Operational Environmental Management Plan. Do you think there should be

29:53

and helpful North Steve District Council? It might be helpful to have a sort of the. List of works that might take place as part of the maintenance. But also, I think we probably need to clarify and possibly separate off things like hotel replacement midterm in the in the in the scheme, because, as the architect has said, although they anticipate no greater impact than the construction phase, they could be significant depending on how and when they're carried out over what time period and some of the activities may be noisy. Good.

30:37

Does the county council want to add anything? I mum,

30:43

if I just might add, for Lincoln County Council, I think we'd welcome that. I think it'd be helpful to have clarity in the in the relevant framework plan. I think they probably sit and we'll come on to in the draft DCO session tomorrow, the council's position respect to the definition of maintain within the draft DCO

you'll have seen already the council's position, respective, potentially limiting it in a similar way that has been done in other current examinations. So perhaps, depending on where we get to with that, it might sit within the framework plan too.

31:16

Okay, thank you. And we could possibly then see where the discussion on the DCO tomorrow takes us on that matter. But is that something that the applicant could do in terms of listing out sort of the likely activities or signpost where people could find that information?

31:38

Neil, totally on behalf of the applicant, the applicant team can do that, and we'll come back to you in writing. Thank you.

31:45

Thank you, Mr. Lyons, I've seen your hand up, if you could just bear with me, because I've probably only got one more question to ask, just so that I can get the information that I want from today's session. Then, then I'll come back. I'm just conscious of the time, and we've still got cultural heritage to do. Thank you.

32:11

So this is my last question, actually, on health and well being side of things, while I remember, though, just in case I forget after this question, you've obviously mentioned the note that's been prepared and that you would submit it to a future deadline. What deadline were you thinking of submitting it to us for

32:32

Neil tipley, on behalf of the applicant, our intention for the health and wellbeing summary statement was to share that with yourself. So deadline three, we shared that with the two councils I mentioned because of the time space between deadline two and three for feedback, so that I believe I understand from conversations in the last couple of days, both councils have had an opportunity to read that, but perhaps not yet collated the comments. When those comments come across, we'll review those and make a decision at that point whether we have that time to update the statement before deadline three. But our current, our current aim, is to share that at deadline three. I

33:26

Okay, to ensure that, for our benefit, that the notes is complete as possible, from from both sides. If you want to push that back to deadline, three, a which is obviously a little bit further and later on, that would be fine with us, if that's of any help for getting the document as complete as possible.

33:52

Neil Tetley, on behalf of the applicant, thank you, Madam. That's appreciated and noted.

33:57

What we can do on that point is as an action point, we'll say not later than three, if it's ready at three, all well and good, but may assist.

34:15

So the final question, then, is for the applicant and the councils. So a common theme in many of the relevant representations is the effect of industrialization of the countryside. That's a term that's been used by quite a lot of interested parties with communities and placing value on the sense of place stemming from things such as surrounding countryside and the agricultural identity of the area. Can the

parties comment on the effect of the changes to the landscape on the mental health and well being of local residents? And I'll turn to the applicant first. Do.

35:04

You know, totally on behalf of the applicant, the health and well being summary statement that I refer to goes through topic by topic and landscape. And visual is one of those where it draws on the information from that assessment, and that takes into account the effects on the landscape that my colleague Sam Griffiths was mentioning earlier, and the effects on visual amenity, and that's from residential properties and from public rights away and other sensitive receptors that that assessment has considered the it draws very heavily on the conclusions of that landscape and visual assessment and from that takes into account the effects that may occur on well being and health, how people may change or differences in the the use of public rights away as a result of the impacts that have been discussed earlier This morning and and how people may feel from having sight of the proposed development, and that is addressed for the construction phase, where the impacts are greater, and also taking into account the operation following the planting and the growth of that planting after year one, as that develops. So there's a conclusion for that in the health and well being summary statement, and I'm sure that's one of the issues the Councils would have commented on. And we'll have a look and address those comments when they come through.

36:30

Thank you. I'll turn to the district council for comments please.

36:38

North cave District Council, I don't think we've got a great deal more to add, other than to yet again, draw a link to our comments on visual impact changes the landscape, on the user experience of popular pride, popular rights of way and promoted paths such as dipping out walks. Okay.

36:59

Thank you and to the county council for any comments.

