



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Rosefield Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue specific hearing 1 (ISH1) – Day 2 – Part 1
Date:	21 May 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:08:08 - 00:00:19:08

Good morning. The time is now 930 and it's time for issue specific hearing one to continue. Can I confirm that the live streaming and recording has commenced, please?

00:00:21:10 - 00:00:40:03

Thank you. I don't intend to go through all of the introductions again, but if there are any attendees who wish to speak today who did not speak yesterday, please can you introduce yourself? Starting with the the applicant team. Do you have any new speakers today, Mr. Griffiths? Good morning, Sir Richard Griffiths for the applicant.

00:00:40:05 - 00:01:00:08

Yes. Uh, uh, we have, um, relevant speakers for at the table on cultural heritage and also our cultural heritage experts online. I contribute to the entries, introduce them to you now, if that's helpful. And we also have our transport consultant at the table anticipating those two first agenda items. Can I use them now?

00:01:00:15 - 00:01:01:00

Yes, please.

00:01:01:02 - 00:01:29:24

Yes. So our cultural heritage expert is Jennifer Richards, principal archaeology and built heritage consultant at Headland Archaeology. Uh, Miss Richards is online. And to my left I have Ruth Knight, um, on design, uh, technical director at Abilene Landscape Planning. And then for the transport. Um, agenda item, we have, uh, Gordon Buchan, senior director, sector director of energy at Pearl Fishman.

00:01:32:26 - 00:01:33:18

Thank you.

00:01:35:29 - 00:01:39:24

And did the council have any new speakers today, Mr. Gazelka?

00:01:40:29 - 00:02:02:00

Thank you sir. Good morning, Daniel Gazelka for the council. I have sat with me today. Um, Zainab Hearn, our planning officer. Um, and then we have various experts who are online. Um, I don't know if it would be preferable for me to adopt the same approach I did yesterday, which is introducing when I'm going to raise them for a specific issue. I can introduce the same as Mr. Griffiths. Just have as if that is helpful.

00:02:02:20 - 00:02:06:11

Perhaps if we could cover the heritage specialist at the very least now.

00:02:06:13 - 00:02:06:28

Yes.

00:02:07:00 - 00:02:07:15

Thank you.

00:02:07:20 - 00:02:20:08

Um, yeah. So, um, we have, uh, Mr. Kenneth Sabel, who's online, who is our, um, heritage expert. And just because it came up as well, the, um, the highways expert we have as Mr. James Duncan.

00:02:20:27 - 00:02:21:22

Thank you.

00:02:24:26 - 00:02:32:21

And are there any other attendees in the room who wish to speak today? Who didn't speak yesterday? Mr. Burton?

00:02:34:17 - 00:03:12:00

Thank you sir. Good morning, James Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Bio Sciences. So just, um, to let you know that, um, Miss Helen Dent, who is the chief executive of the British In Vitro Diagnostics Association, has very kindly agreed to attend virtually today and will be speaking during the the population session, so that I'm not sure she quite counts as a new speaker for us, but she has kindly agreed to attend and speak.

00:03:12:02 - 00:03:12:20

Thank you sir.

00:03:12:26 - 00:03:14:08

Thank you. Noted.

00:03:16:03 - 00:03:22:06

And are there any other new speakers in the room who wish to speak today? You didn't speak yesterday.

00:03:25:06 - 00:03:28:06

I can see no hands and online.

00:03:33:15 - 00:03:36:01

Again I can see no hands. Oh, sorry. We do have a hand.

00:03:38:16 - 00:03:43:19

So I can just wait for the microphone, please. Jamie Ingham, clerk from the.

00:03:43:21 - 00:03:49:27

Claydon Solar Action Group. It rather depends on the subject matter. But if I do need to speak, I'll raise my hand. Thank you.

00:03:49:29 - 00:03:53:14

Is there a particular agenda item that you would like to speak on or at least.

00:03:53:18 - 00:03:54:03

Not at this.

00:03:54:05 - 00:03:55:14

Point. Okay. Thank you.

00:04:01:15 - 00:04:34:04

I can see no further hands. I shall move on for the benefit of those who didn't attend yesterday and speak yesterday. Um. Please. Each time you speak clearly into the microphone, you state your name. Who you are and who you represent each time before you speak. If you're not at the table with a microphone, there is a roving microphone. So please wait for one to be brought to you before you do speak. In terms of housekeeping for those attending in person, can everyone please sets phones and devices to silence? Toilets and refreshments are to the rear.

00:04:34:06 - 00:04:49:10

I believe there's no fire alarm test planned today. So does Garth please exit the building via the nearest fire exits? We'll aim to have a coffee break around 1130 with a lunch break around 1 p.m., depending on progress.

00:04:51:09 - 00:05:10:16

Okay, So moving into agenda item six then. So continuing on the agenda from issue specific hearing one, we'll move on to cultural heritage. And to begin with the applicant assessment of the cultural heritage effects, including its consideration of the setting of significance to designated head assets.

00:05:14:09 - 00:05:56:27

So Buckinghamshire Council's local impact reports that's rep 1-112 identifies concern that the assessment of heritage assets is high level and lacking sufficient supporting evidence, with limited consideration of historic and visual associative relationships and their setting, including the agricultural landscape. And the Council has expressed concern that the assets are siloed in their assessment, and as such, the Council considers there's a risk that effects and significant of assets have been under assessed, and therefore the assessment as provided by the applicant does not comply with MPs M1 or policy B1 of the Local Plan.

00:05:57:24 - 00:06:30:08

I note the applicant's response to the Local Impact report. That's rep 2-85 can test this position and refers back to the archaeological based assessment and Setting assessment. And that's live reference rep 2-046, as well as the planning statements regarding policy compliance. And the first question to the council, then does it have any initial comments in response to the applicant's feedback on its local impact report on this particular matter?

00:06:32:03 - 00:06:40:18

Thank you sir. Daniel Gazelka for the council. I'll bring Mr. Sable in, um, who I think has just popped up online. Mr. Sable.

00:06:40:28 - 00:06:52:19

Oh, hello. Um, Kenneth Sable, um, technical director for historic environment at Atkins. Re are this, um, heritage specialist for Buckinghamshire Council. Um, yes. The, um. Um.

00:06:55:06 - 00:07:34:06

I mean, basically the, um, a lot of our problem is with the XD of, of rep, um, to uh, 2246, which is the baseline assessment of, of um, of significance and contribution of setting to significance. Um, what we found is that it doesn't always identify the elements of significance accurately of what and what elements of of setting contribute to them. Um, the exact significance of the architecture and the history of the bill and the history of the buildings and the way in which they interact with their um, surroundings is sometimes missing.

00:07:34:17 - 00:08:07:20

Um, it also sometimes misses the wider historical relationships that still survive or partly survive and contribute to the setting. So some, some assessment of significance is is and contribution is cursory um in that, in that detailed assessment. Um and, and of course, you know our we, we feel that this, that issue leads to emission of elements. Um, um, further down the, the assessment route, uh, to which we get to, um, you know, significance of effect and harm.

