

File Name: PHSF_23OCT_ISH2_PT1

File Length: 01:26:47

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:16 - 00:00:24:15

Good morning. It is now 9:30 a.m.. Time for this hearing to begin. I'd like to welcome you all to this hearing. Can I just check that everybody can hear me clearly, including at the back. Okay. Thank you. And can I confirm with Mr. Stevens that the live streaming of this event has commenced?

00:00:26:22 - 00:00:46:03

For those people watching the live stream. Can I also advise you that should be at any point, adjourn. We will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. As a result, at the point in which we recommend the hearing and restart the live stream. You'll need to refresh your browser page to re to view the restarted stream.

00:00:47:29 - 00:01:03:03

This hearing is an issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by RWA, RWA renewables, UK Solar and Storage Limited, who we refer to as the applicant for an order granting development consent for the Pear Tree Hill Solar Farm.

00:01:05:10 - 00:01:21:07

My name is Alex Hutson. I'm a chartered town planner and a chartered landscape planner. I'm a planning inspector employed by the Planning Inspectorate, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State for housing, Communities and Local Governments to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application.

00:01:22:28 - 00:01:32:21

I'm now going to ask you, the panel member who was meant to be here in person today, but for reasons beyond her control, he's joining us virtually today to introduce herself.

00:01:34:13 - 00:02:07:19

Thank you. Good morning. My name is Mary Louise Milliken. I'm a chartered time planner and a planning inspector. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State for housing, Communities and Local Government to be a member of the panel to examine this application. As I'm attending this hearing virtually, there may be times when I'll be looking at my second screen and not directly at the camera. This doesn't mean that I'm disengaged from the event in any way so as to not distract from the proceedings. Today, I will only turn on my camera and microphone when I'm addressed by Mr.

00:02:07:21 - 00:02:11:13

Hudson, or when I am asking a question. Thank you.

00:02:13:13 - 00:02:39:28

Together, we constitute the examining authority for this application, and we'll be reporting to the Secretary of State for Energy Security in net zero, with a recommendation as to whether the

development consent order should be made. For those joining online and those who are present in this room, you will or may have spoken to Jake Stevens, who's a case manager for the project. Mr. Stevens is supported here today by Harry Davies, and Caroline Allen is providing support remotely.

00:02:42:06 - 00:03:16:29

If you have any questions or queries about the examination process or the technology we are using for blended or virtual events, Mr. Stevens should be your first point of contact. This is a blended event comprising an in-person hearing, as well as being held on the Microsoft Teams platform. This has been both live streamed and recorded. For those people observing or participating through teams. In order to minimize background noise. Can you please make sure you stay muted unless you are speaking? If you are participating virtually and you wish to speak at the relevant point of the proceedings, please use the Microsoft Teams hands up function.

00:03:19:08 - 00:03:34:10

I also remind people that the chat function on Microsoft Teams will not work, so please don't try to use this if you don't manage to ask your questions. There'll be an opportunity to do so at the end of the hearing under item 11 on the agenda. Any other matters?

00:03:36:12 - 00:04:09:14

Because the digital recordings that we make are retained and published, they form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. The Planning Inspectorate practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it's important that you understand that you'll be live streamed and recorded and that the digital recording will be published. If you don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. And for those in the room who don't want to be recorded, there'll be an area out of camera shot.

00:04:12:20 - 00:04:37:14

We will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public register. That's important and relevant to the planning decision. Therefore, to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, what we would ask is that you try your best not to add information to the public record that you would wish to be kept private, or that is confidential. If you feel that personal information is necessary, please provide this in a written document that we can redact before publication

00:04:39:03 - 00:05:09:19

and I'll deal with a few housekeeping matters. Firstly, can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent? We're not expecting any fire alarms today. If the alarm goes off, then the procedure is to leave by the fire exits and congregate in the car park at the front of the hotel. Toilets located through the door. At the back. Through the door. At the back. And on the right. And we'll take a short break around 11 a.m. and we'll look to break for lunch at around 1 p.m.. And I don't expect that the hearing would go beyond 5 p.m.,

00:05:09:21 - 00:05:10:16

hopefully.

00:05:12:06 - 00:05:14:22

Um, can I just ask if there's anyone here from the press today?

00:05:20:18 - 00:05:52:05

Um, I did. The recording of today's hearing will be available on the project web page, um, as soon as practicable after this hearing. With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone. If you're not disabled. With the microphone, there's roving microphone, which you can use if any individual or group wishes to use social media, report, film or record during today's hearing or any subsequent hearings. Please do so responsibly and with proper consideration for other parties. This must not be disruptive and the material must not be misused.

00:05:53:14 - 00:06:25:17

Here in today will be a structured discussion, which I and Miss Milliken will lead based on the agenda that has already been published on the 16th October 2025, reference EV6 002, which detailed the areas we wish to discuss today, including in respect of noise and vibration, land, soil and groundwater, health and safety, landscape and visual cultural heritage, biodiversity and transport and access agenda. The agenda is for guidance only. We may add to add other issues for consideration as we progress.

00:06:26:15 - 00:06:48:21

We do, however, propose one slight change to the agenda, and that is due to the availability of the relevant expert from East Riding of Yorkshire Council. We intend to cover item eight, which is matters relating to transport and access first. The rest of the agenda remains unchanged. Um, can I just check with the applicants that this is acceptable to it?

00:06:49:26 - 00:06:52:16

Mr. have very much for the applicant. Yes. Of course.

00:06:52:18 - 00:06:53:19

Okay. Thank you.

00:06:56:25 - 00:07:12:24

Uh, if you refer to information already submitted. I'd be grateful if you could give the appropriate examination library reference so we can all follow. Um, can I also please ask that the first time you use an abbreviation or an acronym, that you also give it the full title first?

00:07:14:26 - 00:07:22:24

For the purpose of identification and ease of reference, can I also ask that at every point in which you speak? Could you please give your name and whom you represent?

00:07:24:27 - 00:07:37:02

The only official recording of proceedings is recording which will be uploaded to the project web page. Tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of this hearing will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application.

00:07:39:18 - 00:07:54:28

Should the consideration of the issues take less time than anticipated, we may conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to. Equally, if we cannot conclude all matters on the agenda today, there may be a need to defer to written questions.

00:07:57:10 - 00:08:08:27

Finally, it's important that we get the right answers to the questions we ask. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or require time to get the information, can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing?

00:08:11:07 - 00:08:26:06

I'm not going to ask those of you who are participating in today's hearing to briefly introduce yourself and indicate which agenda item you wish to speak on. Please say your name, who you represent, and how you wish to be addressed. Um, firstly for the applicant.

00:08:27:12 - 00:08:49:28

Good morning. My name is Mr. Latif Ramesh. I'm a partner and parliamentary agent at TLT, and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. So, as you'll appreciate, we have quite a few topic specialists here today in order to be helpful. And I suggest that we introduce them as we go through the relevant agenda item. But in the meantime, I just invite my colleague, Miss Reese, to introduce herself.

00:08:52:20 - 00:09:00:15

Good morning, Miss Sophia Reese for the applicant. I'm a managing associate at TLT and will be assisting with the efficacy today.

00:09:00:17 - 00:09:01:18

Okay. Thank you.

00:09:07:02 - 00:09:09:22

Thank you. And for East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

00:09:11:10 - 00:09:14:28

Rachael Hodgson, principal planning officer at East Council.

00:09:17:02 - 00:09:21:16

Scott Richardson, transport planning manager, East Yorkshire Council.

00:09:23:26 - 00:09:27:29

Uh Tom Pitts, environmental control officer, East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

00:09:30:04 - 00:09:31:08

Deborah Smedley.

00:09:31:10 - 00:09:34:18

Um senior defensive map officer at East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

00:09:40:08 - 00:09:47:14

Hello. Uh, Bill Blackledge, um, on behalf of East Riding of Yorkshire Council on Landscape and Visual Matters.

00:09:49:08 - 00:09:50:00

Thank you.

00:09:51:06 - 00:09:57:07

Hi. And Amanda McDermott, on behalf of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Landscape and visual matters.

00:09:59:09 - 00:10:04:28

I'm Jennifer Woollen. I'm the natural environment planning manager. I'll be speaking on a biodiversity.

00:10:07:22 - 00:10:12:08

I'm John Tate from East Riding of Yorkshire Council. We're speaking on land contamination if needed.

00:10:19:21 - 00:10:24:14

Russell Godstone, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, flood risk management.

00:10:31:04 - 00:10:38:12

Hey thank you. Everybody from East Riding okay. And the Environment Agency.