37:05

Sean Johnson, Public Health Management, Lincolnshire county council, likewise, I don't want to labor the point on things that have been discussed intensively yesterday and this morning, but we do feel it's the scale of change, both from the proposed development and other interrelated developments in the area that's been underestimated in terms of its potential impact on mental health. And obviously, as we've discussed already, this isn't one solar farm in isolation, but one of several extremely large solar farms in the area, or with associated substations and battery energy storage systems, etc, many of which are considered separately to this development consent order and through different planning application routes. So we're keen to say that all those cumulative effects are brought together and considered in relation to to mental health, which the way the statement that's been referred to is going, we feel will be able to do again. We've also talked about some of the mitigation measures for landscape and visuals around screening. We do have concerns that if the development goes ahead, the screening itself wouldn't be established until 15 years into operation, which is long enough for mental health impacts to become embedded and we've talked already about, you know, being very carefully considered around where high hedging etc is, is appropriate, where it's not because maintaining some of those open aspects that are there now, perhaps in conjunction with softening the landscape of the solar panels, with wild flower planting, animal grazing, things like that, could actually help mitigate the potential impacts. And then my last point was around community gain from the proposed development if it goes ahead, we do feel this is quite limited in the application, and there could be opportunities for further enhancement through that, as part of that and as part of the ongoing mitigation measures. We

do feel that community layers on group that reference would need to continue beyond the construction phase and throughout operation of the of the plant, okay, thank you.

39:42

Just turning back to the council just about community benefits, that reminded me that we obviously left that question for today you've set out in your local impact report, something stating that the negative impacts the benefits to offer. Set the negative impact should be increased. Is there anything that you wanted to say in addition to what you said now and that set out in your local impact report about that specific matter?

40:10

Sean Johnson, Public Health Manager, Lincoln County Council, nothing much to add to what was said in the impact report. I think the point to make is that the community gain would need to be what the community wants, which is why, from a public health world, we advocate for the health impact assessment approach, because that doesn't just look to mitigate potential negative health impacts, it looks to enhance those positive gains. So that's why I referenced the Community Liaison Group, continuing that some of those things could actually develop over time through the community funding that believe is proposed. One thing I would add to the list that was in the in the local impact report, and as I say, these are just our sort of suggestions of the kind of things that might be considered, was the the applicant does reference high levels of fuel poverty in the area, and given that this is a renewable energy generation scheme, it would be nice to say something actually helps those that are struggling too for the heating and keep their homes warm locally, we appreciate that that would be an offer by The applicant, potentially, rather than a requirement that the examining authority can put on the development but things like putting solar PV on individual house roofs would have that benefit to some vulnerable individuals in the area.

41:36

Okay, thank you. Before I turn to the floor, does the applicant want to come back on any points that the council's made?

41:45

Reuben Taylor for the applicant, no. Thank you, man. We'll continue discussions. Hopefully we'll make some good progress. Thank you. Okay.

42:10

You, Mr. Lyons, do you

42:11

want to make just, just a brief input? Nick Lyons, Chair Thorpe, on the Hill parish council, I'd like to strongly object to the extended working hours. I'm impressed by the applicant's creativity. They suggest that this is an overall improvement to the local community, to have traffic move till later in the day, and that these extended hours will shorten the overall period of construction. Well, the real seems to me, the real reason behind this is to give them a financial benefit of having a more concentrated period of construction, which it isn't hard to see how that's a financial benefit from their point of view, but from a practical point of view, I just don't see this as being enforceable by the time people have objected or there's a slippage over into this quieter period. Do you really think that when they, you know, when we, when I'm faced in our community with complaints about this, that the subtlety that it's supposed to finish at six, and it's run on into seven. Do you really think that's in, you know, enforceable? I suggest it won't be, and it's beyond what anybody and I'm sorry for mixing my metaphors with regards to the man on the Clapham omnibus that who was referred to yesterday, and this is an audio example, so I am mixing

them, but most people would regard working beyond six as unreasonable. That's their leisure time. So whatever the notion that this could be construed as operate, you know, mobilization or demobilization, is completely, utterly unenforceable. Thank you very much.

44:08

Councilor Overton,

44:10

Thank you. I'd like to raise a different point, if I may, although I certainly support what's just been said, the issue that I wanted to talk about was community benefits. We know that they're not enforceable. They're not required to provide anything, but there might be ways in which they could help our local industries. So Lincolnshire has a proud manufacturing heritage gas turbines, and also Scunthorpe for steel sector, the applicant does not appear to have considered the potential to sustain local manufacturing, or indeed taking steel, for example. So if they said that the steel was going to be taken from local or at least greater Lincolnshire suppliers, I think that would specify in that. Could be helpful. And I think, for example, this was done in the third when the third runway at Heathrow, it has a committee to to use to has committed, sorry, to the use of UK steel. So something simple like that might be helpful. It's it's disappointing the applicant has not committed to UK steel, then we'd like to see that. Thank you.

45:28

Thank you, Mr. Elvin.