00:08:10:08 - 00:08:22:26

Thank you. And are you able to expand on your position at this point in terms of how the applicant's approach is not compliance with National policy Statement? M1 um, be one of the of the local plan?

00:08:22:29 - 00:08:53:17

Yes. I mean, it's mainly due to the fact that the the we feel that the, um, the contribution of significant setting hasn't been, um, adequately explained in quite a number of cases. Um, which, which is in both of those, those policies. Um, it's interesting that, um, that I should mention now also that, um, uh, historically England's GPA three. The guidance, their guidance for setting which is mentioned, which the applicant mentions as being followed in their assessment.

00:08:53:24 - 00:09:29:20

There's a really useful checklist in there identifying aspects of setting that contribute to significance. Um which um and which help identify which might well help the applicant identify elements and the and the examiners, of course, uh, that are missed. Um, things like, um, uh, you know, layout, functional relationships, visual dominance, prominence, um, or role as a focal point. Land use, intentional interference into visibility, um, with other historic features, cultural associations.

00:09:29:22 - 00:10:03:26

And we feel that some of that some of that's missing, um, in our response to, um, uh, to, uh, the applicant's uh, uh, deadline to, um, uh, comments on our local impact report, uh, that we're going to submit it at deadline three. I've gone into a detail on the case of Butler House about where we see that

sort of playing out in detail in an example. Um, uh, we are, of course, also agreed in quite a few instances.

00:10:04:00 - 00:10:19:13

Um, um, in relation to the significance to the contribution of significance and the rest of the, um, the assessment. Uh, but there are these several heritage assets, significant heritage assets that we have still have disagreement on.

00:10:21:11 - 00:10:28:20

Thank you. Does the applicant have any initial response to that, including the point around the use of historical lens guidance.

00:10:30:02 - 00:11:04:25

Which you Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant? Um, first of all, I think it's important to note that at this, um, there was a signed statement of common ground with Historic England, and at table two, paragraph 1.4 titled Methodology and Scope of the assessment. It says that Historic England agree with the scope of methodology and conclusions of the cultural heritage assessment. So that's been submitted at deadline two. But I'm going to bring in Miss Richards now, our cultural heritage expert, to go to answer specifically the rest.

00:11:04:27 - 00:11:05:22

Thank you.

00:11:07:10 - 00:11:38:00

Good. Good morning. Jen Richards for for the applicant. Um, yes. Uh, to respond to the comments that the assessment has not adequately identified the elements of setting that contribute to significance. Um, the assessment within annex D, um, has taken the staged approach, as required by the Historic England guidance, the setting of heritage assets, and in each case, for the short list of assets that we agreed with. Buckinghamshire needed detailed assessment.

00:11:38:09 - 00:12:12:09

We have taken that staged approach of setting out what is significant about the heritage asset, how its setting contributes, the changes that the proposed development would make to that setting, and what the effect would be to significance of the heritage asset. Um, we've we've followed that staged approach. Um, I appreciate that. There is a very long checklist, uh, within the historic England guidance of elements that might contribute to significance. Um, within the assessment, we have highlighted those we felt were most relevant to the assessment.

00:12:12:11 - 00:12:44:11

Um, we have covered, um, functional relationships where they occur, um, historic associations, um, into visibilities such that it exists within there. Um, the general approach has been with the um, the specific assets within this study area. Um, in the majority of cases, the the positive contribution that the setting makes to their significance is less about specific views or viewpoints, either from or to the assets, and more about the general rural character of their surroundings.

00:12:44:16 - 00:13:15:10

That has been acknowledged within the assessment. There are a number of cases where we have not acknowledged that, that, um, that character will change. My colleague Mr. Leaver spoke to landscape character yesterday. Um, that contribution is therefore diminished, and it is our conclusion that the harm is at the lessor, substantial harm scale, um, for, for these assets. Um, I note that um, at Buckinghamshire said that they will be submitting a more, more detail at deadline three.

00:13:15:12 - 00:13:26:23

Um, and we can respond back more, more fully when we've seen the detail of that. Um, I hope that that, that, that that helps. Um, if there was anything I've, I've missed, please do let me know.

00:13:28:23 - 00:13:31:12

Thank you, Mr. Gazelka.

00:13:32:24 - 00:14:04:03

Thank you, Sir Daniel Gazelka for council. Um, obviously Mr. Szabo flagged that, um, we are providing an example at deadline three to make the point, applying, uh, the historic England guidance. I wonder, sir, if it would help with that in mind, but also noting deadline three is next Wednesday. Um, if at deadline four we provide a more complete or at least looking at the more significant examples that we see. Um, to sort of highlight in your mind where the points of disagreement are.

00:14:04:09 - 00:14:13:07

Um, I think quite a lot of it is set out in the IR, but it may be that having it all in one place or one table more obviously might assist you.

00:14:13:22 - 00:14:22:07

I think that's a good idea. So deadline four. I thought I could highlight each of the assets where this is a concern and why in relation to the guidance. Yeah, very useful exercise. Thank you.

00:14:22:10 - 00:15:01:00

So sorry. Which gives can I suggest though it might be more fruitful for the examination if we see what is written at deadline three next week. And rather than just assume that deadline for the relevant experts should actually then or our expert can look at what's being said at deadline three and then discuss, uh, the points, um, to try and avoid that disagreement. As the council's expert, um, consultant just said, there are points of agreement between quite considerable points of agreement between the two parties. So I would hope that through that discussion, once we see more detail at deadline three, that they can perhaps narrow those issues down rather than just assume we go straight to deadline four.

00:15:01:02 - 00:15:05:29

So I would encourage both parties in this forum to have engage in that further conversation.

00:15:06:01 - 00:15:17:09

Absolutely. I would always encourage negotiations behind the scenes if that can lead to any kind of agreement, all the better, really. But um, if no agreement is reached, a statement as described as the deadline for.

00:15:17:16 - 00:15:39:00

Thank you sir. The only thing I would say for the council, the only thing I'd say on that basis, then it would be it would depend when that meeting occurs. Um, so maybe if we can have some optionality around deadline for this is deadline five or we undertake to give it as soon as we can, but in any event, by deadline five, I just don't know if we can promise the meeting will happen next Friday, for example.

00:15:39:05 - 00:15:42:27

Okay. That's it. We shall try to reflect that in the in the action point.

00:15:42:29 - 00:15:43:16

Thank you sir.

00:15:46:20 - 00:15:50:27

Sir, may I make a quick comment on behalf of the Clayton Solar Action Group, please?

00:15:50:29 - 00:15:51:20

Please do.

00:15:52:04 - 00:16:32:14

Yes. Helen Hamilton, on behalf of the Clayton Solar Action Group. Um, as you will be aware, from our representation, we disagree with the level of harm identified by the applicant. Um, I just wanted to draw attention to one point which came up during the site visit when we were looking at the looking from the from Claydon House and the registered park and garden towards that designed landscape, and in particular towards Knowle Hill, which um, it is acknowledged has is part of a design landscape with that group of trees planted on the top.

