

AUDIO_DAENMOOR_OFH_SESSION1_13.11.25

Thu, Nov 13, 2025 3:07PM • 58:02

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Demore Solar Project, open floor hearing, virtual meeting, noise impact, buffer zone, visual impact, site inspection, written submissions, applicant response, local concerns, flood risks, commercial reasons, solar farm output, National Park, planning inspectorate.

SPEAKERS

Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 1, Speaker 5, Speaker 4

00:05

Good afternoon, everybody. The time's just past two o'clock. So it is time for this hearing to begin. So firstly, I'd like to welcome you all to the open floor hearing for the demore solar project. Can I just confirm that I'm audible and visible. So could the applicant perhaps raise a hand or turn a camera on please? Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Till I also confirm with Miss Robbins that the live streaming and recording has commenced. Yes, both have started. Okay, thank you. So for those that don't know me, my name is Matthew Woodward. I am a charter town planner, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as a single examining inspector to examine this application. You may also hear me, you'll see me referred to as the examining authority. So today's hearing is being undertaken virtually only, and we are all using Microsoft Teams. The hearing will be treated in the same way as an in person event for the purposes of examination. And as you have heard, the event is also being recorded and live streamed. A recording will be made available on the Dean Moore solar farm section of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible after the hearing is finished. So with this in mind, please do state your name and who you are representing each time before you speak, a link to the planning inspectorates privacy notice was provided in the notification for the hearing. If there are any questions about data protection laws and how customers data is handled by the inspectorate, then please do speak to either Miss Robbins or the case team. So with this event being virtual, and if we do need a break, I do intend to take a break after approximately one hour. If anyone wishes to take a break beforehand, then please do let me know. We did have a we had a hearing this morning, and there was a small issue from my side with the technology. So if that does happen, then either try and make me aware, or if necessary, I can adjourn the hearing so that you can try and address any connection issues. If you do completely get disconnected, try and reconnect to the to the to the to the call. If that fails and you may need to speak to the case team. And I do recognize as well that virtual working does present its own challenges. So I am going to be looking at different material on on various screens and are in paper form as well. So just bear with me and bear with other participants as well as we try and source material. Sometimes I may be looking away from the screen, but it doesn't mean to

say that I'm not listening to what's been said. So I have not prepared an agenda for today, and this is because it's the purpose of this hearing for me to hear representations of interested parties who have registered to make oral representations to this hearing, these representations should elaborate on any written representations made so far. So it's a chance for you to raise anything directly that you feel is relevant and important and which you think I need to consider. So I'm not going to put a time limit on proceedings or participants speaking today, but if I do feel the points not relevant, or I'm not sure where the conversation is going or discussion, then I may intervene. Please. Also know I am aware of general feelings about the proposal, and I have read the written representations that have been made by interested parties, so you don't need to repeat material that's already been provided. And once, once you have spoken, I may ask some questions, and I will also ask the applicant to respond. However, I would expect the applicant's response to be very concise, and any particular detail in relation to technical matters or anything that's particularly excessive should be provided in writing at the appropriate deadline, which would either be deadline number five on the 25th of November or deadline number six. So as with the other hearings this week, I would appreciate written submissions of your verbal submissions to this hearing by deadline number five, which is the Tuesday the 25th of November. So I'm just now going to briefly ask participants to introduce themselves today. So I'm going to start with the applicant, and then I will, I will try and go around the room based on the attendance list that I received. So could I ask the applicant just to introduce themselves or. The camera, Mr. Turtle, I assume soon that's you, if you'd like to introduce yourself and who, who may be speaking today.

05:06

Lee till, for the applicant. Thank you, sir. I'm aware that I'm probably the fourth person you've been seen over the last few days. I'm past the battle to be passed over to me. The intention is so that I it'll probably just be me speaking. We have do have some people on the line if needed. But I'm very correlated to the point you made, that the expectation is that any response that we give today will be really quite brief, and obviously confirm points in writing that that's definitely the starting point, but we will be taking so

05:34

Okay, thank you, Mr. Till. So just to confirm that if anyone else from from the applicants side does wish to speak today, if you if they just introduce themselves at the appropriate moment,

05:44

apologies, sir. Let's get the point. I should have said that clear. I didn't clarify for that. So I do apologize. If they do need to speak, they'll notify me separately, and I could just sort of introduce them for you. But as I say, the exhortation is that it should just be my good self that you have to sort of endure for the next, however, many hours and just I'm happy to be referred to as Mr. Toll, which you are doing as well already. So that's perfectly fine.

06:07

Thank you, sir. Okay, thank you. Okay, now I'll try and get around the room based on the attendance list, in no particular order. So on the screen, I have Susan Carlin and Malcolm Fulton. If you could just introduce yourselves and how you wish to be referred, whether that be Mr. Miss or whether you indeed you are speaking as one or separately. Thank you.

06:29

Hi, Malcolm Fulton, resident of [REDACTED], just call me Malcolm, that's fine.