45:40

Thank you, Mr. Elvin Digby and Cliff villages Action Group. Yeah, I've got three points to make, really one of those is on hours now, given the unpopularity and what's viewed by many people in the local area as the destructive nature of what's being proposed by the applicant. I'm concerned about those working hours. I believe the construction industry for far too long has been allowed to start far too early. I don't regard seven o'clock in the morning for heavy machinery to start lumbering around and being started up, even if it's not going to immediately be used warmed up in the winter, seven o'clock that's still dark. A lot of people are in bed still. And why shouldn't they be so I think that's way too early to be starting and too late to be finishing. I can't see why the construction industry can't work on a nine to five basis. I think that would be a lot more acceptable to local people who find the whole concept of what's being planned unacceptable anyway, and have to wake up to that, to that noise, to the rumblings, to the banging and crashing, to the beep, beep, beep of vehicles reversing and so on and so forth. And how you're going to control a lot of that. I, you know, I'm very skeptical, and I think the first thing is to control it on the times. And I'm concerned that nkdc haven't been a lot more robust about that, then you need to look after the residents that have elected you, or pay their council tax to the to the council. They need to be looked after. The other thing that I wanted to raise, I said there were three, but I'll reduce it to two. I'm concerned. I think it'd be remiss not to say something about the potential, and they are potential. We don't know. We don't really know for sure, at the minute, the potential for physical illness as a result of some of the materials that may or may not be contained within solar panels, there is a high probability that there will be PFAs, PFAs chemicals, these are chemicals have a very long lifespan. They're very resistant to decay and destruction in the environment. They will they have quality properties like reducing resist reflectivity, reducing reflection, which would be good for solar panels, because you don't want the sunlight being reflected. You want it in there.

48:54

Sorry, to cut in. Yeah. But just on that point about we asked a question, our first round of questions about that specific point, and the applicant came back to confirm that there wouldn't be any of that particular chemical used on site. Am I right in remembering that?

49:12

Well, can I just say that it's actually a family of chemicals numbering? We're not sure. I mean, you get different numbers quoted on it, and these are numbers quoted from the Environment Agency and from the DWI, the drinking water inspectorate, that these things can find their way into the soils, into the groundwater, into the water courses, and into the crops as a result of that, and therefore into the human food chain. And I don't know whether the applicant can really give a definite answer on that. There's such a huge group of them, and they're so good for increasing conductivity, which you want with electricity, they're so good at being non stick if you want, and therefore reducing the amount of grime and deposits which you don't want on so. Of the panel. So, you know, well, that's a very important area. It's a very gray area at the moment, and needs a lot of particularly as a lot of these panels are being produced abroad, and we don't fully know what's going in. I mean, it's not always easy to detect what they are. Is a scenario. It needs to be very seriously taken, I believe. Thank you. Okay, thank you.

50:25

Neil, totally on behalf of the applicant, just to respond to your point, madam, you're correct in that the applicant committed that PV sales would be PFAs free. That's secured in the proposed development parameters. Rep, 1029, and that's despite the panels being a sealed system, so there should not be any leakage of any kind. But despite that, we've taken that comment into account and made that commitment. Thank you.

50:52

Thank you for confirming the

51:09

um, so Mrs. Overton, if you just bear with me, just now I was going to ask the council just about the enforcement point that Mr. Lyons raised, and just about whether things are clear enough in the framework, construction, environmental management plan, so that both local residents would know what to expect and what not to expect when, and also for your enforcement powers. However, I'm aware that we've got the DCO session tomorrow, so I think it's something that we could probably pick up in a little bit more detail there. I'm just saying that because I'm conscious that we've got a sort of a hard deadline of one o'clock, and we've still got to do cultural heritage this afternoon well before one. So I think we'll leave that point until tomorrow.

51:58

North Castine District Council, yes, I was going to suggest I'll have a conversation with Mr. David about the enforceability and the detail in the framework, construction, environmental

52:10

management plan. Thank you. Does the applicant want to sorry, Mrs. Overton, I realize you had your hand up. Is? Is it? Short and something that we've not already touched on?

52:25

Yes, you know, I never talked for very long at a time, just to say that the point was raised about the health impact assessment not being included, and the relevant officer from the county council pointed out that it would be helpful, because it would actually look at a bit more about the impact, rather than in more, in a more in a better way. It is, I think, within the powers of the council, or indeed of the inquiry to

request that. And I think because it's so important and so far reaching that I think that that could be included, perhaps just, just ask for a report on that.