00:10:41:07 - 00:10:54:07

Good morning sir, it's Miss Lizzie Griffiths. I'm a planning specialist for the Environment Agency. I'm supported today by a number of specialists. Um, and I would suggest that they could maybe introduce themselves at a later point when needed.

00:10:55:09 - 00:11:01:25

Okay. That's fine. Thank you. Um, the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.

00:11:17:05 - 00:11:21:28

Is a representative of the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust. Um, attending virtually.

00:11:25:09 - 00:11:30:24

Hello. Um, Florence Bell from the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust. Planning specialist.

00:11:33:12 - 00:11:37:12

Thank you. Sorry, did I say did I say Yorkshire Wildlife? Yes. Okay.

00:11:39:18 - 00:11:40:09

Thank you.

00:11:43:14 - 00:11:44:05

Um,

00:11:45:21 - 00:11:46:18

I've had no

00:11:48:06 - 00:11:55:04

formal notification to anybody else who wishes to speak today. Is there anybody else who wish to speak today? Yes, please. Thank you. Chair.

00:11:55:06 - 00:12:07:18

George McManus representing erase, which is the East Riding Against Solar expansion. Local campaign group representing local communities and affected by the proposals.

00:12:07:28 - 00:12:12:20

Okay. Thank you, Mr. McManus. And are there any other parties who wish to speak today?

00:12:17:12 - 00:12:22:28

I'm not seeing any hands raised virtually either. So in that case.

00:12:25:08 - 00:12:26:14

I shall move on.

00:12:29:18 - 00:12:37:26

Um, just for those persons joining online, can I just remind you that to please switch off your cameras and microphones if you're not participating in the discussion. Thank you.

00:12:39:20 - 00:12:42:18

Um, are there any questions on this agenda item before I move on.

00:12:47:28 - 00:12:50:07

So you have no hands raised virtually either.

00:12:52:02 - 00:12:53:22

So we'll move on to GG's.

00:12:53:26 - 00:13:25:09

Apologies, sir. Um, Mustapha Latif for the applicant. Sorry, I should have raised my hand earlier. Just. Just two things. You'll appreciate that as our relevant experts change, there might be a bit of musical chairs. So if you could give us 15 20s. Yes. Just to make that just a minute. And the only other thing, just just as a request, is we've, um, been collecting actions as we've gone through the hearings. And to the extent that you consider it appropriate, I think you mentioned that you might have a further round of written questions.

00:13:25:11 - 00:13:39:01

And so if there's a possibility of including any of the matters that we pick up today, if they are appropriate to include in written questions rather than hearing actions, that would be greatly appreciated. But that's just a flag.

00:13:42:16 - 00:14:06:06

Okay, I'll bear that in mind. I mean, often it's helpful for the Tsar to get the information sooner rather than later. Um, and there is a period, obviously, between the end of the hearing and when we'd expect the, um, action point information. But if there's anything that you think you need particular more time for, then, you know, we'll consider, uh, pushing that in a further written question.

00:14:06:08 - 00:14:06:29

Thank you.

00:14:12:22 - 00:14:17:15

Okay. So moving on to agenda item two, which is now Transport and access.

00:14:21:00 - 00:14:55:26

Um, firstly, just a point of clarification. Really. Um, can the applicant please confirm if it would be ten HGVs equating to 20 HGV movements per day using Park Lane for construction purposes, as it states on page 72 of the responses to the deadline one submissions document. It also states this on page 17 of the statement to Common Ground, with East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and in parts of chapter 14, such as paragraph 4.9.

00:14:55:28 - 00:15:13:22

13, or whether it would be five HGVs equating to ten movements. As my understanding that table 14 five of as chapter 14 sets out, as I say, that's if I understood that table correctly.

00:15:14:09 - 00:15:21:00

Miss Felicity, very much for the applicant. Can I introduce Calum Hill Quirk, who's the senior consultant on transport matters?

00:15:21:05 - 00:15:21:28

Thank you.

00:15:23:16 - 00:15:38:18

Um, Callum Quirk, speaking on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah, I can confirm that it's, um, ten HGVs, as in the number of vehicles, which equates to 20 HGV movements. Um, so an arrival and departure for each vehicle.

00:15:38:20 - 00:15:46:27

Okay. Thank you. Is it possible just to put on the screen? Um. Rep 201. Just for a second.

00:16:09:04 - 00:16:18:18

Okay. We go to just down to the bottom of table 14 five. We've got the grid connection. Cable routes works.

00:16:22:06 - 00:16:27:28

Is the the grid connection cable route works. Is that Park Lane?

00:16:33:01 - 00:16:37:09

Um, yeah. Can I go quick? Speaking on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. That's correct.

00:16:37:11 - 00:16:49:01

Thank you. In the first, the delivery vehicles HGVs says arrivals five departures. Five, two. Eight, ten. Is that. Are you saying that's not correct?

00:16:51:24 - 00:16:59:12

Um, yeah. That would not. That would appear to be a, um, incorrect. Um, but I'll take that back and check that. Um.

00:17:00:00 - 00:17:00:15

So that was.

00:17:00:17 - 00:17:01:02

My.

00:17:01:04 - 00:17:19:17

Question. So that says ten two way other documents say 22 way HGV. So I just want I need to be clear before I move on really as to whether it would be five HGVs in total going backwards and forwards or whether it would be ten going backwards and forwards.

00:17:19:23 - 00:17:35:21

Yeah, I think that going forward, um, what we've um, the applicant's position is that it's ten HGVs. Um, number of vehicles. Um, okay. So I think we can assume that this is, um, incorrect in the a typo in this table.

00:17:36:00 - 00:17:50:24

Okay. And I suppose following on from that in that case, does does that affect any assessment in the. Yes. In terms of facing the use of Park Lane on that particular number of vehicles.

00:17:51:10 - 00:18:25:22

Um, I think quick, speaking on behalf of the applicant, um, the um, the assessments for particularly for the grid connection works. Um, um, such as on Park Lane, um, we're more outside of the study area due to the sort of low vehicle numbers in the temporary nature. Um, of the particular works. Um, the s assessments primarily focused on, um, the land areas which had a much more significant um, or higher number of HGVs, which would require more detailed assessment.

00:18:25:24 - 00:18:44:24

Okay. So in that case, your position is that, um, there'd be no Pipeline can accommodate, and the routes to Park Lane can accommodate the number of vehicles. Is that your view? Based on ten HGVs or based on five HGVs? And will there be any difference if it was 5 or 10.

00:18:45:10 - 00:18:57:16

And I would agree there would be. Callum, go quick on behalf of the applicant. Um, I would agree that there would be no difference between 5 and 10, um, daily basis. Okay.

00:18:57:18 - 00:19:04:08

But it will work on the basis that it is ten. And should this be updated in that case to reflect that?

00:19:05:12 - 00:19:06:01

Yes.

00:19:07:18 - 00:19:12:16

Okay. Um, I'll just make an action. I'll just make an action for that in that case.

00:19:20:08 - 00:19:50:12

Okay. Could I ask, please, um, East Riding of Yorkshire Council? Um, Mr. Richardson, whether there has been any change in your position on the matter since deadline three, that is, that you're objecting to the use of Park Lane as a construction route for 10 or 20 movements per day over and four month period. Um, whether it also be restrictions on its use between the hours of 7:30 a.m.

00:19:50:14 - 00:19:56:18

to 9 a.m. and 3:03 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.. Er, Scott.

00:19:56:20 - 00:19:57:06

Richardson.

00:19:57:08 - 00:19:57:25

On behalf of East.

00:19:58:03 - 00:19:59:04

Yorkshire Council.

00:19:59:16 - 00:20:00:01

Um.

00:20:00:03 - 00:20:13:29

Thank you. Uh, no, there is no real, um, changes in what we initially said. I do have a bit of further evidence from our, um, road safety engineer, if you'd like me to, um, read that.

00:20:14:29 - 00:20:21:16

Um, if maybe just bear with me so I could just ask these questions, then maybe we can come back to that.

00:20:21:27 - 00:20:23:13

Yeah. Our stance hasn't changed.

00:20:23:21 - 00:20:52:27

Um, okay, so no change in your position. And You gave some, like, traffic count data from September 2020, uh, which there was supposed to be an appendix, but that never really never arrived. You said you the information was in the response to the written question anyway, so I don't think we necessarily needed that, but I'm just wondering what. To what extent can traffic count data from September 2020 still be relied upon?

00:20:56:21 - 00:21:03:24

In New York City Council. Sorry, was the question. Why are we relying on 2020 data?

00:21:03:26 - 00:21:04:12

Yes.

00:21:04:16 - 00:21:19:23

Yeah. Um, that's the only data we currently have and the most recent data we currently have on Park Lane. And just to reiterate, it was, um, 1154 daily trips and that's 0.2% HGV movements. So very little. Thank you.