06:35

Matthew. I'm Susan Carling from Resident [REDACTED] Malcolm will be speaking on behalf of both of us.

06:44

Okay, I will refer to you as Mr. Fulton, just to keep some semblance of formality to the hearing. But no, thank you, Mr. Fulton, point noted, and I will come to you when when it's your turn to speak. Thank you.

06:57

Thank you, Matthew, thank you.

07:00

Okay, Mr. Howell, could you introduce yourself? Please?

07:09

Hello, I'm James Howe. You can call me Jamie. I'm representing. I do represent a number of, indirectly, a number of interest groups, and I also represent the local interest as well, I think, which is sort of being under represented, even by its representative, and the National Park as well. I get to mention, I live on Red House State, which used to own all the land down in gilgaron as well. But I'm not representing the landlord who is not absentee, exactly, but it's holding trust. My family up there, who I thought I'd bring to the table includes partly because I just wanted to qualify my relevance for discussing certain points along the way, but Sir Thomas Fowle Buxton was my great, great grandfather, and he's on the portrait who was CEO for the largest brewery of its time, Truman Hanbury, Buxton, and he was also emancipated the known as the emancipators, because he brought the Act into Power that actually freed the slaves. And I was explaining earlier, he was an Anglo Saxon. He his pedigree goes, lineage goes back to Red Bull buckstone, certain who there's a scepter with a with a buck on top of it, and it's a stone not like Michael Caine, not a lot of people know that my grandfather, who was the youngest general in the army, British Army. Oh, he was also chair, founding chairman, of the RSPCA, and he introduced the capital into Scotland.

08:57

By, sorry, Mr. Mr. How can I just intervene there. Thank you that. I mean, that is interesting, but I just want to know this stage who you're representing, and can I just rewind, because you did suggest local interest groups. Are there any? Are you speaking on as yourself? You're not representing formally.

09:15

I don't formally represent an organization through a friend called Curlew action, partly because I've been observing curlews around here. These haven't been mentioned in any of the reports, but it's a breeding ground for Curlew which are endangered. So in that respect, I represent that. I represent fishing interests throughout the country, and I deal with, I have great arguments with the various

authorities about that, in particularly the Environment Agency I represent the National Park, because my mother over there, family came from these parts. She was a Radcliffe whose formal name was Derwentwater from. Basic and and then I represent my own interest in bringing out the truth of what I consider to be a scheme that's undeserved, not needed, and has been merited a huge amount of Not, not an amount of public attention at the moment, it appears a lot, but is sort of pretty forward.

10:27

Sorry, I don't wish to intervene, but I'm going to do it at this stage because I know I understand speaking, and I will come back to you shortly and give you an opportunity to put your points of view across. What I would say is I have read your written representations. And I'm particularly interested to know what specifically about the scheme you're concerned about. So when I come back to you, if you can just outline your concerns in relation to the scheme, that would be really helpful if you want to provide additional detail. And again, I have seen some of your recent written representations, and the most appropriate means to do that is through written form. At deadline number five, which is the 25th

11:05

of November, discuss that earlier, and we'll be doing that. I brought a matter to to your attention because it's come to my notice. I'm not sure whether you're aware of it, and I've sent an email with that effect, your your colleague, very kindly. So we went through it, and she suggested writing a full submission again, and I will be drawing the points, some of the points I'm drawing out from this become part of the the groundwork for a legal case. And I'm bringing, I'm going

11:39

to cut you off again, because I just want to hear at this stage who's going to speak today, and you will get your opportunity in the next couple of minutes. No, I'm fine. Okay, that okay? So thank you, Mr. Howell, that's fine. Mr. TURL, you have your hand raised. Is this something that needs raising at this particular junction, or

11:59

it is, sir, if that's okay. Lee till, for the applicant, just trying to seek a bit of clarity, sir, on whom Howell is representing. I've like yourself. I've read through the reps and documents you submitted, and it appears to the applicant that he's representing himself. He's not representing other interested parties. I just wanted to make that point. And if he is acting for other interested parties or groups, if you could formally confirm that position to our mind, sir, he is, is an interesting party, which is understood, but he's active himself.

12:27

Yes, okay, thank you. When I introduce Mr. Howell, I will ask him again, just to summarize, and my understanding is Mr. Howell, and I'm sure he'll correct me if I'm if I'm wrong. He has an interest in certain matters in relation to the National Park and various other things. But formally, he's representing himself. He's an interested party, but I will ask Mr. Hal to confirm in due course.