53:07

Thank you. Thank you. I'll turn to the applicant. Do you want to briefly come back on anything of the recent points that we've touched on

53:18

very, very quickly by May Reuben Taylor for the applicant, the working hours, of course, form part of the construction environmental management plan, and that has to be complied with by requirement 12, three. A breach of that plan is a criminal offense, and that's one of the reasons why it's enforceable. In relation to that last point about the requirement for an additional document. It started from the premise that there hasn't been an assessment. There has been an assessment. We've produced a document that the council, the councils have been provided with that draws together where in the environmental statement that assessments set out, and that's going to be hopefully with you by deadline three, but if not deadline three, a

54:07

thank you. Yes, I think on the point about the health impact assessment, I think we need to wait to see the note, because obviously we as the examining authority haven't had sight of that yet. We'll see what that sets out for us and whether we need to to probe in any more detail on that particular matter. Thank you.

54:39

Mr. Kobish, is it a very quick point that we've not already touched on? Okay?

54:53

Gordon covish Thorpe on the Hill resident, yes, in all this discussion, I've heard nothing mentioned on the word lighting. Days, which presumably in the winter months would be appropriate. As regards working hours, I don't know if that's something that needs to be featured at some time. And secondly, where you're having specific tasks such as pile driving, would there be or could there be a requirement that the village has to be notified so we know how long the thump, thump, thump of pile driving is going on, whether we have to expect it for a week or a fortnight or whatever. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Corbyn,

55:41

so that ends the population effects one. So I'll hand back to Mr. Gould to take us through cultural heritage. Thank you.

55:51

Thank you. Are the right members of the team sitting at the table for the applicant.

56:00

Yes, Reuben Taylor for the applicant,

56:04

and looks like the councils are set up as well. Yeah, Taylor,

56:16

then if you could do some introductions to the council.

56:19

So I think it's 123, to my right is Mr. Mr. Sutton, who will be dealing with this part of the agenda,

56:30

and then for the council's first

56:39

Stephen District Council, I'll be saying a short piece on behalf of Council, but unfortunately, Mr. Bentley, councilors, conservation officer, unavailable for any of the hearing days this week, so I will be relaying his comments for probably any additional questions you have to

57:01

me, most of what's going to come here from me are a few questions, really just asking for updates. And if need to be putting a little bit of force on to get some information flowing, I can certainly do that. And then for Lincolnshire,

57:16

Lincolnshire county council, so Mr. Mark niceton, who is the council's built heritage officer is not available to attend today. He was yesterday. I'll just address you on an update in that respect. And then Ms, Jan Allen, who sits two to my left, deals with archeology.

57:41

Right. Beginning with above ground matters first, just turning to you, the applicant, can you give a brief update on what the state of Pele is with the preparation of the technical note? Covering ground designated sorry above ground, designated heritage assets that was referred to in rep two, hyphen zero, 30, and that we picked up also in our second round of written questions.

58:22

Do Rob Sutton, on behalf of the applicant, good afternoon. So in the first instance, you've just made reference to a technical note about designated heritage assets, just for the avoidance of doubt. So it's covering all types of built heritage and historic landscape not just designated heritage assets. The technical note covers two parts and the scope of both parts were agreed in correspondence with Mr. Knighton and Mr. Bentley. Via email correspondence included quite a lot of detailed discussions on that point, including the specific farmsteads that might be included as well. And that covers two parts. It's a further elaboration on the study areas that have been adopted, and additional information regarding designated heritage assets in some of those studied areas. So in fact, we're just showing additional working that was formed part of the scoping, as originally reported in the ES and the appendices and the second part of the note is additional information on the matter of the historic farmsteads and group value. That technical note was submitted in draft to both Mr. My, Mr. Knighton and Mr. Bentley yesterday morning, hoping to seek comments and agreement on at least the content and scope of the document, so it includes everything that they've expected to see, and hopefully some common ground on the conclusions too. And it will be our hope and expectation that we'll be able to deliver a agreed document to the examining authority. As per your request, or not before three a thank

1:00:16

you. Mr. Sutton, any observations from either North Keston or Lincolnshire about progress with this note

1:00:25

and hunt North Seaman District Council relaying Mr. Bentley's comments, I think what he'd say is he doesn't feel that the correspondence and liaison has been rapid, and that is a bit disappointing that we've only just received the notes in its first draft form, given that really, the District Council position on this hasn't changed since its relevant representation in late October. Mr. Bennett says he does need more time to look at the document. He's had an initial read. But one thing he's disappointed at is he feels that in respect of the scoping element, there is a lack of explanation and analysis on why some assets have been scoped out. But that that issue remains to date. We will endeavor liaise with the applicant and produces a position which is a, hopefully agreed on the scope, as Mr. Duncan indicated, and B, as far as possible, on the findings by deadline three A, but I will have to go back to that legacy, how he's fixed time wise, given that the gap between three and three A is quite short.

1:01:49

Thank you. Mr. Hunt for Lincolnshire County Council. Mr.