00:21:20:27 - 00:21:32:03

Okay. I suppose the question is, is there could there have been any potential change between 2020. So what? To what extent can five year old data be relied upon?

00:21:36:14 - 00:21:43:09

In terms of how it could be relied upon? Yes, it could have changed, but unfortunately, that's the only data we currently have to hand.

00:21:44:07 - 00:21:48:06

Okay. Thank you. Um, also,

00:21:49:22 - 00:22:06:27

Mr. Richardson, the applicant notes that Park Lane would be used for the construction of um. Refers to its Creek Beck battery storage development, uh, with reference 20 3/03926/ STP.

00:22:09:08 - 00:22:32:06

Um, and that would have a total of 2002 HGV movements. So we're told across its construction phase um using Park Lane. And I suppose I'm just interested in understanding why it was considered acceptable for that HCV use along party line and you know, not for this particular development.

00:22:34:09 - 00:23:08:20

Counsel, whilst I speak on behalf of, um, people at the authority, um, when that was assessed, um, this is obviously on its own merits and er considering all the complaints we got during that, um, construction period and all, um, road safety matters, um, that were taken into consideration at the time, I think it's, um, a case of once bitten twice. Yeah. Um, we don't want to increase any, um, highway safety risks on Park Lane, given that, um, there is the alternate route now that council believes is a strong position to almost get to the point of that being approved.

00:23:11:26 - 00:23:20:26

Okay. Were there any highway safety issue, accidents or, um, injuries or anything? Is that complete or that construction that do that?

00:23:21:08 - 00:23:23:18

Yeah, that construction has been completed.

00:23:23:24 - 00:23:30:11

Were there Other incidents like highway safety or road traffic accidents or injuries.

00:23:32:16 - 00:23:42:18

There have been a number of incidents during that time, but it's hard to understand if it was specifically related to that development.

00:23:44:00 - 00:23:45:02

Okay. Thank you.

00:23:57:08 - 00:24:38:08

Um, also, I think the council says in response to ask to the use of Park Lane could have a have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Um, for the Exa and the secretary of state, the test, you know, that we would need to consider is in the NPS. Um, and that is that it would have, you know, if we were going to go down the route of it being unacceptable. Um, could you please just clarify your view on whether the use of pipeline could have or would have an unacceptable, unacceptable impact on highway safety?

00:24:41:10 - 00:24:50:06

Mr.. Council feel that? Um, so it's not the council, it's the council's view that it would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

00:24:59:22 - 00:25:27:14

Okay. Thank you. And in response to excuse two, um, East Riding of Yorkshire Council also suggested well you suggested for HGV use on Park Lane. It could be well, if the Tsar recommends approval or granted the DCO, you'd recommend that, uh, HGV use is restricted to between the hours of 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 pm. Um,

00:25:29:01 - 00:25:34:01

I suppose my question is, were the applicant to commit to this? Would this alleviate your concerns?

00:25:36:03 - 00:26:10:03

Uh. Not fully? No. Then it's just, uh, if the Excel was to approve it, it would just be a condition that we'd like to see. Or at least a, um, commitment from the applicants. Uh, to to do this, it will, um, reduce the risks, um, with school traffic. And, um, there's also a real entrance to the school which exits onto Park Lane. And then there's also, um, a playing area off Park Lane and all these, uh, you'd like to think during Monday to Friday, especially term time.

00:26:10:17 - 00:26:30:22

Um, they wouldn't be children playing in the, in the area in along Park Lane. And also there's commuting, there's just commuting traffic. Cyclist walkers between Cottingham and Beverly along Park Lane, the public right of way. And there's also been limited during those times.

00:26:33:16 - 00:26:51:16

Okay, so the applicant was already suggesting restricting the use of Park Lane between like school drop and school pickup hours. I guess you're suggesting that it would be condensed a little bit further than that. So just between. So not before school, not after school, but between those kind of hours.

00:26:52:11 - 00:27:06:28

At those times, the local highway network will also be not as constrained with parked vehicles and, um, just the general use of Northgate and Park Lane, i.e. the number of vehicles using it, it would be less constrained as well.

00:27:08:00 - 00:27:12:21

Okay. Can I just ask the applicant for review on that please,

00:27:14:10 - 00:27:15:06

Mr. Quirke?

00:27:16:08 - 00:27:51:02

Mr. parish for the applicant says, as you noted, the Outline Construction Traffic Management plan, the most recent version of which is Rep 3034, includes a commitment of paragraph 6.1.8 relating to school hours, the way that requirement five of the Draft Development Consent Order is structured is that it would require the production of a traffic management plan at the construction stage, which reflects that outline document. That document will be approved by the council following consultation with various parties.

00:27:51:04 - 00:28:23:24

And so what the outline document is securing is that we will consider school hours and then subsequently consult, work out where exactly those hours fall. And so insofar as there is any residual concern, it is addressed through the process that's secured under the draft development consent order. We don't think it's appropriate at this stage to specify Anything further than what's already included in 6.1.8 of the outline construction traffic management plan.

00:28:24:06 - 00:28:25:24

Okay. Thank you.

00:28:28:03 - 00:28:29:03

Um, and.

00:28:31:25 - 00:28:55:13

Might there be any other mitigation measures with which East Riding Yorkshire Council considers might alleviate your concerns? Um, in addition to those already put forward by the applicant, um, which the applicant suggested time restrictions, the use of banks, person control areas. Um, also the temporary short term closures, um and restrictions of public rights of way in cycle routes.

00:28:57:05 - 00:29:23:11

And East Yorkshire Council. Um the mitigation would be to use the new access, which has been approved on a previous um DCR application, which I believe has been shelved at the moment. And it's to work with the Yorkshire Council to allow this access after 1079, fully alleviating any potential road safety issues on Park Lane and off Gatesville. Cottingham.

00:29:23:15 - 00:29:32:10

Okay. Thank you, but we're Park Lane to be used. Would there be any further mitigation measures that you can think of that might help to alleviate your concerns.

00:29:33:08 - 00:29:50:16

About potentially additional passing places along Park Lane on the public right of way. Area and potential traffic regulation. Temporary traffic regulation orders around um tackling itself and navigate strict parking restrictions allowing extra visibility from the access with Northgate.

00:29:58:09 - 00:30:00:11

Okay, with that, let's comments on that.

00:30:01:08 - 00:30:14:28

Mr. Ramesh, for the applicant, I think the issues concerning the, uh, access track that's mentioned, uh, we've set out our position that that's not yet built and it's not appropriate for us to rely on that development coming forward.

00:30:15:00 - 00:30:16:15

When I come on to that, my next question.

00:30:16:17 - 00:30:17:16

Yes. But yeah.

00:30:17:18 - 00:30:45:22

Um, in terms of the other mitigation measures that are being suggested, again, we think that the outline construction traffic management plan includes not just, uh, further traffic regulation measures. It includes references to additional signage, additional banks, persons being used as part of the process. And so to the extent that that's necessary, there is a process in order to secure that if the development consent order is granted as part of the discharge of requirement five.

00:30:50:03 - 00:31:20:27

Okay. I've got no further questions on that first, um, particular bullet point. Moving on to the second one, which is consideration of the potential for any alternative to the use of park lanes, such as the use of an access proposed directly off the A1 079, associated with an unrelated planning application for works at Creek Beck substation. Um, can you just confirm what stage the planning application is at for those access works, please?

00:31:21:06 - 00:31:52:13

Rachel Hodgson, Easter council. There's a number of consents here. We've got the consent 24 DCO, which includes the access. And there's three pending planning applications. So we've got one for the access alone, one which forms part of, um, one Los Beck substation, which is an extension to create Quebec and one for Beck Hill Wood substation. As I said, those three planning applications are all still pending. There's a few issues that still need addressing to potentially.

00:31:52:15 - 00:31:56:05

We're another two months from determination.

00:32:03:17 - 00:32:10:29

So the Hornsea Four DCO included that access. So that could be built out if one's forwards go ahead.

00:32:11:01 - 00:32:12:22

If it were to go ahead.

00:32:13:09 - 00:32:20:09

Yeah, I understand it's not going ahead. Is that correct, or is that the things changed from then? From before?

00:32:20:16 - 00:32:30:21

Mr. parish, with the applicant, Orsted, the promoter behind Hornsea Four, has publicly said that they're no longer pursuing that and we haven't seen anything that changes that position.

00:32:31:00 - 00:32:43:16

Okay. I thought I'd seen something that said something in the evidence said that there was consideration, but it hadn't really been brought about again and actually happening, but maybe not. Okay.