12:52

Thank you, sir. Sorry. Apologies. Cut across you. Thank you. The mention of the late discussion part, obviously they have already been participated in the in this conversation that appeared at the issue specific hearing. So obviously, the the Idnpa has participated already in this examination and this application, as you will be aware of. So I just want to make that point as well. Sir, thank you. Okay,

13:13

thank you. That's my understanding as well. Mr. Till, thank you. Finally, Mr. Barton, you are on the call, and I appreciate you on the call earlier as well. Of course, you're entitled to speak in this hearing. I just interested to know if you do wish to speak or you're here to observe. Tom Barton, to our property. Fe anticipating, but I'll purely be observing. Okay, thank you, Mr. Barton. Well, please raise your hand if you do wish to raise anything in particular. Thank you. Is there anybody else on the call who wishes or may wish to speak today, apart from, obviously, the applicant's representatives and Cumberland Council, I think, potentially on the call as well,

14:01

possibly not looking at the names. I don't think Cumberland Council are in attendance today. If that does change, obviously they can introduce themselves at the opportune moment. Okay, so I think I have a list there, therefore, of speakers, and in no particular order, I am going to ask Mr. Fulton, well, if you'd like to just tell me what he wants to tell me about the scheme and any concerns he may have. And I appreciate Mr. Fulton, you're speaking on behalf and with Miss Carling as well.

14:36

Hi, Matthew. It's just my main concern is the the distance between our boundaries to the solar farm, and looking at the present proposal, we've got approximately 100 84 meters on the road down to rig house, and 50 meters on the road up to pika. And I don't think that is anywhere near Big enough a buffer zone from our property, especially with the the wind that we get up here that's going to be blown through the panels, the noise from the inverters on Thompson heights, I think it needs to be pushed back quite the way further than what they've got on the plan. Now. Not that, but obviously the visual impact can be a big thing for us, whether it be trees blocking our view or looking at Panels. I just think on the scale of the scheme, there is a scope there to move give us a bigger buffer zone, if it was a two year scheme, fair enough, but not a 40 year scheme. I wouldn't like to be sitting here for the next 40 years. And my daughter, she's going to be moving in here, taking the business on. I wouldn't want her and her family to have to put up with noise for the next 40 years, we've already been here like 58 Well, I've been here 58 years, and my pens have had the place before us. So I just like you to consider before grant and plan admission that the applicant gives us a much bigger buffer zone between our boundaries and the actual proposed solar farm, that is my biggest concern.

16:53

Okay, thank you. I will let the applicant come back on noise, but just to touch upon a couple of well, one point in particular that you've just raised, the visual impact we had the issue specific hearing on Tuesday. I apologize, I can't remember, Mr. Porter, Mother, You attended. I know Ms Carling was there and made representation. The point I was going to raise here is that I am doing an accompanied site inspection on December 4, yeah, and so I am scheduled to go and look at some of the viewpoints, one or one of which is particularly close to your property. And there is a second viewpoint which is fairly

close as well. In addition, I do intend to walk, as I have done already, walk around the boundary, boundary roads. My question really is, is there anything specific? Are you wanting me to look from your property itself, ie the garden area, or you? Are you?

17:43

I think, I think, yeah, that would be good if you could call in and have a look from where we are, from our place. Okay, could I ask you?

17:57

Then, no, that's Fulton. I wonder if you could take the trouble to send an email or make a representation at this stage and write into the case team and just say that you'd like me to see from your property. And what I intend to do, therefore is I'm going to issue a site inspection itinerary approximately one week before the site visit site inspection. And so I do intend, therefore to include a visit to your property as well. So that would help me. Yeah, and then I'll be able to have a look from your property. If that's okay,

18:29

that'll be good. You'll just then, you know where we're coming from.

18:32

Matthew, okay, thank you. That's helpful in terms of noise, it's not, it's not for me to make the applicant's case or make any response, and I've heard a note of what you've said. I will give it an opportunity for Mr. Turle if he does wish to make any comments either on any of the points that have been raised by Mr. Fulton, but in particular, particularly regard to the noise.

18:58

Sorry. Apologies. Thank you, sir, Lee. Till for the applicant, just dealing with the noise point first, I no surprises. I mean, I'd like, obviously the ability to come back to you, for me in writing on this. It's an issue that has been well covered in the past, and we can obviously firm, firm up the position even further. I just think it's worth mentioning that as part of the application, we, the applicant did carry out a noise impact assessment to assess the potential noise impacts. It was might have been touched upon on the specific hearing on Tuesday. In terms of the TCO, there is a requirement in that, a noise requirement. I believe it's requirement 12, to try and sort of deal with these sort of issues. And I think it's also worth mentioning in that, if I just bear with me. So I just need the reference. If you look at rep 4030, which was the council's response to, I think your second round of questions, sir, and they responded to some of the points on sort of residential amenity, and they covered sort of points relating to Glinda glare and to noise. So. And they confirmed within that sort of response, so that they were broadly happy with, not broadly they were happy with the position of being the applicant had adopted in terms of noise, etc. So, but as I say, we'll respond more fully to the points that if that in terms of noise at deadline five, if I could just quickly touch upon the visual impact against we will formally respond in writing. I think it's fair to say that we have previously replied to Mr. Fulton in the past. I think it is worth just looking to rep two zero 10 or so rep 2010, which is the response to your written questions. I can't remember. Would it be your first round of written questions? If it was rep two, where we responded to questions relating to sort of this property in particular, and it's page 52 of that response. It's quite a long document, but if you look