1:01:53

Shake for Lincolnshire county council, our position is largely the same. We received the draft yesterday morning, so Mr. Nice, and hasn't had a chance to properly review it yet, so essentially, we need some time to Properly review it and then come back in writing. Do

1:02:37

so it sounds like we should be in receipt of the document by deadline three a as we've indicated in other sessions of this hearing, the examining authority will be undertaking unaccompanied site inspections in the not too distant future. As part of those inspections, it's going to be important for us to know, particularly in terms of this emerging note, from the council's perspective, which buildings, whether they're designated or undesignated, you think we need to pay particular attention to, and if there are premises missing from the review that the applicant has undertaken, they will need to be identified to us as well so that we can come to a view as to whether or not we think we need to go and have a look at this, the relationship of the proposed development relative to the settings of those premises. So I think there's an action arising out of this hearing, whatever happens in terms of the production of the Note, we would ask that the council's make it clear that beyond the three cognitive initial analysis area that you highlight any any locations that you want us particularly go go to, so that we can factor that in to our unaccompanied inspections, which we will be doing in due course.

1:04:13

Ben, on behalf of Steven District Council, do you have an idea of when you'll be taking these further sub visits. You have a deadline. Was it just as soon as possible? It will be

1:04:25

as soon as possible. And it may well be that we, we will have to do two batches. We've got Easter coming up as well, which will create some complications in terms of potentially our availability. And we will soon be also trying to factor in the weather, because we might schedule a day, find the weather is awful, decide we've got to go with a different day or two. We think perhaps when we do the action list and publish. That we might be able to give some indication of weeks that we might target for unaccompanied inspection, which might help the local authorities in terms of identifying when they need to get to information to us as soon as possible. But I think as we sit here today, we ideally like to be informed, probably by three a

1:05:23

I think we can definitely do that. I know it's

1:05:29

difficult for you, Mr. Shape, because your your experts not available. But does that seem feasible? Yes, I'm told yes. Mrs. Foster seems to be indicating that She can make it happen. And

1:06:09

I think in terms of above ground built heritage, that's that's as far as we can take things to this in this hearing. So I'd like now to turn to buried archeology. I don't know why I said very because archeology always is. And again, Mr. Sutton, what what is the position with the updating of the framework written scheme of investigation.

1:06:39

Thank you, sir Rob Sutton, on behalf of the applicant, the framework written scheme of investigation. Comments have been received from both Historic England and Lincolnshire county council on the original draft. A meeting was held just last week, last Thursday, the fifth which with both Lincolnshire County Council, the applicant myself and Historic England as well, to further discuss the nature of some of those comments and give Historic England the opportunity to provide additional ones, which was their original instruction to us. They were keen to do that. On the conclusion of that meeting, we committed to submitting a revised, updated one to both Historic England and Lincolnshire County Council this week, and that was done this morning.

1:07:39

And in your view, are you on track to have something available for submission by deadline three A

1:07:46

it is most definitely our intention to do that, sir. And if there are still matters in discussion between any of those parties, we'll make that clear to you with that submitted document. Thank you.

1:08:04

Then turning to Lincolnshire county council, are you able at this stage to give in, give any indication as to whether you think what's emerging in the revised written scheme of investigation is getting closer to addressing the concerns that you raised.

1:08:29

Jan Allen, Lincolnshire county council, excuse me, my voice always rose as soon as they turn the speaker on. My apologies.

1:08:45

Sorry, sir. In terms of discussion, we are involved in ongoing positive discussions, along with Historic England, with the applicant, and I think we are moving forward towards that document reflecting the future commitment that will be what we're looking for in terms of adequate evaluation and reasonable mitigation measures for developmental impacts that we currently do not know and which have yet to be details of which have yet to be provided. I think what we have is a situation where we are quite opposed in terms of assessment of what the potential impacts will be and the degree of impact, however, we are in ongoing discussions about the methodology and approach and scope of the future commitment that will be need to be undertaken in order to adequately understand the RTL. As it survives across the order limit, and for there to be an archeological management plan, an archeological clerk of works who will be in post from the beginning up through to decommissioning and to reversion to arable agricultural land as these all involve aspects that we do Not currently know the details of the ground impacts for

1:11:04

Thank you, Mr. Sun, have you got any observations terms of what you've just heard from on Lincolnshire Kent Council's behalf?