00:32:46:14 - 00:32:53:27

Um, so potentially those planning applications might not be determined by the end of this examination.

00:32:56:04 - 00:33:22:03

Rachel Hutchison, East Village Council I'd like to think they would be before the close of the examination of this application. Um, but obviously there's no certainty. Also, just to know, I believe that one of the applications just for the actor to learn. That is an application submitted by Ofsted. Um, and I think that is potentially because of issues with the DCR potentially not coming forward.

00:33:30:22 - 00:33:43:10

Okay. And can I ask the applicant if you've had any contact with any of the parties who are submitting these planning applications, you know, just around potential for the use of access?

00:33:45:18 - 00:34:11:08

Mr. Adams, for the applicant, the applicant has had discussions. However, because of the uncertainty of not just the pending applications, but the absence of the land rights to use any, any access should it

come forward. Um, those discussions are not advanced. Um, and it's for that reason that we've been fairly consistent that we can't rely on that as an alternative.

00:34:17:20 - 00:34:48:07

Okay. And could the applicant commit maybe to further exploration of the use of any future constructed access directly off the A1079A1079 um, as opposed to the use of Park Lane. Should this be feasible? Perhaps written in to the outline construction traffic management plan. You know, just as a side that you, you know, you may potentially be able to have discussions and something may come of that in the future.

00:34:48:29 - 00:35:05:25

Mr. Phillips, you very much for the applicant. That will be one. We just have to take away our need to get instructions on, on the extent we're, we're we're comfortable with relying on a third party delivery. But I understand your request is specifically if it becomes available and we secure the rights. So we'll take that away.

00:35:07:21 - 00:35:12:22

Okay, so I'll put that as an action point in that case. Um, and would the

00:35:14:10 - 00:35:26:27

the outline construction traffic management plan be the best place for that would you say? Or would it be the outline construction environmental management plan or a number of management plans?

00:35:29:18 - 00:35:34:18

For the applicant, if it were to be included, it would be the outline construction traffic management plan.

00:35:34:20 - 00:35:35:09

Okay.

00:35:50:20 - 00:36:21:10

Um, does Mr. Richardson, do you have anything to add to any of that? I mean, would that I mean, you know, to what extent is it reasonable to rely on something that hasn't got permission yet and, you know, may not and may not be constructed for however long the permission lasts for. Which then? Which should then mean that should this development get development consent, it would. It would hold up this particular development if part time. If they found the pipeline wasn't acceptable.

00:36:23:13 - 00:37:01:14

In Council I think if this were to be a local planning authority application, it may well be refused based on the access. Um, for for this at this moment in time. Um, one thing to potentially stay and, um, give potential returns to the applicant is we are in detailed design discussions with National Grid to submit the section 278. And their timeframes are very, very tight. Um, so I believe as soon as the planning application, if the planning application gets approved, um, they will be on site within months.

00:37:02:03 - 00:37:22:20

Um, is Why? What I'm getting. I'm being pressed for the section 278. At the moment, technical approval details have been submitted and we are currently reviewing those to give looking to give technical approval as soon as the planning application and section 278 submission has been on the application once it's been granted. If it is.

00:37:25:21 - 00:37:45:12

Okay. Thank you. But I mean currently there's no restrictions for HGVs on Park Lane at the moment. Like come, come, come HGVs drive down Park Lane without any permissions from the council. You know, should a delivery be needed to creep back substation for example.

00:37:46:05 - 00:38:02:29

Even if there was a traffic regulation order restricting that for delivery, HGV could use, um, could use a restricted site. Um, but at the moment there isn't a um there is a regulation order restricting where are given a weight limit in the local area.

00:38:03:15 - 00:38:04:18

Okay. Thank you.

00:38:11:22 - 00:38:19:11

Um, so there were all the questions I had with regard to the parkland Matter. You said you wanted to read something else. Is that you still want to do that?

00:38:19:15 - 00:38:53:18

Um, yeah. It's just a statement from our. A short statement from our, um, road safety principal engineer. Oh, I haven't been able to come to the, um. And it includes further evidence as well in terms of why the the construction route from the A1 65 through was cutting on to parkland is not acceptable. Um, so, um, I just read this short statement. Uh, the road through Cottingham from the A1 64 isn't recommended as access to the proposed site and to put in bullet points one.

00:38:54:09 - 00:39:30:06

There have been 17 recorded injury collisions along the route, resulting in 18 casualties. Three serious, 15 Slight of these, five were motorcycle riders, four cycle riders and three pedestrian riders. Um, so the majority were vulnerable road users. Three the route along Highland Way passes Cottingham High School. Despite measures outside the school along the road, there continues to be collisions involving school traffic, riders and pedestrians. Four On Northgate there are recorded injury collisions due to the narrow nature of the road and traffic passing.

00:39:30:09 - 00:40:12:23

Five the turn into Park Lane is tight, with traffic from the west already overrunning the footwear. Six at the junction with Park Lane and nearby. Sorry, there's a typo and nearby there have been injury collisions with vulnerable road users. Seven there have been injury collisions on Park Lane involving at involving both parked and maneuvering vehicles And whilst details are not published, um, in the stats 19 data, I know there have been injury collisions on the non highway part of the route to cricket back.

00:40:12:25 - 00:40:33:07

And at the moment I can't find any evidence of that. Um and then just ending it says additional HGVs would not be recommended. The the route isn't suitable. The turn into Park Lane already has issues and existing parking and use is already producing collisions.

00:40:35:01 - 00:41:10:06

And then there are collisions in particular on Northgate and Park Lane, which we will submit. Um, and just as two on Park Lane, one of which is a cyclist colliding with an unattended parked car, suggesting it's already constrained. Um, the other, um, Park Lane, um, Was, um. I read the description. Uh, vehicle one was parked opposite the junction facing north. The driver has reversed and pulled out to turn around a junction and collided with vehicle two.

00:41:10:08 - 00:41:15:24

And that was on Park Lane, near the junction of Grange Drive. Again suggesting it's fairly constrained.

00:41:17:28 - 00:41:21:08

And then the two on North Gate. Um,

00:41:22:29 - 00:41:54:16

and one is to do with, um, a rider on the, on the footpath exiting the north gate parkland junction and um, pulling into the path of vehicles which was turning into the junction. This kind of shows that there's, um, lack of visibility at the junction, as shown in um. Rep 3055 and then, um, on a bit further down Northgate collision between pedestrian and car.

00:41:54:21 - 00:42:12:16

And that's the only details I've got with that. So I believe that could be to do with mounting the pavement or something like that. Um, due to the constraint nature of Northgate near the junction of Park Lane, um, that's everything I believe will submit these, um, at a later date.

00:42:14:15 - 00:42:21:25

Okay. Thank you. Um, Mr. Lateef, have you got anything you want to respond to that point before we move on to the next bullet point?

00:42:22:15 - 00:43:02:18

Mr. Lateef, for the applicant, uh, just two quick submissions. Uh, so we've we've acted quite quickly on the action that you've just given us. Um, we will update the outline construction traffic management plan to say that we will explore the use of the access road, provided that it is actually constructed and it can feasibly be used. Um, for the purposes of our project in the, in the timelines that we have, just to provide additional reassurance. Um, on on the submissions that you've just heard on the accident numbers, I think the only thing that we'd add is that, um, the personal injury collision reports are contained in rep 2027.

00:43:02:20 - 00:43:13:09

Um, from the applicant's perspective. But we'll have further discussions on the evidence that's just been raised to see if it affects anything in those documents.

00:43:22:12 - 00:44:02:06

George McManus speaking for East Riding against solar expansion. I want to raise, uh, we have a number of issues about transport and access in particular. Uh, very disappointed at the, could I say, lack of joined up thinking when it comes to the better alternative route. Anybody who has driven down Pat Lane at us and see some specific questions earlier, Mister Chair knows that it is a narrow country Lane is simply unsuited to HGTV's, which is one of the reasons why we think there is a serious accident risk.

00:44:02:23 - 00:44:27:28

But there's also a potential overlap with a project currently underway at field House Solar Farm. And again, we're disappointed that that hasn't been considered in coming up with transport proposals. One, I'm afraid I'm obviously I'm detecting a lot of skepticism for a number of people about these proposals and when, for example,

00:44:29:15 - 00:45:03:22

the very elastic some somebody described to me as elastic as being the longest word in the English language. And this morning we had a four month period being referred to as a temporary period. And on Tuesday we heard of a 40 year contract period as being a temporary period. These are the sort of things that come home to the public and make the public skeptical. So, for example, when you talk about a four month period, people say, how elastic is that? And what is the likelihood of of more accidents.