00:16:33:00 - 00:17:23:08

And although the proposals are to remove the panels from the very top of the hill, that view will nevertheless be significantly altered by an essentially encircling the remainder the lower slopes of that hill within the view. And I don't feel that that has been appropriately addressed or addressed at all in the in the applicant's assessment. What's also unclear from the applicant's assessment is that we have, um, in the site selection report, a reference to the fields along Culvert Road alongside Culvert Road having been, um, disregarded because they were because of their proximity to the registered park and garden.

00:17:23:10 - 00:17:52:11

But in fact, those are level lower lying fields which would have more readily been been screened and are not as obviously part of that designed landscape. And I think that the, that, that, that some consideration could be given to, to certainly bringing the panels lower down Noel Hill so that they do not interrupt that design landscape. Thank you.

00:17:52:29 - 00:17:57:16

Thank you. Miss Hamilton. Would the applicant like to respond to those points, please?

00:17:57:27 - 00:18:04:11

Thank you sir. Richard Rivers, on behalf of the applicant, I'll ask Miss Richards if she has anything to respond to that, please.

00:18:05:09 - 00:18:35:20

Hey. Good. Good morning. Um, yeah. Jen Richards for the applicant. Um, you know, in response to the comments from the Clayton Social Action Group, um, you will note, Mister Inspector, that we have a signed statement of common ground with both Historic England and the National Trust regarding the level of harm to significance to Clayton House. Um, both parties agree that the harm is at the lower end of less than substantial. That is based on the assessment that we have provided within the environmental statement and the appendices.

00:18:35:29 - 00:18:46:05

Um, that that has given great consideration to the views from Clayton House towards Noel Hill. A key part of our design. Um, uh, consideration.

00:18:48:28 - 00:18:51:23

Thank you. Miss Hamilton, do you have any further response to that?

00:18:53:11 - 00:18:54:22

Um, I

00:18:56:12 - 00:19:17:10

only that we stand by a position that we haven't had a proper explanation of why Noel Hill was chosen in preference to those lower lying fields which could have accommodated the solar panels, with much less harm to the setting of the both the registered park and garden and the grade one listed building.

00:19:21:06 - 00:19:23:05

Miss Richards or Mr. Griffiths?

00:19:23:21 - 00:19:57:28

Uh, yes. Uh, Jen Richards for, for for the applicant. Um, the design approach is set out within our, um, design approach document. Um, Noel Hill has been, you know, panels have been excluded from Noel Hill from failed B17 in order to maintain the views from Clayton House. Um, panels would only be present on on the lower lying slopes below Noel Hill. In that view, um, we've we've pushed back from, from the, um, the, um, uh, reverse the summit, as it were, of, of Noel Hill.

00:19:58:08 - 00:20:33:16

Um, to, to to to keep that, um, appearance clear. Um, the sighting zone for the collector compound has been chosen to, um, put it within the lower, um, that the field that is, um, you know, dips down to to reduce its prominence and visibility. Um, additional poplar screening along Three Points Lane would further screen it, but once it was established. And as I said, it's all this has been agreed with Historic England and National Trust and is set out within the Statements of Common Ground, signed and submitted at deadline two.

00:20:36:06 - 00:20:36:21

Thank you.

00:20:39:02 - 00:21:15:26

Mr. Jordan. Sorry. Thank you sir. Chris Jordan, on behalf of East Claydon Parish Council. And just to add that it's not just the views from Claydon House towards Noel Hill, but there is the reverse and I think, um, as you'll appreciate from your the site visit earlier in the week when there are very clear views of Claydon House from Noel Hill, and so they will be seen in the setting of solar panels. So the contribution to the setting of Claydon House itself is influenced by the presence of solar panels, in my view.

00:21:17:08 - 00:21:56:13

Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Um, continuing on on this theme, then noting Buckinghamshire Council's stint on the grounds that's. 2 to 4 and considers that the harm to the significance of Claydon House and its associated park will be in the middle of the scale of less than substantial, which does appear to differ from the views of the National Trust, for instance. Um. The council's local report also acknowledges that mitigation may be refined following review of the additional visualisations that were submitted by deadline two from the Chinese room and the custodians flat at Clayton's House.

00:21:56:22 - 00:22:09:13

And that's led by reference rep 2052. In light of the additional visualisations. Does the council have any further comments on the level of harm to clean house?

00:22:10:09 - 00:22:14:24

Thank you sir. Danny Kosaka for the council. I'll bring in Mr. Sable here to comment on this point.

00:22:15:10 - 00:22:52:04

Sable, can I say with Buckinghamshire Council? Um, Uh, the, um, you know, the the the visualizations, uh, seem to suggest that the, um, that in the views out of the out of the principal rooms on the first floor on the garden front there, wouldn't there, you know, there wouldn't be that much visibility. There would be some visibility, but, um, there would be the same issue in relation to, um, I don't think it'll reduce the, the, um, uh, significance of the harm and the, um, in that, uh, there are much wider elements of the, um, setting of Claydon House that are affected.

00:22:52:06 - 00:23:25:21

Its its relationship with its former estate, the satellite farms, the its former parkland, which will be severed by the, by the, um, some of the, um, uh, additional, uh, mitigation planting. Um, the the, um, views from Noel Hill, as previously mentioned by others. Um, and the presence of of the awareness by people moving through the area and approaching Claydon House along its traditional towards its traditional southern entrance.

00:23:26:13 - 00:23:57:26

Of these presence of of infrastructure covering quite a wide area in and with of course the cumulative elements of um HS2 and East-West rail and the various other solar farms added to that. So we feel that actually the, the that um, in relation to, to Clayton House itself, there would be an increase in um, there would still be, um, substantial harm, less than substantial harm at the middle end of the scale.

00:23:59:15 - 00:24:16:24

Thank you. That's that's clear. Um, in terms of the point made previously around potential additional mitigation in light of those visualizations. Do you have any further comments to raise on that particular point? Are there any additional mitigations that you may have identified in light of a review of those visualizations.

00:24:18:05 - 00:25:00:26

Um, as far as, um, uh, sorry, Kent Sable, uh, Buckinghamshire Council, um, as far as, uh, in relation to those visualizations. No, I mean, there is a problem with, with planting mitigation, mitigation in that, um, the more planting that you do, the more permanent impact you're having on, on, uh, visual and associative interrelationships between heritage assets by, you know, creating barriers between fields that are otherwise, um, linked. I mean, for instance, there are bits of the, um, historic parkland of Clayton House which contribute quite, quite strongly to Clayton House that are outside the registered park and garden, um, and behind hedges.

00:25:01:00 - 00:25:31:23

There are proposals to increase the size of the heights of hedges, various other, um, planting elements which I realise also mitigate other topics. But in terms of historic environment, um, Sorry. Cultural heritage. Um, there is, um, you know, the, um, more main, you know, you more, maybe less. I mean, in a way, you're sort of damned if you do and you're damned if you don't. Do. You can put it that way. Um, and also the, uh, more planting may, uh, for further divorce.