1:11:13

Nothing from me, sir. I

1:11:28

next question, maybe something the applicant will need to take away rather than

1:11:36

now, but in terms of buried archeology and preservation Institute, what scale of avoidance

1:11:53

might start to render the proposed development unviable through either scaling back array array areas or having something have an impact on the available room within the cable corridor now, Mr. Snedden has been very quiet with us. Dana, this might be something that for him, in terms of if significant areas of the site start to be affected, because perhaps archeology that's not expected the moment starts to become more apparent. Is there a point at which this project might start to suffer in terms of lesser area being available, for instance, so you may not be able to address this here and now, you might want to come back post hearing

1:12:49

you and Snedden on behalf of the applicant. There are various ways that you can mitigate archeological finds under array areas. It does depend exactly on what the archeology is. If there was something found, we would obviously have discussions with the local authorities archeologists about the best way to mitigate it. One option that has been used for certain types of archeology is to use our sort of ballast Foundation, rather than a driven pile. So effectively, you keep their ground disturbance to a minimum. Obviously that doesn't work for cable routes, so we would redesign the scheme around not having cable routes running through those areas, which is one of the reasons we were retaining the flexibility of where they could go within our work plans. There are other types of archeology that archeologists feel that the ballast foundation is not suitable mitigation, and often we would just exclude those areas from the development area that can be compensated by using flexibility that we have built into the outline design parameters around the spacing between the array tables, where we could slightly reduce that across the whole scheme, still staying within our outline design parameters to maintain the capacity that we have. The consequence of that for the applicant or the undertaker would be a slight reduction in the energy energy generated per megawatt, but there is quite a lot you can do to that to minimize those those impacts, whilst avoiding areas of sensitive archeology.

1:15:01

Thank you. Thank you.

1:15:31

It can council want to respond in terms of the mitigation that might be employed to try and avoid any archeology that we don't know about at the moment. It sounds like, from what Mr. Sledden is saying, that there is quite a lot of flexibility within the scheme design. Look, if exclusion zones were required, for instance, there might still be a viable project without archeology, in effect tipping the balance.

1:16:08

Janelle in Lincolnshire county council, thank you, sir. Yes, we are obviously pleased that in the applicant's response there is an understanding that we would need to have sufficient evaluation in order to understand the character, the depth, the extent of areas of surviving archeology, those would need to be fenced off if they're going to be preserved in situ for the duration of the stream, or until, for example, another type of mitigation is for it to be excavated, strip map and record monitored, so as long as there's an archeological process that's going to be ongoing, those areas, the sites Need to be the extent needs to be determined, and they need to be fenced off, and that needs to be something that's a monarch monitorable process, because for the evaluation that's been undertaken so far, we know that archeology survives across these this stream at Less than 30 centimeters from the ground surface. So I'm sure the planning authority will appreciate that plant movement on a wet February is a day is going to have an impact in terms of things like compaction or damage or destruction. So we just need to be aware of what's going to be happening in terms of the potential developmental impact, and the fact that there's flexibility built into the scheme is obviously extremely positive, and we just need to be working together to get sufficient understanding to have an appropriate mitigation strategy to deal with the archeology that survives across the scheme. So this is all to play for, and this is exactly what happens in terms of archeology and development works for the past, however many decades, one would hope that the size of this scheme would mean you'd need a tremendous amount of very exciting archeology for it to become something that would make the stream unviable in terms of cost. So it's the reason why we strongly encourage there to be early engagement, which absolutely the applicant has been doing early evaluation, where we've got an understanding that there will be impacts, early exchange of information, when the applicant knows what sort of ground impact there's going to be, and their methodologies and what areas In the development order limits are going to be subject to extensive ground impact and all of these things, the developmental impact and the archeological potential are the two things that we need to understand. The earlier we are in the scheme for understanding the more that that can manage risk and be incorporated in terms of not only the budget, but also the work program, so that things can be accommodated. Archeology tends to become expensive when it's unexpected and during the work program, and when you have the situation of having to stand down plant and people, that's where it starts to get expensive. Thank you.

1:19:58

Think I've only got one other. Question for quite sure, who, who will deal with this in responding,

1:20:16

in responding to our first round of written questions? He 101 B, which, which dealt with ground disturbance. There's reference to horizontal displacement, 20 centimeters by 20 centimeters in respect of the supporting structures for the solar arrays. But there was no indication to what depth that was take being taken to so that you could actually understand the cubic volume that was being affected. Are you able to give an indication now, or do you want to take that one away and deal with it in writing. Post hearing

1:21:03

Rob Sutton on behalf of the applicant, the nature of the archeology that's been discovered across sites so far, and any rational predictive modeling of the type of archeology that one might find across the site as well can suggest that the depth of the pile in is deeper than the known archeological remains. So, in effect, the extraction, which I believe, is the point you're referring to there. So the displacement of material as a pile is extracted could be larger than the area of the pile itself. In that instance, it would it would remove any archeological remains that the pile has encountered across that cross sectional area. But of course, it's, it's it's worthwhile just making absolutely clear here that the volume of displaced material is isn't necessarily the relevant consideration. It's just part of an understanding of whether the archeological interest has been lost or has been depleted in some way, and there that

that's where the harm is occasioned. So in effect, you can, you can just assume that all of the piles are deeper than any of the archeology anyway.