00:45:03:24 - 00:45:42:15

So we think that before this goes any further, and we agree very much with what Mr. Richardson was saying, before it goes any further, we need to take a comprehensive approach to producing an access strategy, because it is not just partly, it is other parts of the project as well that are simply unsuitable to HGTV's. And until we can get to the stage where public safety can be secured with. And that I think requires and we're very I honestly thought when we met back in July that by the time we got to this meeting in October, we would have crossed these barriers already.

00:45:42:17 - 00:46:06:14

But it seems that they are still in place. So as I mentioned in Tuesday, we are very concerned that this is being rushed. We understand the examining authority's timetable on this, but we think that that has that comprehensive proposal has to be put in place before the public will get behind it. And really, I'm sure the applicant would agree that is what we would all like to see. Thank you.

00:46:06:27 - 00:46:08:07

Thank you, Mr. McManus.

00:46:10:29 - 00:46:45:05

Mr. Lateef, for the applicant, just two very brief submissions. The first is the applicant takes public safety very, very seriously. And that is the reason why we produce the assessments and why we've secured further commitments, including just moments ago on the outline construction traffic management plan. We consider this to be an iterative process where as we develop the design and we get closer to the construction, we will carry on working with East Riding of Yorkshire Council

to make sure that we can include as many commitments as possible and as practicable as part of that engagement.

00:46:45:07 - 00:47:02:08

The only other comment I wish to make is that we have been engaging on the use of alternatives. And as you've heard, there are pending applications, projects which have been withdrawn, which is a changing environment that we're trying to ensure that we adapt to whilst making sure public safety is protected.

00:47:02:20 - 00:47:18:24

Okay. Thank you. I'll move on to the next bullet point. In that case, um, it's to do with fields E15 to E17. Um, I just was hoping you could clarify how they would be accessed during maintenance for maintenance purposes. So

00:47:20:17 - 00:47:26:21

will there be access through the other fields and then to eventually right with those fields, or would it require any traffic through.

00:47:26:23 - 00:47:57:27

We'll um, can't go quick on behalf of the applicant. Um, um, yeah, we've we've committed to, um, accessing E15 to E17 from the adjacent parcel of land, E17 by an internal, uh, access track, um, for the operation and maintenance phase. Um, we will, uh, access via Caroline, and we'll, um. Generally, this will be, um, LGV trips for, um, for, um, maintenance.

00:47:58:08 - 00:48:28:10

Um, and there'll be a small number of trips per year. Um, there will also be an occasional requirement for HGV movements, uh, or numbers of vehicles. Um, and um, this will be more for repair and replacement of, of parts. So um, for example, um, um for the battery replacement for the best, um, as sort of standard that's um, due for replacement in, in 20 years.

00:48:28:19 - 00:49:00:12

Um, and it's one HGV per battery so it'll be 12. In year 2012 HGVs in year 20 that we would um it's anticipated at that point. Um, and so a sort of average of about 12 HGVs per year. Um, which we would not consider to have any significant effects. Um, which is also why we did not consider it necessary to, uh, include, um, car lane wheel as a link in our transport and access assessment.

00:49:00:14 - 00:49:06:03

Um, submitted as part of the. Yes. Um, yeah. Nothing further to it.

00:49:06:12 - 00:49:07:11

Okay. Is.

00:49:09:01 - 00:49:14:24

I just wonder whether it's worth addressing that somewhere in the yes chapter, because

00:49:16:19 - 00:49:33:07

if there will be some HGV movement through wheel, then, you know, it's not reasonable to even if you think it's not going to be a significant effect, it's not reasonable to include that or say why you've discounted that and not assessed it somewhere.

00:49:33:27 - 00:49:44:10

Miss Felicity, very much with the applicant. Is your specific question that it should be included in the yes. Or that we we should address it as part of some written submission.

00:49:44:12 - 00:50:11:23

Well, you've either, I suppose. Um, it's just I don't I couldn't tell from the plans whether those fields were, you know, replacement solar panels. And as you say, battery replacement would come through the internal access track, some of the fields or whether it would come through. We'll. Sounds like it might come through. We'll. And therefore, should you not say this somewhere in, in any of your documents or maybe in a different, separate statement.

00:50:11:25 - 00:50:34:16

Yes. Mr.. Parametrically applicant. What I think we'll do is confirm the position as part of our written submissions for this, for this hearing. Um, and that should hopefully address the point. But the, the, the reason I'm querying whether the yes needs to be updated is in light of what you've just heard, in terms of the the low level of impact, I understand we should put it in writing. So it's very clear that this is what we're proposing to do. Hmm.

00:50:34:29 - 00:50:38:15

Okay. Well, I'll leave it to you where you do that. Um.

00:50:46:04 - 00:50:46:24

Okay.

00:50:52:06 - 00:50:55:14

That answers all my other questions in that case. Um.

00:51:02:04 - 00:51:06:19

In that case, I'll move on to the East Riding. Had anything to add to that?

00:51:08:24 - 00:51:10:28

Council? Uh, no. Nothing to add. Thanks.

00:51:11:00 - 00:51:11:18

Okay.

00:51:14:03 - 00:51:35:16

Um, so this was the match about the field house solar farm. But I think we discussed everything on Tuesday. So I'm not planning on covering that again unless you had any updates for me. Um, in regards to any of those things we discussed on Tuesday, if we've had any other discussions with Alban Wise.

00:51:36:16 - 00:51:43:05

Mr. Phillips, for the applicant, there is there is a very, um,

00:51:44:27 - 00:52:22:07

important clarification. I think we, we need to make. So we as we explain, we have been engaging with organ wise and we have provided them with that provision last week, and we're waiting to hear back on any thoughts that they have so that we can update the provision in light of any further concerns that they have. The two the two important updates are you you asked a series of questions about the difference in noise impacts between the option of the, uh, access track being further away into plot to A5 or over the existing track.

00:52:22:09 - 00:52:53:17

And we confirmed that the conclusions for, you know, both of those are not changed in the context of noise, i.e. there's no significant impact that arises, um, depending on which route precisely is taken through those plots. You'll note that the applicant has said that the further separation is still something. That is is the reason why we're proposing to go through plot 205. Following the hearing on Tuesday.

00:52:53:21 - 00:53:27:10

We contacted again the owners of the Or the tenants, I should say, of the properties in question. And we just wanted to be clear that when we say that there is a there is a reason for the separation and why we're proposing that separation. The tenants of the properties include, um, children with protected characteristics. I'm not proposing to go into further detail about that for reasons you'll understand in these proceedings, but we will specify what we can in writing.

00:53:27:12 - 00:54:05:04

And so when we talk about further separation, it's not in the context of noise that there is a difference. It's in the wider context of health and safety. Um, I should say urban wise, are the landlords for these tenants. So they'll, they'll, they'll be aware of, of this issue. So when we talk about further separation, it's not to make an argument about noise. That's just one clarification. And then the next is, um, subject to Auburn Wise's responses to, uh, the provisions that we've suggested will be trying to, um, propose further interface arrangements to to ensure that we can provide as much comfort as possible.

00:54:05:19 - 00:54:06:22

That's all I had, sir.

00:54:10:03 - 00:54:18:08

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, any other comments on transport and access before I move on to the next agenda item?

00:54:21:06 - 00:54:32:02

Okay. In that case, I'm going to hand over to miss to Miss Milligan for item three on the agenda. Um, which is noise and vibration. Thank you.

00:54:34:09 - 00:55:05:11

Thank you. Uh, for this agenda item. My question relates to the explanation that was provided by the applicant in response to the examining authority's second written questions and the references. XQ

2.1.2 and that's a reference, right? Three zero 40 and my question is, can the applicant confirm whether the response incorporates the change request to option.

00:55:05:13 - 00:55:23:09

That would include the 19 HGVs. And that's 38 movements per day which would drive past field House farm properties during construction. So that would be if the existing tracks is used rather than the field. Thank you.

00:55:24:11 - 00:55:32:19

Mr. Latif, for the applicant. Thank you. Um, I'd invite John Mark, who's attending virtually, to respond to this question.

00:55:34:00 - 00:56:09:29

Good morning. Jonathan. Mark, On behalf of the applicant. Um, calculations have been undertaken for HGV movements along the access track. Um, those calculations have been undertaken in accordance with the procedures outlined in section F2 52 of BS 50 228, which is reference 12.3. Uh, in chapter 12 of our ES Noise and Vibration chapter, which is document rep 2079. The calculations assume that the use of the uh plot to A4, which is adjacent to field House form, which is considered the worst case option in distance terms, uh, calculations.