00:25:31:27 - 00:26:04:20

The, um, the Claydon house from the its setting in relation to buildings like pond House and, um, and other elements of its setting. So I think that it's not that it may not be, um, uh, mitigate all the harm that that we've identified. I'm, you know, I'm happy to I think, you know, exploring whether, um, more planting up slightly up. Um, uh, Noel Hill may help with views from the top of Noel Hill and willing to have that discussion.

00:26:04:22 - 00:26:15:25

We're willing to have that discussion with with the applicant, um, during our continued Engagement. But this at this stage, I'm not sure whether that will help or not.

00:26:17:13 - 00:26:31:24

Thank you. Can you respond to that point of view in terms of the the level of harm that the Council considers there to be to Clayton House, and also the issues around the potential for mitigation plans into an adverse effect in some instances.

00:26:32:14 - 00:27:07:21

Thank you sir. Richard Griffiths, um, before I bring you my switches, I'll just obviously re-emphasize that the level of harm which is, um, which we say is that the lower end of less than substantial has been agreed with the National Trust, and that's recorded in their signed Stone of Common Ground and is agreed with Historic England. So those two bodies agree with our approach, the methodology, our assessment, our conclusions of the level of of the harm at the lower end of substantial of of of less than substantial.

00:27:08:15 - 00:27:51:07

So that's the first key point. And of course we are. We are. We're not, um, arguing over the, the whether it's substantial harm or less substantial. Both parties agree it's less substantial. So the test in 5.9.32 even one is engaged. Um, but you've got the applicant and National Trust and Historic England agreeing that it's less at the lower end of that less than substantial harm, uh, which is also explained the mitigation that we've already, um, proposed, uh, which was agreed with a historic England, the National Trust, um, such as the removal of panels and additional mitigation planting along um, uh, Three Points Lane.

00:27:51:09 - 00:28:24:03

And I would just add, before bringing Miss Richards, that there is also, in addition to the wider project, benefits on climate change, there are specific, uh, cultural heritage benefits that the scheme is proposing, such as the new permissive path, uh, to Noel Hill, together with interpretation panels for a new vista to Claydon House, as well as other interpretation measures and public engagement during the post DCO consent on archaeological work, so those specific cultural heritage benefits should be weighed in the balance.

00:28:24:16 - 00:28:28:28

But I now bring you, Miss Richards, to deal with any additional mitigation that the council has just mentioned.

00:28:29:04 - 00:28:29:24

Thank you.

00:28:31:07 - 00:29:10:22

Thank you, Jen Richards, for for the applicant. Um, yes. It would be useful as we start to have further conversations with, with Buckinghamshire about, um, any specific additional mitigation that they are requesting. Um, I would say that in terms of anything, um, to screen panels and views of or from Noel Hill to, to Claydon House. Um, the decision was made not to include additional planting on Noel Hill, specifically to keep that that openness and the, um, the smoothness of the of of of the profile of the Hill in the views from Clayton House, in discussion with Historic England and National Trust.

00:29:10:27 - 00:29:47:16

Um, I think, um, uh, Mr. Sable mentioned the impacts on on pond farmhouse, um, of the of the planting. Uh, they're, um, obstructing the view of the farmhouse from, um, um, Culvert Road. Um, and that planting was specifically requested by the National Trust in order to maintain the, um, approaches to to Claydon House, um, uh, to to to avoid visibility of panels. Um, as you're approaching Clayton House. Um, we acknowledge that this is is part of this planting is part of the reason that there is an impact on Pond Farmhouse.

00:29:47:18 - 00:30:05:18

We have concluded a moderate level of harm to Pond Farmhouse as a result of the changes in its setting from the proposed development. Um, a less than substantial harm within the middle of that scale, which we conclude is, is moderate, significant and significant within the within the EIA. Um.

00:30:08:03 - 00:30:25:03

Thank you. Um, so that's an interesting point you made around the I think you said the National Trust and Historic England were both, um, had concerns around the prospect of additional planting on Knowle Hill to provide screening because of the impact that the planting itself may have. Is that correct?

00:30:25:06 - 00:30:26:16

That is correct. Yes.

00:30:27:07 - 00:30:28:01

Thank you.

00:30:29:28 - 00:30:41:21

They have agreed. Sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry to interrupt her. Um, to to king it. But they have agreed that what we have proposed is suitable and appropriate mitigation. Um, for Claydon House.

00:30:42:13 - 00:30:55:17

No, sir. Thank you. Does the council have any further points on this? We will touch on Pond Farmhouse, uh, shortly. Um, in terms of clay. And are there any further points that you may have on that at this stage, please?

00:30:56:06 - 00:31:10:23

Yeah. I mean, really sorry can say, um, Buckinghamshire Council, um, just to reiterate really the point that we, we consider the setting of claim has to be more extensive than views to and from Clayton House.

00:31:11:21 - 00:31:16:27

Thank you. Do they play this live action group? Have any comments on this point?

00:31:16:29 - 00:31:19:15

Please no further comments. Thank you.

00:31:23:10 - 00:31:28:23

My apologies. Uh, Carlie Tinkler, on behalf of Clayton Solar Action Group. Would like to speak.

00:31:28:25 - 00:31:29:26

Okay. Thank you.

00:31:29:29 - 00:32:04:17

Thank you sir. It was just at this point I'd like to, um, just emphasize that there is a very similar phenomenon in terms of effects on the setting of heritage assets as there is with landscape and visual assessment. And my concern throughout, as you will have noted from my landscape report, is that the applicant is placing a great deal of reliance on vegetation to Vegetation, screen views, existing and proposed vegetation.

00:32:04:19 - 00:32:34:27

And I'm sure you're aware that, as I have said, it's not considered to be, um, a good idea to rely on vegetation screen views in the longer term, and that in the landscape assessment the applicant has actually said, sorry, excuse me. Um, the applicant actually said that they are assuming that the baseline vegetation will remain the same for the duration of the operation. That's the basis of the effects.

00:32:34:29 - 00:33:06:26

And all I would like to do here is just, um, draw your attention to Historic England's document, the setting of Heritage Assets part one, which is Settings and Views, where it is made very clear that whilst the visual effects on the setting of a heritage asset are part of the story, it is the non visual Effect that must be considered as well in terms of disturbance, noise and also importantly, how the asset is experienced.

00:33:06:28 - 00:33:16:26

And it also emphasizes that people don't need to be there or in the vicinity at that time, because things can change over time. So, um, I

00:33:18:16 - 00:33:51:23

in my opinion, not just equal importance, should be given to the non-visual aspects of effects on landscape and views, whether it's heritage or people. Um, but also it's the fact that when we're considering character and views in my report, there's an image called figure one. What is landscape? And if you look at that, that describes all the components of landscape, which includes heritage. And only a very small proportion of that wheel is devoted to site.

00:33:51:26 - 00:34:05:05

In other words, we're so accustomed to judging things by what we see, that we forget sometimes that if we were blind, we would experience a heritage asset in a different way. Thank you.

00:34:07:14 - 00:34:08:12

Mr. Griffiths.

00:34:08:23 - 00:34:13:09

Thank you sir. I see Miss Richards has her hand up to our pass. Straight to to her. Thank you.