at page 52 there is reference there, just sort of some of the points that the Mr. Fulton and MS calling raised, and they are so there's, there's this initial response there, we will obviously sort of back it up with a more formal response. I think you'll find actually, so that when you do go on the site inspection, I do think it's worth making the point, which is, in the answer I just referred you to, that a lot of the proposed development is hidden, restrict is hidden from the residential dwelling by the commercial property. That's sort of in between. So I think that's something that you'll obviously see for yourself when you are on on the site visit. And the last thing I just want to say so on this point, applicants response to the relevant representation that was submitted by Miss Carling, which I think was a and I think Mr. Fulton also submitted one, but it was the were effectively the same. So that's rep 1002, page 63, of that document is where we respond. We acknowledge that the fultons miscarried Mr. Fulton are the nearest residential home to the property. That's not disputed. Just make the point we have engaged with them, and she's talking about sort of the buffer zones that were repeatedly referenced by Mr. Fulton. I think it's worth pointing out that as a result of discussions that did take place, there was a large exclusion zone inserted in connection with the Work, Work Number one, works which are on schedule, one of the GCo Sir, where, which allows a sort of follows, if I recall correctly, will confirm it in writing. There's a topographic contour to the north of the property which we kind of followed and that. So there is a much bigger buffer zone than there was initially at the peer stage and the consultation stage. And my understanding is that that sort of additional exclusion zone was added at the request of the applicant in conversations that took place between the applicant and and the Fulton So, but we'll set out the position more thoroughly. But I think it just wanted to just bring those couple of documents to your attention. So well we I think we have touched upon proofs in the past as well.

23:06

I don't think 50 meters from our boundaries anywhere near big enough.

23:13

Thank you, Mr. Fulton, I understand, I think that this is one of these cases where I need to look at this on the site in particular. I think that's going to obviously help, because I'm going to be making the recommendation. I take the point. Mr. Fulton, I don't think Mr. Tales responses is likely to remove your objection. I didn't expect that. I'm just trying to understand the position of respective parties. But Mr. Fulton, while you're on the line, could I just ask one question? Do you have any concerns about the nature of, for example, the landscape screening or anything similar to that, or is it just the proximity of the scheme to your property, for the reasons you've set out?

23:53

I think if the the farm, the solar farm, is far enough away, I think it won't be a problem at all. We just don't want the total thing blacked out by trees so it's blocked the whole of our view. If you know what I mean, we don't. But if it's further, further, far enough away, it ain't going to be a problem.

24:20

I don't want to put words in your mouth at all, and that's not my intention. But is your your concern, is the distance, not necessarily the nature of the screening. So you you're saying the screening is not going to address the distance, okay? It

24:35

is the distance. It's not the nature. I've never, I've never raised any problems or the screening before, it's just the actual distance from our property that is my only concern.

24:48

Okay, Mr. Till, I don't want to turn this into a forum of backwards and forwards, but I will give you an opportunity to come back on on the points that have been raised by Mr. Fulton, and they may. There may be nothing to say on that, I'm not sure, but I will give you a chance if you'd like to come in

25:05

Lee till for the applicant. Thank you, sir. No, I would conquer what you said. I mean, there's no need to sort of batten backwards and forwards. I think we'll, we'll set our position. I think his position has been set out previously, and we'll just reconfirm that position in writing at deadline five for

25:19

you, sir. Okay, thank you and Miss Fulton, if you could just agree that or request a site inspection from your property, I'm sure that can be accommodated within the itinerary. Thank you. Was there anything else? Was there anything else? Sorry, go on, Miss Fulton.

25:38

Who did we email that to you? Matthew, it will be

25:41

to the case team. So it's the correspondence that Miss Carling has been using, I assume, in in in the past. So just the same, same address. Okay, no problem. Was there anything else, Miss Carling? Mr.

25:53

Fulton, no occasion. Thank you. Thank

25:59

you. Okay, thank you. Can I move on now to Mr. Howell.

26:09

Hello, yes.

26:10

Hi, Mr. Howell, would you like to tell me your concerns about, specifically about the scheme, and so before you do that, could you confirm I know you have interests in certain organizations and interests generally in the national park, but you are speaking as an interested person, from a personal perspective. Is that

26:29

correct? Yes, I am, yeah. So initially, yes, but what I'm laying is a groundwork for other interventions at a later stage, if it goes through,

26:43

but I do. I think my question is going to authorize you. You're not speaking on behalf of any of the organizations that you refer to, so you're not a formal spokesperson for them. I'll make that assumption.