00:56:10:01 - 00:56:33:21

Consider the updated traffic flow information along the A6 track, uh, with the resulting noise levels predicted to be less than 60dB, which will result in a low magnitude of impact. In accordance with table 12.7 of chapter 12 of uh Document Rep 2079. With that in mind, we will consider the HGV movements along the access track as being not significant.

00:56:36:19 - 00:56:48:09

Okay. That's fine. Um. That's fine. That was that answered my question. Um, I just want to ask briefly if the council has anything to add on that at all. Miss Hodgson.

00:56:52:15 - 00:56:57:25

Rachel Hodgson, East Yorkshire Council I will pass that to my colleague Tom Pitt.

00:56:59:26 - 00:57:00:16

Thank you Tom.

00:57:01:00 - 00:57:01:22

East Yorkshire.

00:57:01:24 - 00:57:02:14

Council.

00:57:02:21 - 00:57:19:16

Um, no, I'm happy with with that additional information and explanation. Thank you. And I would just, um, look forward to future confirmation of how generally construction noise will be managed. Um, for local residents. Thank you.

00:57:20:27 - 00:57:29:26

Thank you. Um, I'm just going to ask before I move on to the next agenda item, whether anyone in the room or online, uh, has any questions relating to this matter.

00:57:33:01 - 00:57:34:03

Okay. Thank you.

00:57:35:14 - 00:57:36:14

Miss. Apologies.

00:57:37:09 - 00:57:39:06

Apologies, Mr. Mayor.

00:57:39:17 - 00:57:52:13

Thanks very much. George McManus speaking for East Riding against Sony expansion. Uh, and please correct me if I'm wrong, but I understand that there was a request made, uh, for

00:57:54:09 - 00:58:03:03

to try and provide additional clarity, technical clarity in particular, and for updated noise modelling at Harvard.

00:58:04:23 - 00:58:22:29

My understanding is that RWC have refused to do updated noise modelling, which we think would be very helpful. So I would like to ask why has the applicant refused this modelling? Despite the known risk to protected bird species and to residential property? Thank you.

00:58:27:29 - 00:58:31:15

Mr. Lateef. Would you like to respond on behalf of the applicant, please.

00:58:32:20 - 00:58:56:10

Mr. Romesh, on behalf of the applicant. So updated assessments were provided. Uh, and the references are rep 2079 and Rep 2131. Um, so as far as far as my understanding is those those assessments were provided updated assessments that that is in light of the changes.

00:58:58:17 - 00:59:01:29

So I'll just ask for that reference again. And obviously I'll check it out.

00:59:02:04 - 00:59:09:14

Yes of course. So it's rep. Rep 2079. And rep 2131.

00:59:10:17 - 00:59:11:06

Thank you.

00:59:15:10 - 00:59:16:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:59:16:26 - 00:59:17:23

Sorry.

00:59:18:02 - 00:59:18:23

Sorry.

00:59:19:02 - 00:59:46:18

Uh, apologies. And just to add, in terms of the specific impact that Mr. Mr. McManus is referring to, Natural England have agreed that, uh, That no further information is necessary, and the issue is now resolved that um, in their representations that appears as, quote, noisy works, location and impact on birds and mitigation, and the reference to their submission confirming it's resolved is as 018.

01:00:05:27 - 01:00:07:03

Okay. Thank you.

01:00:09:07 - 01:00:46:08

I'm going to move on now, if that's okay, to, uh, item four in the agenda, um, which is land, soil and groundwater for this item. Um, I'm simply looking for an update from the applicant, please. Um, regarding to what extent the Environment Agency's, uh, Outstanding concerns have been addressed. Um, and it's just to focus on those matters outlined in the detailed agenda for the hearing. Um, and from what I understand from the hearings that we held on Tuesday, is that matters relating to the application of permits are now seen as resolved by the applicant.

01:00:46:17 - 01:00:56:18

Um, obviously, I will invite the Environment Agency to comment, but if we could be updated on the other matters, please, it would be appreciated. Thank you.

01:01:01:11 - 01:01:11:01

Very much for the applicant. Uh, can I just clarify? Would you like us to provide the update or the, um, representative, uh, from the Environment Agency to provide that update?

01:01:11:06 - 01:01:16:11

Apologies. I would like the applicant to provide an update, please. And then I'll ask the Environment Agency to comment. Thank you.

01:01:17:00 - 01:01:21:02

Thank you. Um, in which case I'll introduce Patrick Goody.

01:01:23:01 - 01:01:45:02

Uh, yeah. Patrick goody, uh, for the applicant. Um, the, uh, the majority of the issues raised by the Environment Agency, um, we understand have been addressed with them. Um, the, the main, um, issues that remain outstanding as we understand.

01:01:45:04 - 01:01:46:12

It relate.

01:01:46:14 - 01:01:49:23

To the approach to watercourse crossings.

01:01:49:29 - 01:01:51:17

Which is outlined.

01:01:51:19 - 01:02:05:16

In the relevant responses. Uh, reference. Ah, 005 EA oh six and 807. Um, would you like me to provide our.

01:02:05:18 - 01:02:06:10

Response.

01:02:06:12 - 01:02:09:14

To these as I go through, or, um, would you like me.

01:02:09:16 - 01:02:10:01

To just.

01:02:10:03 - 01:02:12:24

Outline the ones that are, we believe are outstanding?

01:02:13:27 - 01:02:23:08

I think, um, in the interest of time, it's it's fine for you to, um, to deal with the matters that are outstanding at present. That would be appropriate. Thank you.

01:02:23:20 - 01:02:50:14

Okay. Thank you. So Patrick Guildford, on behalf of the applicant, um, in terms of watercourse crossings, um, our response has been that, um, we cannot confirm, um, the design of watercourse crossings until we've undertaken a series of detailed surveys of existing crossings. Um, mainly because um, as outlined in um, our Water Framework.

01:02:50:16 - 01:02:51:08

Directive.

01:02:51:10 - 01:03:05:07

Screening and scoping assessment. Uh rep 1030. Um, we've clarified that, um, we have a we have preference to reuse existing crossings wherever possible. Um, and then a.

01:03:05:09 - 01:03:06:02

Priority.

01:03:06:06 - 01:03:07:14

Process, um, if we.

01:03:07:16 - 01:03:08:01

Do.

01:03:08:03 - 01:03:08:22

Need new crossings. So until.

01:03:08:24 - 01:03:09:09

We've done those.

01:03:09:11 - 01:03:10:20

Detailed surveys.

01:03:11:01 - 01:03:12:04

Um, we.

01:03:12:06 - 01:03:15:21

We don't know. Um, we don't have the details.

01:03:16:02 - 01:03:16:17

Um, to.

01:03:16:19 - 01:03:22:24

Be able to provide, but we have, um, made sure or ensured that there is, um.

01:03:23:00 - 01:03:23:15

There's.

01:03:23:17 - 01:03:25:01

An approach through the protected.

01:03:25:03 - 01:03:25:29

Provisions.

01:03:26:01 - 01:03:31:25

To agree those crossings with the Environment Agency. Um, and.

01:03:31:27 - 01:03:32:12

Actually.

01:03:32:14 - 01:03:35:01

On that point this morning, we've we've.

01:03:35:03 - 01:03:36:01

Been engaging.

01:03:36:03 - 01:03:37:20

With them to agree a meeting hopefully.

01:03:37:22 - 01:03:38:07

Next.

01:03:38:09 - 01:03:43:29

Week to progress those discussions. Um, to understand, um, the.

01:03:44:01 - 01:03:44:16

Direction of.

01:03:44:18 - 01:03:45:25

Travel in terms of agreeing.

01:03:45:27 - 01:03:46:12

On the detailed.

01:03:46:14 - 01:03:50:26

Designs of the, of the watercourse crossings. Um.

01:03:51:05 - 01:03:52:02

So just.

01:03:52:04 - 01:04:00:09

Um, excuse me while I refer to the refer to the notes to, um, find the next, um, outstanding item.

01:04:05:23 - 01:04:21:05

Apologies. Actually, just to just to add to the to the previous one. Um, uh, we understand, um, the Environment Agency's, uh, concerns relate potentially to, um, the impact of crossings on the.

01:04:21:07 - 01:04:21:22

Morphology.

01:04:21:24 - 01:04:58:28

Of the rivers and the flows of the watercourses. Um. As part of our hydraulic modeling, um, exercise, um, that supported the flood risk assessment, which is rep one um 046. Um, we did we undertook some, some model tests, um, looking at adding, existing adding um crossings into the model. Um, and to cut a long story short, the um, the modelling exercise, um, demonstrated that the impact of additional crossings would be, um, not significant.