00:34:14:02 - 00:34:14:17

Yes.

00:34:14:19 - 00:34:49:23

Jen Richards for the for the applicant. Um, or say that our assessment of Clayton House has considered more than just the views to and from Noel Hill. It is acknowledged as an important part of its setting, but other important parts have also been considered within the assessment, such as views towards Steeple Claydon, the design view towards the south, um east from the park um, that survives as a as an avenue of trees. Um the historic associations with the Verney family with um uh with with other historical figures.

00:34:49:28 - 00:35:22:09

This has all been considered within our assessment. Um, we have you know, we have not just focused on specific views. Um, the, um, uh, environmental impact assessment, the Cultural heritage chapter has also considered aspects of the development, such as such as noise during construction or decommissioning. Um, those, those, those potential effects on the significance of, of the heritage assets have been included in our assessment. They we have not sort of solely focused on, um, novel health.

00:35:24:13 - 00:35:33:04

Thank you. I think that was a point as well raised around, um, whether or not the hedgerows and screening would be, um, retained and maintained.

00:35:34:20 - 00:35:36:19

If you could respond to that point as well, please.

00:35:38:00 - 00:36:04:16

Yes. Um, for the hedgerows within, within the site, um, I would consider it is reasonable to assume that they would be maintained. Um, they are within the applicant's control. Um, to, to, to to ensure that um, the hedgerows are kept to, to the heights anticipated for appropriate mitigation screening. I think that is reasonable. And part of my colleague, Mr. Lever can speak to that a little bit more if you need to.

00:36:05:25 - 00:36:06:26

Yes, please.

00:36:12:12 - 00:36:53:21

And lever on behalf of the applicant. Yes. So the um, the Olympe document in particular provides, uh, I think, reassurance in terms of the approach to management of hedgerows. Um, hedgerows are something that we discussed or hedgerow management was something that we discussed with the National Trust in particular at an early stage, and they were very keen with regard to the hedgerows being, uh, primarily elm species in nature, that any stepping up of heights would be done in a very, uh, graduated process and, and with a limit of height as well, in order to ensure that the health of the elm hedgerows was maintained.

00:36:54:06 - 00:37:08:15

Um, so in terms of, of of how and why we're, uh, increasing the height of the hedgerow, uh, that has been undertaken with clear discussion with the National Trust. Um,

00:37:10:09 - 00:37:15:14

thank you, Mr. Leaver. Miss Tinkler, do you have any points in response, please?

00:37:15:16 - 00:37:16:13

No, thank you, sir.

00:37:18:04 - 00:37:18:28

Thank you.

00:37:22:22 - 00:37:56:06

Do you have any final comments on point A in the agenda around the assessment of effects and significant before we move on to mitigation? We have touched on mitigation to an extent already, but I've got further questions on that point. Um, moving on then I coming back to the pond farmhouse. Can the applicant please show appendix to B, which is the Landscape and Ecological Management Mitigation and Enhancement Plan in the Olymp.

00:37:56:13 - 00:38:07:27

That's rep 20670. There we go. Thank you. Um. Buckinghamshire Council's response to the examining authority's first written question. That's Q 1.1.1

00:38:09:18 - 00:38:42:01

stated that it would welcome the setting of solar PV arrays further back from Pond Farmhouse. Um, the examining authority also noted on its unaccompanied site inspection that the setback between the solar array and the list of buildings is reduced at the north eastern corner of field B4. Um. As has already been mentioned, the council has also expressed concern around excessive screening to the east of the farmhouse, which may cause harm by severing the relationship between the farm and Claydon House. A question, first of all, to the applicants.

00:38:43:01 - 00:39:08:20

Um, can you expand on the rationale behind the extent of the setbacks from farmhouse in terms of heritage mitigation, please, recognizing that it is acknowledged there will be a moderate significant effect at this location. Um, could that not be reduced any further by further consideration of the extent of the setbacks over the applicant?

00:39:09:13 - 00:39:12:06

Thank you sir. I'll bring in Miss Richards to answer that question.

00:39:13:26 - 00:39:47:14

Jen Richards for the applicant. Um, um, you you've asked whether, um, uh, panels could be could be further set back, um, in order to, to to get to a point where we, um, you know, say we've concluded a middle level of a substantial harm to Pond Farmhouse as a result of this, um, development. Um, to to get to a point where we had no harm to the significance of Pond Farmhouse, we would effectively need to remove, um, all panels, um, uh, west of Shrubs Wood.

00:39:47:16 - 00:40:22:11

Um, there's a substantial, um, uh, portion of, of the development and have a commensurate, uh, impact on the, um, the output generating capacity of, of the scheme and noting that, um, it's already been reduced from an initial 500MW to 335MW. Um, and so to get to a point where we had, um, no impact, we would need to lose a considerable chunk of generating capacity. Um, we would still therefore, um, be within realms of less than substantial harm if we were to only have a slight offset, an increased offset within B4.

00:40:22:25 - 00:40:41:09

Um, we would still have less than substantial harm to it. Uh, to to Pond Farmhouse. And that that was the sort of reasoning behind, um, balancing, um, you know, unacknowledged impact to Pond Farmhouse with, um, increased benefits of the additional generating capacity.

00:40:42:27 - 00:41:13:26

Thank you. And what inform the distance of the setbacks from the farmhouse? And again, I note field before the corner. North eastern corner has come quite close to the boundary of Pond Farmhouse. Um, it's not clear why that is, for instance, or why the other distances of setbacks have been set in the way that they have. And I understand from the response and the counsel that they weren't agreed with the council either, to stand a bit more on the applicant's thought process on those, please.

00:41:15:06 - 00:41:41:03

Yes. Um, it was it was, um, a partly residential amenity as well as heritage. On this it is a residential property. Um, there are, um, trees as along the, the western boundary of, of Pond Farmhouse, which help to sort of filter the view in that direction. The more open views are those to the north, south and east. And that is why those fields have been removed from solar PV.

00:41:44:13 - 00:41:48:02

Thank you. Does the council have any points to raise please?

00:41:48:08 - 00:41:51:23

Thank you sir. I'll bring in Mr. Sable straightaway.

00:41:52:11 - 00:42:30:11

Yeah, I can Sable. Buckinghamshire council. Um, the, um. I mean, our concern really is that, um, um, you know, well, speaking generally, in fact, uh, when, you know, when a grade two listed building is sitting in, it's more or less in its original, um, unaltered setting and then enclosed by, um, uh, um, planting and development, uh, on, on most sides instead of distance and that the approaches past it to its significant associated other um assets um feature um development.

00:42:30:13 - 00:42:51:03

Um, it would normally, uh, conservatively be be um, assessed at being at the high end of less and substantial harm. And I think some people might even consider it substantial harm. Um, there is there is quite a lot of damage to significance. And actually the, um, you know, I can I can understand why the my, the, um,

00:42:52:27 - 00:43:08:21

uh, mitigation planting has, has been thought out. Uh, but but in a way. Um, the more setback there is and, uh, the better the, um, the situation would be, and the less harm there would be to the farmhouse.