1:22:39

Thank you, Mr. Thompson, I think that then does bring us to the end of gender. Item three, the four multi poles under any other business, conscious of where we are, time wise and

1:23:04

in term, I'm turning really to North kesterman District Council, as far as the national grid proposal for the proposed substation is concerned, is, has there been any progress in terms of an application to the what the timescale for that might be

1:23:25

bent on North Caden District Council. I haven't seen the email myself. I wouldn't say progress more an update, and subject to clarification, which I can provide fairly promptly after this, because they haven't seen an email. I am my understanding is the application has been put back until at least the middle of April. Give a schedule for late this month, but it's now into April, but I will check that that date I was informed about verbally.

1:24:03

Thank you, Mr. Hunt. I think what we will say to the applicant, this perhaps, seems to be a bit of a me moving target, is that as and when an application is submitted, and presuming that is prior to the close of the examination, we would like some sort of information submitted that, if that sumises What the proposal is, and some visual information, terms of where the substation is on plan and any visual, innovational type stuff and block plans that may have been submitted. So at least we've got some understanding of what that proposal is, so that we, when we're reporting particularly on cumulative matters, we can take that on. Board. This is the sort of issue I think it caused problems for one of the offshore wind farms off the East Anglia coast, where the applications were out of sync, and the examining authority that was dealing with the first of the wind farms didn't have any information about a proposed substation for the adjoining project, the the other project caught up. So the second of examining authority was able to take both substations into account when it made its recommendations, when the Secretary of State decided the first application, it was unable to take much account of the second substation, and then that then led to a problem in the High Court, with that permission being quashed. So this is an area that we're a wee bit sensitive to. I'm presuming the applicant will take, will be content to do what it can if that if the information is in the public domain by the time this examination closes.

1:26:10

Reuben Taylor, for the applicant, yes, sir, that will make sure that that's done.

1:26:21

And my final question, I think this will direct is to be directed both to the applicant and the councils, but we'll, we'll suggest you provide this answer in writing, post hearing, and it's really relating to under what circumstances do you consider the policy relating to critical national priority? CMP, in short, as stated in national planning policies statement en one should be applied because the applicant in various of your documents, for instance, the submitted planning statement, which is as hyphen zero 98 has used the phrase CMP presumption, or we just like some clarity as to how you think CMP should be applied, whether it's automatic in this case, whether it might be stepped depending on weightings that may arise in the planning balance. When all the various issues are being considered just that phrase, CMP,

presumption is a wee bit of concern, but I say we'd like to hear both from the applicant and the council's on that point.

1:28:09

Were there any other out other business? Yes, I'm locked in air of outstanding beauty mode for something.

1:28:22

Are they not even called that

1:28:29

legally, they are any other AOB from anybody, applicant side.

1:28:38

Revere the applicant. Do you want us to run through a list of actions, or in a minute, okay,

1:28:44

any other AOV from anything from the councils, anything from anybody else. This is Overton.

1:28:53

Thank you. I just like to say thank you. You've had to listen to an awful lot from an awful lot of us. And I appreciate that you have tried to take short make both of you have tried to make sure that all of the points that people were able to raise were at least properly considered. So much appreciated. Thank you.

1:29:09

Thank you. Mrs. Evan, that's that's our role. That's why we sit here so

1:29:23

right then, if we can have a quick answer through action points, is there somebody from the applicant's team who's Oh, Mr. Taylor is getting something for the first time. I've got, I've got some scruple notes. I've managed to keep them in one place this time. So I think I've got most of them, other than the later ones of today, where I might have been talking and writing in another now.

1:30:00

Book. So Reuben Taylor for the for the applicant I've got, I've just been handed a list, so I'm going to rely on this.

1:30:10

So would it be easier if I recount what I've noted down until I stopped?

1:30:16

Whatever way you want to do is fine by me.

1:30:19

Well, shall I shall I start? Yeah, so the first action I've got is, in effect, an updating of the solar technical note. Well,

1:30:38

actually, no, that, that's wrong. That's a parking place for various actions. First action, really is an more detailed explanation of how the best storage system operates, with a bit of seasonality in the mix. Then second point, a full explanation of SDC and no TC and how they particularly relate to over planting.

1:31:22

The third point, really, I'm trying to read my hieroglyphics. It's the environmental stewardship point and plans to be submitted by the applicant identifying the areas of the order limits that are under stewardship at the moment is that tally with what you've gotten.