01:04:59:17 - 01:05:34:16

Um, in terms of, um, assessing the environmental impact of, of new crossings, clearly that will be, um, a case by case, um, study when we know the what new crossings are required. Um, but as we outlined in our water Framework Directive assessment, um, it's likely that existing um activities within the watercourses. So watercourse cutbacks and internal drainage board activities within the watercourses may actually have a more detrimental impact than new crossings.

01:05:34:18 - 01:05:40:27

But obviously that assessment is subject to to more detailed investigations.

01:05:42:14 - 01:06:06:27

Um, we understand that the, um the other outstanding item, um, from the Environment Agency, uh, relates to, um, the impact of, uh, fire effluent from the battery energy storage systems or bass systems that are proposed. Um, again, we've, um, we've undertaken a.

01:06:07:14 - 01:06:08:15

Um, a relatively.

01:06:08:17 - 01:06:41:00

Detailed assessment of this in the WFD, um, screening and scoping report, um, such that we followed a source pathway receptor assessment, which is a, you know, an industry standard method of assessment. Um, to look at the likelihood of a release of pollutants. Um, and as explained in paragraph or section 3.4 of the WFD assessment.

01:06:41:05 - 01:07:12:29

Um, we outlined that the the source of pollution is actually very, very low. Um, because the risk of fires occurring is um, is very low and well below, um, defined socially acceptable um risk levels as defined by the Health and Safety Executive. Um, so we've got a very we've demonstrated with empirical evidence that there is a very low risk of fire breakout occurring. We then, um, explored the pathway.

01:07:13:06 - 01:07:22:19

Um, so the method for pollutants to be released in the very unlikely event of a fire, and we concluded that the pathway.

01:07:22:21 - 01:07:23:09

Is.

01:07:23:11 - 01:08:08:28

Very limited because, um, the chances for um, uh, escape of pollutants from a battery units is very, very low because they're, um, they're designed to be effectively watertight. So, um, water can't get in as much as anything that's spilled within them. Can't get out. Um, we then proposed, um, mitigation, um, uh, in the form of gravel bases, um, uh, geotextile membranes and sand layers, um, such that in an extremely unlikely event that any pollutants did escape, um, there's mitigation proposed to reduce the chance of their release.

01:08:09:11 - 01:08:35:10

And finally, um, we concluded that the receptor, um, which, uh, in the Water Framework Directive terms, is the principal aquifer that lies beneath the site. Um, that um receptor is not particularly sensitive. So following the sort of pathway receptor method, we concluded that the risks and the environment is not significant.

01:08:40:18 - 01:08:49:03

Okay. Thank you. Is that is that your in summary, is that that are those all the matters you have in front of you as standing?

01:08:50:15 - 01:09:04:22

Mr.. For the teeth, for the applicant. That's correct. And in case it's helpful, the Environment Agency themselves produced a very helpful table which shows a sea of green with some limited smattering of amber in depth. 3039.

01:09:05:01 - 01:09:25:23

Yes, I'm aware. I'm just looking for an, you know, the most recent update, please. Um. Thank you. Um, I'd just like to ask Miss Griffiths, I believe, who's present from the Environment Agency, if she'd like to comment on what we've just heard. Um, and indeed, whether, um, she's content with what's been said. Thank you.

01:09:27:17 - 01:10:08:05

Um, Lizzie Griffiths, planning specialist for the Environment Agency. Um, I'm happy with the applicant's summary of, um. Which points remain outstanding. Um, I think we, um, are actually able to confirm that IAO seven, which was originally, uh, based on our relevant representation, uh, 005, um, has now been resolved. Um, the applicant has added commitment 669 um, which ensures that a risk assessment will be undertaken to determine where the cables will be left, in which culverts will be left in situ.

01:10:08:07 - 01:10:32:22

Sorry. Or removed. Um, so we're happy to confirm that that has been addressed in writing at the next deadline. Um, in regard to, um, the applicant's response on, um, the culverts, I think I'd like to bring in my colleague, Miss Sharon Holland. Um, as I think she may have, uh, some, some questions around that.

01:10:33:09 - 01:10:35:11

That's fine. Thank you, Miss Holland.

01:10:35:21 - 01:11:10:15

Hi, John Holland, on behalf of the irony. See, I'm a flood risk specialist. Um, so I'll be talking in terms of flood risk. Um, I know, I understand the applicant has said they've undertaken this modelling. Is this being presented within the most recent Fra? Just because I'm unaware of seeing a specific sensitivity test where you've looked at the accumulation of having multiple culvert crossings in one area. Um, we only have concerns where there is multiple in quite a small area, as obviously that will have quite throttle points on the flow. Um, so yeah, that was just my question of has this been presented in the Fra because I'm not aware of it.

01:11:11:04 - 01:11:14:24

Understood. Um, can I ask the applicant to comment, please?

01:11:24:22 - 01:11:46:10

Uh, Patrick. Good for the applicant. Yeah. The, uh, the modelling that I described is, um, contained within. And you have to bear with me on this a little bit. It's contained within appendix F of, um, the hydraulic modeling, um, report, which itself is appendix C

01:11:48:00 - 01:11:49:26

of the flood risk assessment.

01:11:54:12 - 01:12:05:15

Which is um sorry. Both. Now get the, the reference, um, which is, uh, the flood risk assessment is rep one um 046.

01:12:11:01 - 01:12:13:11

Thank you, Miss Holland. Does that answer your question?

01:12:13:13 - 01:12:40:24

Yeah. Um, however, I would expect to see commentary around this specific aspect within the main portion of the Fra as well as they do reference culverts being necessary as watercourse crossing crossings within that main portion of the Fra. We would expect them to then reference to this specifically, and also specifically discuss the results, so that it is clear within the main form of the Fra that the culvert crossings will be safe.

01:12:42:12 - 01:12:46:23

It's a goodie. Would you like to respond as to whether that's something the applicant can provide, please?

01:12:47:23 - 01:12:57:08

Mr. ability for the applicant, I think we're going to take that one away and just see if there are appropriate references that we can provide that might resolve the issue.

01:12:58:08 - 01:13:01:07

Okay. That's helpful. Let's put that down as an action point then.

01:13:05:13 - 01:13:06:06

Thank you.

01:13:09:07 - 01:13:13:03

Can I just check whether the Environment Agency has anything further to add at this point?

01:13:14:17 - 01:13:40:15

Lizzie Griffiths for the Environment Agency. Um, you mentioned, um, before, um, about our position in regards to this application and the protective provisions for the Environment Agency. Just to confirm that we're satisfied those have now been agreed and, um, we have agreed to the application

of, um, the environmental permitting regulations in regard to flood risk activities only and also the Water Resources Act in respect to the byelaws.

01:13:42:06 - 01:13:43:01

Thank you.

01:13:43:12 - 01:13:58:01

That's helpful. And then on just an additional point, um, the other outstanding issue in regard to the drainage for the battery energy storage system. Um, I would like to bring in my colleague, um, Susie Batson on that point, if that's okay.

01:13:58:21 - 01:14:00:29

That's fine. Thank you, Miss Basin.

01:14:03:21 - 01:14:04:23

Susan batson.

01:14:04:25 - 01:14:05:16

Um, groundwater.

01:14:05:18 - 01:14:08:24

And contaminated land specialist for the Environment Agency.

01:14:09:12 - 01:14:11:08

Um, on the matter of.

01:14:11:10 - 01:14:12:18

Uh, best drainage.

01:14:12:20 - 01:14:13:05

Um, we.

01:14:13:07 - 01:14:51:25

Have raised concerns previously about the, um, the drainage that's been proposed by the applicant. Um, we don't feel that we have asked for impermeable drainage. Um, around around the best. Um, this this is based on our internal guidance, which requires us to follow the National Fire Chiefs Council guidance that says suitable environmental protection measures should be provided, um, including systems for containing and managing or to run off. Um, so in the absence of any further, uh, direction in relation to using infiltration methods, that's what we expect the applicant to provide.

01:14:52:04 - 01:15:28:23

Um, I note that they have, uh, said they've completed a conceptual site model in their Water Framework Directive report. Um, and, um, we do have questions about that They assigned the principal aquifer as not being very sensitive. They don't mention in the report the fact that around, well, at least half of the proposed best units are sited on a soft protection zone three SPC three, which are vital areas for providing groundwater supplies to large abstractions locally.

01:15:29:06 - 01:15:44:27

Um, so yeah, we have some additional questions about that that we, uh, have raised and our, our stance on the maintenance that we would like some more information about how the drainage will be prevented from reaching the groundwater environment.

01:15:46:25 - 01:15:54:21

And can I just double check, because I wasn't clear, had these had already been raised with the applicant, or are these or these being raised with the applicant?