00:43:11:00 - 00:43:12:12

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths.

00:43:13:01 - 00:43:45:01

Thank you, sir. Rich Griffiths on part of the applicant. I think the the the point here is that our assessment has concluded, uh, as indeed I think all parties agree the harm is less than substantial.

There's a disagreement over whether it's at the middle level of that or which is our position. The council is saying it's higher than that. Um, I would just add that going back to, uh, I know I sound like a broken record, that. The common ground with Historic England, for example, agrees with the methodology in our approach.

00:43:45:12 - 00:44:21:13

Um, to, uh, um, to designated uh, assets. And whilst that's focused on the grade one Claydon House, the fact they agree with how we've approached that and nothing changes in terms of how we approach the methodology to the grade two heritage assets. So I think that's needs to be weighed in the in the balance. And you know, here we you know, we'll keep discussing with the authorities, but I think we're not going to reach a we may not reach agreement. Here's professional judgment as to whether it's at the higher end of less substantial harm or the middle end of less than substantial harm.

00:44:21:15 - 00:44:43:19

And it will then come down to you in terms of policy, 5.9.32 in weighing that level, in the balance against the benefits of the scheme, plus the cultural heritage benefits that the scheme will will give rise to. I don't know whether there is anything else to add on that.

00:44:45:09 - 00:44:47:11

No, no, I have nothing else to add. Thank you.

00:44:49:10 - 00:44:50:15

Thank you, Mr. Elko.

00:44:51:27 - 00:45:26:24

Thank you sir. I may bring in Mr. Sable in a second if he has any further comments on that. Um, just to pick up a couple of things that Mr. Griffiths raised there. Um, we are in, I think, on both sides, a position where we think it's less than substantial harm and we disagree with where on that scale it lies. Of course, the obligation on the applicant is still to apply the mitigation hierarchy and Historic England, or anyone else accepting that there is less than substantial harm, even at the middle end of the scale, doesn't mean that there isn't an obligation to try and avoid and mitigate and compensate as and when you can.

00:45:26:26 - 00:45:57:06

And this is certainly the case where I think the applicant accepts this is a significant effect in EIA terms as well. So, um, even if the applicant disagrees with what Mr. Sable is saying, from a position of the assessment of the harm, the fact that, um, one should approach mitigation and try and introduce it, um, further where we can. It's still something that applies even on the applicant's own assessment and then on approach. Um, obviously you've got Mr. Sables points on approach to Claydon House.

00:45:57:08 - 00:46:29:22

I would have a slight note of caution about saying, um, general comments about the methodology in relation to Claydon House can be just sort of cut and paste to, um, things of a historic England haven't concentrated on. Ultimately, if you were to omit something and by, you know, honest mistake, um, when you're assessing the setting of a heritage asset, um, you may have tried to apply GPA three, but

you may have made a mistake. So I would just a note of caution on saying that Historic England accepted one thing. Therefore we accept the methodology at all.

00:46:30:18 - 00:46:36:28

No, I think that's correct. So, Mr. Griffiths, Um, I don't think historically, actually. Any specific comments on palm farmers, have they?

00:46:38:10 - 00:47:10:06

Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. No, I didn't say they had, I said that. I said the focus of the SOCOG was on the Clayton House. My point was they the the methodology doesn't suddenly how the applicant is approached, the methodology doesn't suddenly change when you move from grade one to grade two. So my point was, they had accepted how we'd approached the methodology to the grade one and therefore, whilst they haven't now accept the SOC doesn't go into grade two, but our methodology hasn't changed.

00:47:10:11 - 00:47:52:10

Just on the mitigation point, the applicant has applied mitigation. As Miss Richards emphasized, and as you've seen from the scheme, the scheme has reduced to its current level of 3.35. We are looking to maximise that grid connection of 3.35MW and the mitigation that's been put forward, and as has been described in terms of the removal and setbacks throughout the scheme, has been applied to a level where we consider and it's obviously down to your judgment and your recommendation that we consider when you balance that, uh, uh, middle level of less than financial harm against the benefits, uh, leads you to a particular conclusion.

00:47:52:12 - 00:48:02:04

Um, so that's where we are with the application of, of mitigation. We consider we've gone as far as we can to mitigate, uh, without to to achieve the scheme's objectives.

00:48:03:15 - 00:48:26:00

Thank you. Um, just staying on the issue of mitigation and screening, noting the applicant's response to our first questions. And that was ten 1.1.13. Uh, it suggests that the existing planting to the west of the farmhouse provides adequate screening. Uh, just a question to the applicant as to how effective that would be during the winter months.

00:48:32:20 - 00:48:35:04

Bringing me switches to answer that question, please. Thank you.

00:48:36:03 - 00:48:36:23

Um.

00:48:39:16 - 00:48:56:06

Uh, it would obviously be, uh, sorry. Jen Richards for the applicant. Um, the, um, you know, with without leaf cover. Um, those those those trees would provide, um, less screening, obviously. Um, but they would still provide some filtering of the views, which would minimize the effect.

00:48:58:28 - 00:49:12:09

And the assessment that's been undertaken. There's that as I would undertake on the basis of a worst case scenario with the uh, Windsor, uh, screening degree planting from the, from the hedgerow, or is that a summer based assessment?

00:49:13:02 - 00:49:43:27

Um, it, it, it has, it has been undertaken um with with with with with the worst case in in mind. Um, the the effects on pond farmhouse are as a result of the change the character of the its surroundings, not just any particular views. It is of, you know that that the agricultural holding changing to solar PV. Um is is what is um, you know, the, the basis of the, of the effect rather than specific visibility of panels from, from Pond Farmhouse.

00:49:44:05 - 00:49:48:22

Um, it is that change in wider character that that is the effect.

00:49:49:17 - 00:49:54:22

Okay. Thank you. Does the council have any final points on on farmhouse, please?

00:49:54:24 - 00:49:56:29

Um, I will bring in Mr. Sable.

00:50:01:06 - 00:50:53:12

Oh, sorry. Yes. My my, uh, Kenneth Sable. Um, Buckinghamshire council. So my camera and mike were became suddenly muted. So I hadn't been able to, um, I've never been able to speak for the last few minutes. Um, the, um. Yes. I mean, the, um, there is a point that I should that I should add that the relationship between the pond farmhouse and indeed the other farmhouses and Claydon House is quite, quite strong. And there was something that the um that the assessment, the detailed the the applicant's detailed assessment appendix D of uh of 46 um, uh, didn't mention which was the architecture of these of the three farmhouses has been deliberately built to respond to that of Claydon House and that they've used stone, whereas other architecture of the period in the vicinity, in the area is, is brick.

00:50:53:14 - 00:51:17:06

So actually there's been a deliberate attempt to, to show that language which, which would probably, um, appreciate from from Noel Hill, from Clayton Housman, from various other places. Um, even though you can't see pond House itself, you can see the other two. Um, so actually there is a strong setting relationship that will will be harmed and a legibility of relationships.

00:51:19:03 - 00:51:23:02

Thank you. So did you say that that relationship is recognised in XD.