1:31:48

I've got a couple of additional ones, Reuben Taylor for the applicant. So the first one we had was that we were to review the works numbers in Churchill, one of the draft ECA to ensure there's no unnecessary duplication across work numbers in relation to the update to the the technical guide, we had a third element to correct, a reference to Little Crow in table 10, one to 99 point, right? So that was one of the one of the points and we had prior to the stewardship point, we were to advise what information is in the public domain for Springwell in relation to the applicant for Spring while seeking to optimize or renegotiate its grid connection.

1:32:56

Next on my list were actions for North Kesteven District Council, which I've got it Part A it's the note that Mr. Hunt referred to yesterday in respect of stepping out network.

1:33:26

And then my my four point B was some sort of note relating to the operation, or what the Lincolnshire landscape restoration scheme.

1:33:44

And the application that's made been made,

1:33:48

yes, sir. I think it was a slightly different name, but I understand what you mean. Yeah. Clarify on that,

1:33:53

yeah, unfortunately, I got to the bottom of the page and it got very small. I think everybody takes the point. Yeah,

1:34:30

and next point I've got relates again, another action for Mr. Hunt. He was volunteering to do a lot yesterday. That's clarification with respect to permissive paths, and I think that was really to share as quickly as possible with the applicant, so that any of that are being proposed that are already paths can be identified and have. And can recalculate lengths and whatnot of permissive path Mr. Taylor, does that accord with what you've got your list?

1:35:08

So yes, it does. I've got two additional matters from prior to the permissive pass point the applicant was to explain the nuances in relation to matters relating to plant, to planting counting as both mitigation and towards bng. For example, hedgerows, landscape and visual mitigation counting towards bng. That is the first of the two additional points I've got. The second is that the applicant was to take away point about the quantity of hedgerow removal within the application documents, a potential discrepancy.

Looking at schedule 11 of the DCO in paragraph 322, of the bng report is at 174 and I've got another point about nkdc to share the section 106 agreements for hangington fen and Springwell,

1:36:15

yep, the next one that was coming on highly Okay, I'm getting ahead of you. Sorry. That was fine. So yeah, Mr. Hunting, yes, undertaking. Yes, that's wrong phrase, given that we're talking about an undertaking. But yeah, the 106 agreement relating to heckerting, heckington fen and

1:36:51

and I think turning to Today, sharing or the health and well well being note to be submitted, not later than deadline, three a if earlier, all well and good, and that's at the point I stopped noting things down.

1:37:15

Reuben Taylor for the for the applicant. So from from yesterday, we've got a note of an action for LCC to check the definitive map in relation to the naming conventions for public rights of way. So that was one. The next action was for the applicant to review the laboring of public rights of way on rep two, iPhone 004, and to consider whether, if that's amended to give the full naming of the policy would be consistent with the drafting of schedule six of the DCO. I remember your stern warning about that

1:37:58

one, sir, we certainly haven't the next point I've got is about the party. So that's to say the applicant, LCC and nkdc to submit count data, information for the usage of public rights of way within the order limits of the proposed development. So

1:38:27

and then on to further on to delay in relation to maintenance activities, the applicant was asked to list or signpost the likely maintenance activities. So

1:38:43

and then I've got four more. The next one is nkdc or LCC to provide, by deadline, three a details of any areas to be visited on the unaccompanied site inspections in relation to to heritage, although I think you said ASAP on that too. The next one is for the applicant to submit the framework WSI at deadline three a noting any point still being discussed with LCC and Historic England. I think that was also to embrace the document relating to to build heritage, or rather, above ground heritage to and then the penultimate action I've got is for nkdc to check and confirm The current plan date for the submission of the nav and be substation further, think we're all going to be checking that one. And then finally, for the applicant, nkdc and LCC to confirm in writing under what circumstances it's considered the. Critical national priority criterion, but policy should be applied and provide clarity as to the approach to take to that.

1:40:14

That's that's our list.

1:40:15

Thank you, Mr. If we could ask for that to be sent to the case team, and then we'll compile with what in my very scribbled notebook versus what's on your list, and get that issued.

1:40:30

It's been taken away before I can delete it. So

1:40:33

very grateful for that. For North caviar, city, coastal I assume it will be forwarded to us at the same time. Thank you.

1:40:42

And it should also be helpful to send to an English year at the same time so they can check but yeah, if, if everybody can try and get that sorted as quickly as possible so that we can get it issued as early as possible next week, that would assist everyone. Right that, then does take us to the close of this hearing. Thank you everyone for your assistance. This hearing is therefore now closed, and some of us will be coming back later this afternoon, at two o'clock for compulsory acquisition hearing two. Thank you very much.