01:15:56:05 - 01:16:02:13

They have been raised. I might just, uh, check that with Lizzie, that, uh, Lizzie Griffiths, that. That's right.

01:16:04:19 - 01:16:20:18

Yeah. I think the the issue around sorry Lizzie Griffiths for the Environment Agency. I think the issue around the drainage for the battery energy storage system was raised in our relevant representation. And so there have been some ongoing discussions around that. But that's our current position at this time.

01:16:22:12 - 01:16:28:03

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Latif Ramesh, is there something the applicant would like to comment on at this time?

01:16:29:06 - 01:16:59:23

Mr. Latif, very much for the applicant. As as Miss Griffiths says, this issue around the battery storage and the drainage has has been the subject of quite significant discussions between the applicant and the Environment Agency insofar as the FCC guidance that was referred to as concerned you, you may already be aware that. But table 5.1 of the Outline Safety Management Plan contains the applicant's consideration and compliance with that document.

01:16:59:25 - 01:17:34:09

And it specifies areas How that document has shaped, um, the, the approach that we are taking. I think I will just ask Mr. Goodie to, to add anything that he wishes, but it's just to assure you this, this is being discussed and we are trying to resolve the issue. This approach that is being taken in this context is, is one that the applicant has taken on other projects. And so it is just a case of, of, of trying to provide, uh, references and assurances to, to, to ensure that we're addressing what the Environment Agency is, is raising.

01:17:36:27 - 01:18:19:07

Uh, Patrick, for the applicant. Um, yeah. Thanks for the comments. And, um, uh, like my colleague says that, uh, you know, this has been subject to a lot of debate, um, over the last few months and, um, uh, and a lot of a lot of study, um, just to reassure the Environment Agency, we do reflect the source protection zones, um, in section 3.3 of our WFD assessment. Um, and I think the, the, the main point I would like to, to put across is, um, in our, uh, detailed assessment, we've concluded that the, that the risk of fires is, uh, occurring on a base is incredibly low.

01:18:19:27 - 01:18:56:14

Um, and the pathway for um, for pollutants to enter the, uh, the environment is also incredibly low, mainly because, um, any pollutants would remain contained within the best units rather than spilling out onto the gravel base, which itself would act as, as mitigation. So I think it's those two points that we're really trying to get across in our WFD assessment and to demonstrate the incredible, incredibly low risk of, um, of danger to the to the water environment.

01:18:56:16 - 01:18:57:12

Thank you.

01:18:57:26 - 01:19:43:22

Mr. Phillips, very much barometer for the applicant. And just to add on this point, um, what the applicants considered as part of these discussions is the specific policy in paragraph five point 16.16 of, uh, N1, which sets out that the Secretary of State should consider proposals to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment and enhancement measures attached to any development consent order that are, quote, necessary. And from our perspective, that the key one of the key measures that we've adopted in this context is paragraph 5.7.1 of the outline, uh, Battery Safety Management plan, which talks about how the risk is even further minimized beyond what Mr.

01:19:43:24 - 01:19:50:07

Goodie has just said in terms of it being unlikely, uh, and, and providing the empirical evidence for that position.

01:19:55:18 - 01:19:57:16

Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

01:20:00:15 - 01:20:15:24

I'm just gonna. Before I move on and hand back to Mr. Hudson. I think that's everything from me on that particular matter. Um, is there anything anyone in the room or online wishes to raise? Can you make it known now, please?

01:20:17:06 - 01:20:17:21

I.

01:20:21:12 - 01:20:22:25

Can't see any hand. Sorry.

01:20:22:27 - 01:20:23:16

Apologies.

01:20:23:18 - 01:20:24:27

Miss. Mr. McManus.

01:20:25:03 - 01:20:27:09

Mr. Romano's apologies. It's hard.

01:20:27:12 - 01:20:41:02

No problem. I can see you very well. Uh, maybe I'm sitting in a black spot, but we have a few of those nice readings we found yesterday when the broadband went down. Uh, George McManus, speaking on behalf of East Riding against solar expansion.

01:20:42:24 - 01:21:15:20

This has been a really interesting part of the discussion. The Environment Agency is the regulator when it comes to projects like this. The area that the solar farm is planned to be built on as one of the most vulnerable parts of the United Kingdom when it comes to flood risk. I've been here 40 years and every other year significant flooding has taken place. I don't see how a project like this can proceed according to the current timetable.

01:21:15:22 - 01:21:47:19

Whilst the Environment Agency still has concerns that haven't yet been clarified. In fact, a number of these were raised only yesterday when RWA were refused permission by the Minister in Wales to go ahead with a solar farm down there. So maybe I would just respectfully suggest that there might be an AWS benefit to suggest some sort of delay, because I do have a couple of specific questions and it's all about.

01:21:47:25 - 01:22:30:03

It's all about doing your homework, basically. And I'm disappointed that since we met in July, a lot of these questions have not yet been covered. You mentioned, for example, water crossings and the fact that detailed surveys have yet to be done. No, I was a land surveyor for British Gas many years ago when I was much younger, and we did all that way in advance of even putting in the applications for construction of major gas pipelines. So the question is, can you tell us when those surveys will be done or if we just have to wait? The other thing I wanted to ask was specifically about fire risk and potential contamination.

01:22:30:13 - 01:22:42:00

My question arises from that arises from that is how Humberside Fire and Rescue Service reported on this, because I think their input could be very useful. Thank you.

01:22:44:25 - 01:22:47:07

So much. Would you like to comment, please?

01:22:53:18 - 01:23:13:19

Mr. Ramesh for the applicant. Just one point from myself and then one from Mr. Goody. I think the table that I referenced from the Environment Agency's representation is, is a good indication of how much progress we've made following discussions with them. Um, and then Mr. Goody just wants to make one point about the flood risk assessment.

01:23:15:01 - 01:23:24:24

Thank you. Patrick Goody for the applicant. Um, thank you for the comment. Um, but obviously with the Environment Agency in the room, I think I'm confident in saying that the.

01:23:24:28 - 01:23:25:13

Uh.

01:23:25:15 - 01:23:58:05

The Environment Agency have no issues with the assessment of flood risk, um, that we've arrived to. And I understand that the lead local flood authority representative is, um, is also, um, online. So I'm sure, um, they will also confirm that, um, yeah. They're happy with the, with the assessment of flood risk, um, that we've presented. Um, we have, um, reflected the, um, the known flood risk, um, to the ER and we've presented mitigation, um, accordingly.

01:23:58:09 - 01:24:00:24

Um, we've undertaken, um, very.

01:24:00:26 - 01:24:01:20

Detailed.

01:24:01:22 - 01:24:06:00

Um, and extensive modelling, um, to look at not only what the impact.

01:24:06:02 - 01:24:06:17

Of.

01:24:06:19 - 01:24:19:11

Of flooding with the defences in place is, but also if the defences failed, um, and we've mitigated accordingly. And that's all written in the Fra that has signed off basically. Thank you.

01:24:20:00 - 01:24:35:11

Sorry with your agreement, Mr. Chair, can I have answers to the two questions that I put? That is when are the detailed surveys going to be done for the water crossings and have Humberside Fire and Rescue being consulted on the fire risk?

01:24:36:02 - 01:24:45:29

Um, just just with regard to, with, with with regard to the second point, we're going to go on to that next and the the next agenda item. Um, with regard to the first, they would like to respond.

01:24:54:07 - 01:25:24:01

Mustapha Lateef for the applicant. This goes back to a point I made at the start about the framework that is established by the requirements. If Mr. McManus wants some more specific dates, we can have a separate discussion with him. Um, but just to provide comfort that the ES is informed by a number of surveys as well as the flood risk assessment, and there's a process that is set out in the requirements that ensures that as the information becomes available prior to construction, relevant surveys are carried out.

01:25:30:09 - 01:25:43:10

Thank you. Can I can I ask that, um, representative from the LRF, um, responds to the point that was raised, please.

01:25:49:13 - 01:25:54:12

Russell Clouston, East Riding, Yorkshire Council. Um, yeah. As um,

01:25:56:02 - 01:26:06:09

as the applicant stated, we have had discussions with them before and we have assessed the flood risk assessment and we were, um, happy with their proposals and the information contained within it.

01:26:08:13 - 01:26:10:08

Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

01:26:12:07 - 01:26:28:08

If, um, if nobody else has anything to add, I think, um, if I'm right, I think Mr. Hudson would like to take a break. Um, so, um, I'll pass back to Mr. Hudson so he can adjourn hearing at this time. Thank you.

01:26:32:16 - 01:26:41:10

Thank you. Yeah. We said we'd take a break around 11. It's nearly 11, so I think we'll do during the hearing until 1120. Okay. Thank you very much.