00:51:23:25 - 00:51:41:13

Know it isn't. It hasn't been mentioned. The fact that the the architecture, in fact, in annex D, there's a lot missing about the detail of architecture of buildings. And the point I've been going to make in the submission three relating to Botolph House relates to an understanding of the nature of its architecture.

00:51:42:24 - 00:51:50:00

Thank you. Um, can you respond to that point, please? About the relationship with the architectural styles between the three?

00:51:50:07 - 00:51:54:20

Yes. I have to agree with some part of the applicant after being in the author of that with Richard's.

00:51:54:22 - 00:51:55:20

Thank you, thank you.

00:51:56:12 - 00:52:26:28

Yes, gentlemen. Richard's for the applicant. Um, the the relationship between, um, uh, the the, um, black Blackmoor Hill farmhouse and Rose Hill farmhouse with, with Clayton um, has been explicitly recognized within the assessment. Um, it has not been noted in the assessment for Pond farmhouse. Um because, uh, the listed building description for that uh, does make no reference to it being an estate farm. We acknowledge that it is a stone building.

00:52:27:06 - 00:52:54:19

Um, there is a potential link with with Claydon House. Um, but there is no indivisibility between it. And I was, um, I would make the point that there will be no physical impact to Pond Farmhouse. It will remain a stone farmhouse building, albeit with its setting altered. Um, and that element of its significance will still be present and appreciable um, to to future generations. Um.

00:52:56:28 - 00:53:13:27

Thank you. And in relation to the point made by the council that the farmhouse was designed specifically to tie in with, with Claydon House recognising its relationship. Um, which I don't think has been reflected in, in the assessment. If you could deal with that point in particular, please.

00:53:14:19 - 00:53:52:10

Um, I, I, I thought I had sorry. Jan Richards for the applicant. Um, the, um, you always say there is. There is no indivisibility between Pond Farmhouse and Claydon. Um, so, you know, there's no visual. Um, there's no severing of a visual relationship between them. Um, that, um, that potential, um, historic link, as I say, the is is is a conceptual one of understanding pond farmhouse as as as a stone farmhouse rather than a brick built one. Um, and it will still be possible to appreciate that, um, that is not sort of, um, you know, expressly set out within within our assessment.

00:53:52:12 - 00:53:58:21

Um, but as I say, we we have concluded a moderate effect on Pond Farmhouse.

00:54:00:18 - 00:54:05:00

Thank you. Does the council have any final comments, please?

00:54:06:10 - 00:54:38:08

Um, yeah. Kenneth Sable. Um, Buckinghamshire Council three. Um, then I should have waited for you to ask to ask you to respond. Uh. My mistake. Um, apologies. Um, the, um. Yeah. I just wanted to make a point in relation to Jen's point. Point about no physical impacts, uh, impacts on setting our

direct impact on significance and can be permanent, especially, um, uh, or temporary. Um, the fact that it isn't physical doesn't make it any less of an impact.

00:54:41:00 - 00:54:41:25

Thank you.

00:54:44:12 - 00:54:45:19

Okay. Unless you have any.

00:54:47:22 - 00:54:51:07

Thank you. Helen Hamilton, on behalf of Clayton Solar Action Group.

00:54:51:14 - 00:54:53:03

Um, just two points.

00:54:53:05 - 00:55:00:08

Um, firstly, following on from what Mr. Tinkler said earlier, um, there is a concern about relying on.

00:55:00:10 - 00:55:01:01

Planting.

00:55:01:03 - 00:55:02:10

For mitigation.

00:55:02:12 - 00:55:03:08

Because.

00:55:03:15 - 00:55:22:08

The we for example, we went up to Maxwell Farm and saw the cherry trees there that had been devastated by the ermine moth. Um, and that sort of, um, that sort of loss of trees and planting is growing increasingly commonplace with climate change.

00:55:22:10 - 00:55:23:25

And the.

00:55:23:27 - 00:55:57:16

Second. Well, actually three points. Sorry. The second point on that is that what would also be an impact on Pond Farmhouse, which is both amenity and related to its setting as a listed building, is the total loss of views. And so the total loss of that relationship within the agricultural landscape within which it sits and with which it's associated. And the third point is about the setback of the solar panels.

00:55:57:21 - 00:56:42:26

Um, and the applicant argument was that there would be two greater loss of generating capacity if the setbacks were increased. But if you refer to at 037, which is the planning statement and the site selection um section, in that the site selection process was for a site of between 250 and 500MW. Um,

the fact that this site will achieve 335MW or thereabouts, means that it's actually delivering more than the applicant initially set out as its threshold.

00:56:43:15 - 00:56:44:14

Thank you very much.

00:56:44:16 - 00:56:49:00

Thank you, Miss Hamilton. Um, can the applicant respond to those points, please?

00:56:49:18 - 00:57:25:00

Thank you sir. Richard Griffiths I'll make a couple of points, then ask Mr. Willis if she has anything to add. Um, just on the climate change point. This is precisely why the scheme is coming forward to help reduce any of those effects of of climate change. Um, so the scheme is precisely designed to try and help a country tackle net zero. Um, Secondly, it is not. It is a standard approach in EIA, and it's not a reasonable approach in EIA for an applicant to assume that planting outside its red line boundary does not exist.

00:57:25:02 - 00:57:51:29

It is reasonable to assume that that planting remains. If you don't assume that there's all that planting disappears. That is not how you would assess your scheme, any scheme. Um, on that point, regarding the, uh, megawatt output, the applicant obtained a grid connection offer of 500MW. Um, and uh, uh, that was then the, um,

00:57:53:23 - 00:58:17:01

that's how then the scheme, uh, to try and maximise that connection through iterative process, then that's been reduced back down to, uh, three, three, five. I can bring in I think, um, uh, Miss Price is on the line as well to, to go into more detail on that. So perhaps I'll bring Miss Price first on that point and then pass to Miss Richards on any specific further landscape mitigation. On cultural heritage. So, Miss Price first.

00:58:20:02 - 00:58:23:02

Thank you, Sarah Price, for the applicant.

00:58:23:07 - 00:58:24:01

Um, just.

00:58:24:03 - 00:58:28:03

On the point raised by the Sailor Action.

00:58:28:05 - 00:58:28:20

Group.

00:58:28:22 - 00:59:02:06

With regard to, um, the the scheme that the applicant was seeking to develop. Um, uh, the speaker for the action group is quite right that the applicant was looking for, um, to develop an NTP scale solar

project within the range of about 250 to 500MW. Um, it is quite normal to then go through a process of, um, seeking to identify suitable lands to deliver a project of that scale.

00:59:02:08 - 00:59:43:14

And as set out in the site selection report, which is appendix one of the planning statement. The applicant took a robust and logical process to seeking to identify suitable land, which could deliver a solar project of a scale within that range. Having been through that iterative process, the applicant identified the scheme that has now been applied for, which delivers a capacity lower than the 500MW, but within the range it was seeking to deliver.