26:56

Yes, yes, yes, okay, that's fine. But basically, I'm in touch with an awful lot of people, including a political party as well, but I do have a number of issues that I need to sort of clarify, and some with the applicant. One is very basic, and is why make the decision to to apply for this site, and what is the motive behind that? And I don't think it's clear why put a solar park on an unfit site to generate what they assumed to be a certain output. As I made clear, it is certainly not the case, and I put that little legal trip wire in there, but I then will go. So that's a question I'd like the applicant to sort of draw to everyone's attention, because it's pertinent to to why locate there? And the purpose of solar farms is to locate them in areas where they optimize solar output, not minimize them. And this is extending over a site of considerable length. There are local concerns. One thing I did gather yesterday was that a lot of the locals, including an entire village, feel very bullied by the over a period of time by first the coal mine, the endless trucks, they're now going to have to face two years of more of that, and this is sustained yesterday, then the other aspect I want to find out is how the government is involved in in the project, and are there subsidies? Is it directly or indirectly involved, etc, etc. I have a question about relevance to the output, because the output is relevant to why have a you know why it's going to try and justify being located at the site is being presented as a slight, frankly absurd number. And then the batteries, which are essential to any solar or wind energy are being removed again, partly because there are huge liability and fire risk. I brought to attention just now the question of Surrey on the site and the damage, the substantive damage to the ancient stone monument. I did mention to your colleague earlier that my grandfather's family stands back to affalac, who was king of the isle, actually, King of Avalon, fought to be in cumbra. So relevant his time. That's just, you know, to be light hearted about it. It's, it's. Pertinent to know why the batteries are being removed, because they're pertinent to having a sustainable output from a technology that, frankly, is 20th 20th century, not 21st Century. And as you know, Maya my notions for small modular I noticed the announcement by the Secretary of State this morning. I still can't see why he doesn't utilize the existing workforce here, which is a diminishing qualified, skilled workforce in nuclear power. And I simply don't believe that solar energy is needed because of small nodular I don't think you even need large nuclear, which is highly risky. Small non gear was conceived. I had a long discussion with the accountant, seller. Feel about it a few years ago, but earlier in in a process of my discussing why aircraft carriers go around the world safely in nuclear plants and that have been carried through to a report on the aircraft carrier in question and Rolls Royce, so I just like to sort of drop that in a little bit. Can we get some answers to that? Why? Why choose this site? You know, it has a number of problems with it, which I've outlined. I'm going to outline further, none of which have been addressed. There are also the flood risks. The matter of the slurry is pertinent to that, because, as I said to wrote you, there are, there was after your site expense, literally a couple of days after 12 inches of rain in 48 hours, I submitted some random figures, not random, but sort of figures that weren't detailed, because I haven't got time to make a detailed report. The applicant certainly should, and he hasn't. Is the, you know, the effects of that, if then slurry, which is possibly illegal, but certainly poisonous, almost certainly illegal, that's contained within the site, then flooding into the streams and then down into working to and into the the whole entire Derwent system at the mouth

of the river, apart from The flood risk along the way in the Marin and then, apart from that, the flood risk increasing in workington too. It is a substantial people never realize. And you know, the Environment Agency have failed to do this several times in in the recent floods in this region, which have been huge. And the recent event is the third event in 15 years. These are considered to be 200 year old events. They're now recurring. You might argue, well, this Solar Park is going to prevent all that, you know, because it's taking carbon out of the atmosphere. I don't want to get into the ark and the semantics of that, but suffice to say, it's going to have absolutely zero, net zero effect on it. But what it will do is bring problems to the area, and I don't think those have been investigated sufficiently. So I know it's your job to invest so you're in the process of putting that into action, I hope. But if I could have some answers to that first question, I didn't hear anything about the report and the unsightliness, particularly to the ancient monument. Do you think people want to come and see an ancient one and visualize a huge array of solar panels across, you know, several 100 acres. Everything is 760 or something, which they do from the monument, which is cited there for a reason. It has that view across the Solway, which wasn't mentioned by any of the the concern people like the Environment Agency. This is why I say I represent all these interests. I have been challenged and a great deal locally, but also nationally. On the Environment Agency on salmon conservation, and the Marin is a Salmon River too, apart from only seeing so pollution coming from the site into the Marin will affect those as well. So there are a whole range of things which. Pulling together. It goes better in writing, but I do right now, would like to have answers from the applicant as to why he wants to locate here, and, you know, persuade me why, why there's good reason for it when there are plenty of other sites which are reasonable and and more appropriate, and this technology is more appropriate for urban areas, not rural areas.

35:30

Okay, thank you, Mr. Howell, I do think that your concerns as detailed, given the detail, I know you've articulated much of this in writing, but I think it would help me if you could articulate the points you've just made in writing for deadline number five, and I will ask the applicant to come back now. But again, it would help me if the applicant could provide responses in writing as well, because it seems to me that there's various topics here and probably reference to vast amounts of material which is just too cumbersome to go through in this in this hearing. So are you able to do that? Mr. Howell,

36:06

oh, yes, certainly. But I do. I think that fundamental question of, Why do you want to locate on this particular site? The other, other point, I just will make clear for the record here and voice it is that this site was a coal mine, which was then, after it was closed down, decommissioned in the sense that British coal, which quite unusually, planted it and considered to let to to the outlying areas, to let it settle down. And now what's been considered is putting back a technology onto it, and all the problems that associated with that come back into the local area and affects the local people, small, small amounts, as they are. When I went into workington Yesterday, every person it wasn't only a small number said they didn't want it. One or two said they didn't know anything about it. And that I perceive as something to do with both for the media, but possibly also the local representative who has an interest in this project going ahead. So I've made those points clear, and what I do want to know from the applicant is, what is his commercial and reasoning behind choosing the site?

37:32

Okay? Thank you. I will ask. I will ask the applicant if they would like to respond now at all. But as I say, I think some of these points are probably better dealt with in writing. Mr. TURL do would you like to come back and point or any of the points raised?

37:48

Thank you, sir. Let's the applicant now, as you say, the quite a lot of points raised, so it was difficult to keep keep abreast of all of them. I think the position is probably massively best served if we do respond to you in writing. I was going to ask the question, if Mr. Howell could confirm in writing the points he's been he's raised, you've already asked for that to be done, which would be very helpful we have. We are taking notes of this conversation, but it would certainly help if matters could be sort of put down in writing so we can then respond properly and formally to those points, can I just check, sir, if Mr. Howell does submit his comments in writing by deadline five, would we then have until deadline six to respond to those comments?

38:34

Yes, that's correct. If the response is coming by deadline five, there is an opportunity for responses to Deadline five, deadline six. So there is opportunity, if that, if the response comes in early, then the chances are I'll be able to accept that response. You may be able to respond by deadline five, but irrespective one way or another, you will have the opportunity to respond to the comments that Mr. Howell is, I'm sure, going to articulate in writing.

39:03

Thank you, sir. Sorry. Apologies, Lee till for the applicant. Thank you, sir. I mean, we will try and respond to some of the points that have been raised verbally in writing without waiting for Mr. Howells's formal response. We'll do what we can, but obviously it will be helped by the points being formalized so and we're conscious that you need, obviously, as much notice as possible to receive our responses.

39:27

I think, I think I make a point. It's a very simple question, what commercial reason is there was this site vacated in the first place? Were you? Mr.

39:42

Howell, I mean, the purpose of the meeting is for you to put your views across. Now I have asked the applicant if they wish to respond. I'm not going to force a response, because I am you. There will be a response, provided it might be that that response is better articulated in writing.

39:57

Okay, I do you. I will bring that into my summation, into possible observation, but I certainly will put my set, my points. Up till now, I haven't had any decent responses to any of the points I made. I think they think I don't know what I'm talking about. The certainly in the local area, they think that the applicant comes along and they have answers for everything. And I've made it quite clear, some of them are in Disney World, and the others are quite clearly, you know, in breach. So the proof will be in the pudding, as it were, I'm trying to prevent that from happening anyway. In fact, you will probably prevent the applicant from serious damages anyway, if he doesn't proceed with this plan. But the first one is the

output that that is quite clear, and I've made even a rough calculation provides provided using the information that that all of them use. And then, as I sent through, going to post up the photographs, and thing is the azimuth of the lie underlying land. And there are no surveys, I don't think I haven't seen any. And then they yield output per perfect and they have had plenty of time to carry out those surveys too. And you know, simply to say it's going to power 50,000 homes, quite frankly, rubbish.

41:39

Okay, thank you, Mr. Howell, I think the other point to raise is, and I will be reporting on what, I think the record board, what the recommendation should be, whether that be that this should be allowed in the order made, or that the order be rejected, but ultimately, the Secretary of State will make the final decision, but irrespective of which, any comments You make will then will be forwarded and provided a summary points to the Secretary of State for them to make their decision. So you may or may not get the response you want from the applicant. I'm not suggesting either way, but I am saying concerns will be reported.

42:16

But what I made clear to you is is the legal implications that I brought up, another legal implication, which implies, is implied of the the the applicant, which in writing, it hasn't been published, and that might come through to do with the monument and site and collusion is a technical word I used, which is there going to come through to them again, but to make to the Secretary of State does the same sort of thing about this technology, and is to create this vast illusion of its importance, and it isn't an important technology, except that it might be incorporated into buildings in particularly in cities, and it's only appropriate where it's close to cities, and the effects of it on the public interest and benefits are much better applied on buildings of their own. But it isn't farms that take out agricultural land, you know, it may be spent. It's only 1% in 2050 you might be gasping for that extra food security. Now, final point is to do with this whole concept of climate change and the illusion which President Trump thinks is a scam. I do believe in climate change. I don't necessarily believe it's all kind of I call myself an Argonaut because I have a different interpretation of it. He used to use the example of two professors being carbon molecules. Who, given the conversion from a carbon dioxide atom, would be several miles apart, jumping up and down. That's but the point about net zero, it's not that. And this comes true from my father's discussions, and anyway, they were more concerned with population as it affects climate change. Is that is that it's Net Zero is rather like an aircraft running out of fuel, and net zero is timed with the the period about 2060 the world will be running out of oil altogether. So. There won't be necessity for carbon reduction, as you put it, and that is the energy security that needs to be in place. This technology is only 20 years long, if that. And by the way, there's a world shortage in materials to make glass. It's a specific type of sand. And you may sort of raise your head, but that's true. It's 20 years long. So it takes us from here to the period when this energy is going to be needed so it won't be utilized into that balance. So it's not about net zero, it's about the fact that there won't be any fuel anyway, and alternatives are needed. And you need secure alternatives. You also need practical solutions to to the national security in terms of defense of visa sites as well. Ukraine war shows the potential for that, and small module takes care of that, particularly locally, can be planted in the hills as well. There are and then food security, as I said, you know, at the period when climate change will be affecting and Argonaut, by the way, is about argon, an inert gas, but it's a huge insulator and abundance through the atmosphere and creates what we call the blue planet. So what you have is an

assertion that this technology is needed, essentially for national needs, and therefore your body is brought into certain planning, and it has no relevance whatsoever to what is actually going to happen, or net zero. So I wanted that point Absolutely, abundantly clear when the applicant makes an absolutely dead on clear answer to my question about why located here and what is its purpose.

47:14

Okay, thank you, Mr. Howell, again, if you could articulate that in writing,

47:20

because it's really relevant now,

47:22

of course, and I know Mr. TURL, I'm sure his team

47:26

power station last 60 years.

47:30

Can I just finish the point? I understand? I mean, the points you've raised have all been noted, and you have made some of the points in writing as well. And I think Mr. Turtle and his team have probably been making notes on the points raised, and a response will be forthcoming. So I'm happy, well, I'm satisfied to leave it there, unless there's anything else to add to the concerns that you raised. I just think they'd be better articulated in writing, because they are quite detailed points.

47:55

They are as as as I mentioned to you. I have been [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and I've had another one on Wednesday, which hopefully will solve it. It's not enormously in fact, but I will bring that port and bring that together. But the legal point I'm making about this going forward, and includes the Secretary of State, is the assertion that it's going to provide so much output. It's absolutely, it's, you know, affecting the carbon balance, and it's affecting net zero, you know, I don't want to use the word, but, you know, it's much like the Surrey in the ground underneath that site.

48:38

Okay, thank you. Let me just talk about sorry. Let me, Mr. Turtle, come in on in response, and I'm sorry to hear about your circumstances. Hopefully you'll be able to get a written response to us by the 25th of November, and that will give the applicant an opportunity to respond. Mr. TURL, is there anything immediate you want to come back on? But as I keep reiterating, I think this is best dealt with in writing.

49:02

Be honest. No, sorry, let for the applicant. No, I was just going to make points that you've actually already made. So, so you kind of stole my thunder, but that's absolutely fine. There were just, maybe just two points I would very quickly make. I'm not going to any detail, because this needs to be dealt with in writing, in terms of, know, the Why would this site was chosen, and the need for this site, etc,

that's all set out in the application itself. It's been fully considered. We can obviously articulate that more thoroughly in the response.

49:28

It has not so, you know, it's just pebbled around and it's encapsulated.

49:37

I think both

49:38

parties have made submissions on this. And it isn't. It isn't a public meeting, really. This is a meeting for you to tell me your views and for me to take them away and consider I do apologize, but anyway, it's a matter for the applicant, who's a businessman. I don't think it has been made clear I used to be a very senior. Investment analysts in the city dealing with energy companies too, I might add, in the London Stock Exchange. And I don't think you've made it abundantly clear. I don't think you've made the commercial reasons clear. And, you know, I just putting it across you as a little gentle warning of where this project might go, in your in your worst interests, okay,

50:28

okay, well, I'm going to cut the hearing short there. I don't think the verbal submissions are taken as any further forward, and I've given opportunities to put your points of view across. And thank you, Mr. How you have spent considerable time, and I'm sure effort in putting your views to me. So I appreciate your comments, but I do think from here on in, it's best to deal with them in writing, because they are so detailed, as I've said, and I would like to hear the applicant response, and clearly they're not in a position to respond during today's hearing. That's fine. Thank you. Mr. Howe, Mr. Tell Can I leave this point here and move on? I mean, there isn't much more to move on to in the hearing. I don't think. Unless Mr. Barton wishes to make any comments at all.

51:14

Lee tilth, the applicant, no, sir. I think the position is quite clear. We will respond in writing. I'll just leave it there. So I think it's basically just move on.

51:24

Yeah, okay, thank you.

51:27

Arguing all quite seriously. People think I'm, you know, crazy. I have big arguments about salmon fishing and genetics and, you know, all, I guess, is, is really rubbish science about genetics. I used to be my senior partner in the London Stock Exchange. Was called Darwin. He was a direct descendant, but I'm not saying that. But the point is that, you know, there's an awful lot of rubbish being circulated around this whole subject, and it's all put down to the authority of scientists. It isn't proven. I go with it. I do believe in climate change. I think it's a very concerning thing. My real problem, which I was discussing with, Okay, Mr.

52:14

Howell, real problem. I think we have exercised I've exercised patience and I've allowed you to speak for a considerable amount of time.

52:26

I do thank you for that. I'm not wanting to use this as a forum, but I do. The first thing I thought was just how absurd to locate a solar farm in Cumbria, which has the worst rainfall and and on a north facing slope with undulations. No, I understand.

52:44

I don't want to this to be my first time I use the mute function. So, all right, if we could leave that there. No, I look forward to receiving your correspondence in writing. Mr. Barton, could I just ask if you have any comments to make? Tom Barton 12 property. Fe, no, I don't think there's possibly anything that I could add. Okay, thank you.

53:06

I have no personal, you know, in energy towards the applicant, I might add, just to say that it's

53:13

Thank you. Well, that's been, that's been recorded now, so thank you. Okay, is there anybody else who would like to raise anything, aside from the parties who've already made some missions,

53:28

shall I shut off?

53:29

Okay, thank you. It's up to you. Mr. Hal I mean, I don't think you can switch your camera off if you wish, or you can leave your camera on. I just would come to the end of the hearing, essentially. So all I'm now is just thank you

53:40

do. Thank you for your hard work in interpreters and very thorough. It is true.

53:46

Okay, thank you, Mr. Howell, so I mean that brings me to the end of the hearing. In any event, Mr. TURL, anything else you wish to you have your hand raised there.

53:57

Thank you, sir. Let's the applicant. It's just a housekeeping point, sir, I know for the issue specific hearing and the CAH hearings, we've obviously sort of written down various action points. I suspect the answer is, Mr. Howell will be writing this down in his written response. So we, we the action will be there. So we probably don't need to go through what the actions are. But if there are some actions, I wouldn't mind just having a five minute journey, if that's possible, just to sort of collate what

54:22

to sort of collate, it's a dormant tripod, but you might.

54:29

Mr. Howe, let me just clarify the position. I don't think we need any formal actions. The reason being, this is a forum for people to tell me their views on the scheme.

54:41

I'm not bringing any actions No, no.

54:45

Sorry, Mr. Howell, this is action points. The applicant is asking me if there's any action points, for example, that they're supposed to submit various documentation to myself over here. Just

54:56

need to answer me in writing and thoroughly, not just sort of. Put sort of opposite. Skate,

55:01

okay, well, the action points, I mean to follow on from that. The action points are that by deadline number five, I would like written submissions of the representations that have been made today. Mr. TURL, you can respond as you wish to today's meeting, but you will have an opportunity to respond to any written submissions made at deadline five, by deadline six, the only other action really was from Mr. Fulton to email or provide confirmation that they wish me to visit their property on the site inspection. They were the outstanding matters as far as I'm concerned. Mr. Till, if there was anything else that you particularly wish to raise as an action point or another reminder, then please do so

55:44

let's the applicant. No, sir, thank you very much. You've just provided the clarity we were seeking. So thank you very much.

55:51

Okay, signing on. Okay, thank you, Mr. Howell keeps flipping on again.

55:57

Okay, so I'm going to close the hearing, and as I've said, I look forward to receiving your written correspondence in due course, just to say thank you to everybody who's attended today, and I will, I will see Sorry, Miss Carling, I think you were making you have your hand raised, sorry, Miss Carling, if you'd like to come in,

56:20

Hi, sorry. The when you said what we had to do, the camera went off and we didn't hear okay.

56:26

Oh, it's okay. It's just if you could let the case team know that you'd like the woman myself the examining authority to visit your property. And what will happen thereafter is I will issue a site visit itinerary, site inspection itinerary, approximately one week before the fourth of December, and that will set out the route I'm going to take for the site inspection. And I with the best endeavors, I'll try and include your property in that as well. And you will receive correspondence on that point when I've finalized the itinerary.

56:56

Okay, I'd appreciate you the good call, please. Yeah,

56:59

of course, yes, if you just clarify that in writing, that I will make sure that that's included in the itinerary. Thank you.

57:06

So little for the applicant, just a very quick minor point, sir, is my recollection that the itinerary already includes the property in question. But obviously there's no harm in that point being reaffirmed and but I'm pretty sure it's already included in the itinerary that having agreed.

57:22

I may need, yes, I'll double check. But I think the point that was in the itinerary was to view it from the viewpoint on public land. I think that what I'm supposed what I'm suggesting to do is to go into the property

57:34

understood, little understood. So that's fine. Thank you.

57:40

Okay, so all that's left is for me to close the hearing. So the time is coming up to three o'clock, and I'd like to thank everyone for their attendance, and thank you. I'm about to sign off. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.