00:59:43:16 - 01:00:12:12

To be able to deliver a viable scheme and to deliver a maximise the energy, renewable energy that could be delivered through this project whilst seeking to deliver a scheme which was suitable to its context. Um, I'm happy to answer questions or go through the site selection approach in more detail, but being mindful of all of the items on the agenda that is all set out in appendix one of the planning statement.

01:00:13:18 - 01:00:23:05

Thank you, Mr. Vice. I don't think there's a need to go through the site selection again. We have considered that previously, and I've got that material available in the library as well. Um, Mr. Griffiths.

01:00:23:07 - 01:00:28:12

And then if I can just ask if Miss Richards has anything else to add to what the action Group has said, please.

01:00:29:04 - 01:01:05:13

Um, I do not, but I sorry, Jan Richards for the applicant. I don't have anything else to add to, um, the comments from the Social action group. I did want to just respond back to something that Mr. Sable had said, um, regarding the, um, that just because the development is, is is not having a physical impact, that it is less it's not less of an impact. Um, and I would just direct the examining authority to the email and CFO guidance document the principles of cultural heritage impact assessment, which is clear, that impact assessment needs to consider.

01:01:07:15 - 01:01:38:29

The significance of heritage assets in the round, as it were, and that it is relevant that there is no physical impact to to these designated heritage assets. They are the elements of their significance that are inherent within their fabric as examples of that, that their type of, of, of, of building or register park or any other sort of designated asset, those, those elements inherent in their fabric are not being altered by this development. We are only talking about change within their setting. Um, so I just wanted to make that point to the examining authority.

01:01:39:25 - 01:01:43:23

Okay. Thank you. Does the council wish to respond to that?

01:01:44:16 - 01:01:58:19

Um, thank you sir. Daniel Gazelka for the council. I will check with Mister Stable, but I don't I don't think there's a disagreement on how one approach is assessing the significance in the way that's just been described. But, Mister. Mister Sable.

01:02:02:19 - 01:02:03:04

If.

01:02:17:28 - 01:02:20:12

I can see that his microphone is sort of doing a

01:02:22:01 - 01:02:22:21

weird.

01:02:24:19 - 01:02:26:19

We'll come back to him in a moment, if that's okay.

01:02:27:03 - 01:02:31:21

Yes. No, I think that's okay. As I say, sorry, I think Mr. Saber was just pointing out. Oh.

01:02:32:06 - 01:02:41:10

Yes, sorry, I yes, I have, I have nothing to add. Uh, sorry. My, my the mic keeps, um, stopping working every now and then. So apologies for that.

01:02:41:27 - 01:02:46:17

That's a problem. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Burton. You have your hand up at the back.

01:02:48:13 - 01:03:26:24

James Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. Uh, just before the debate moves on, sir, could I please just briefly correct something that Miss Price might just have suggested? I'm sure you won't have misunderstood, but it is very important to bear in mind that the selection of alternatives is not one that starts from the applicant having worked up their final scheme, it is one that starts, as policy tells us, based on the objectives and the objectives, which are as far as we can find them, set out in the applicant's

01:03:28:22 - 01:04:02:26

047 alternatives document are for a scheme, amongst other things, of up to 500MW. And the best, of course, we can find. As Miss Hamilton just referred you to in terms of any narrowing of that down is 250 to 500MW, which is what's in the planning statement. Now, it's very important to bear that in mind, because it does mean that when you are considering the question of alternatives, both for EIA purposes and also for compulsory acquisition and other tests.

01:04:03:03 - 01:04:24:12

That is the framework in which you are working and not, as Miss Price suggested, asking whether the fully worked up scheme is that that is the object of alternatives. No, it's the objectives. And I will probably come back to this because there are some other points when we come to transport. But thank you. So I want to make that correction.

01:04:25:27 - 01:04:34:06

Noted. Thank you, Mr. Burton. Um, does he wish to respond to that point now or. I think it was initially covered yesterday to an extent as well.

01:04:34:08 - 01:04:49:03

I think it's on par for the applicant. Um, unless Miss Price has to say. I think given the time and the agenda number of items we need to get through in the course of today. Uh, we can respond to further on that if we need to in writing, but I just double check with Miss Price.

01:04:51:29 - 01:05:02:05

I see that, thank you. Um, sorry, I was just going to confirm. I don't need to add anything further to that. Thank you. We're happy to respond in writing. Sorry, that's there a price for the applicant.

01:05:03:05 - 01:05:07:17

Thank you. Now, would that be a response at deadline three as part of your oral summary?

01:05:08:05 - 01:05:12:11

Yes. We'll add a bit more detail to that at our deadline. Three.

01:05:12:22 - 01:05:50:24

Thank you. Uh, okay. Mr. Jordan. Thank you sir. Um, we haven't had the chance to discuss hidden cultural assets. I was just wondering if I could ask a question in relation to that. Um, in order to contextualize the applicant's findings. Um, please go ahead. Thank you. Conscious of the time, and I understand, since we have agreed to be brief. Um, yes. Uh, this relates to East Claydon and to the north east of East Claydon, to north east of the grade two listed white House and grade two star listed Um Saint Mary's Church.

01:05:50:29 - 01:06:23:12

There is an area which is visible through aerial photography and Being leader representing the former medieval platform village. And if you drop down further towards the National Grid substation, existing National Grid substation. Um, to there's always been the consideration of where a former Roman road, the route of a former Roman Roman road lane, now rose. The applicant's, uh, archaeological investigations those were started.

01:06:23:17 - 01:06:55:29

And also statecraft have found substantial evidence of Iron Age and Roman remains and some evidence of the route of the Roman road. Uh, and statecraft have found remains of a evidence of a Roman ladder settlement to the north east of the site. Now, the missing link in all this is the land that National Grid proposes to occupy with their new substation. They have undertaken archaeological investigations.

01:06:56:03 - 01:07:30:16

As yet, I don't think those have been published. Um, the, uh, the applicant has an interest in that same parcel of land, um, say, um, say 52 to 54 and 57 to 59. And I was just wondering whether the applicant has had sight of the results of that, uh, investigation, the National Grid's investigation, so

that they could contextualize their own findings. And we can see the overall importance of of that area around parcel three.

01:07:30:22 - 01:07:35:22

Thank you. Thank you. Um, Mr. Griffiths, would the applicant like to comment?

01:07:36:00 - 01:07:40:16

Thank you, sir. Mr. Griffiths, I'll ask Miss Switches to respond to that, please.

01:07:42:03 - 01:08:26:15

Yes. Jan Richards for the applicant. Um, the, uh, the. We are aware of the National grid, um, evaluation that's been carried out, but we have not yet had sight of the results of that, um, evaluation. Um, we are in, um, in the process of monitoring when that becomes available. Um, we will be considering how that contextualizes the remains within within the applicant's site. Um, the draft archaeological management strategy, which has been agreed with Buckinghamshire Council, um, includes provision for us at various points in any post consent, um archaeological work to incorporate results from neighbouring schemes.

01:08:26:19 - 01:08:40:04

Um and emerging results from from from from. From any further work they may do. Um into the understanding of of the archaeology that may become apparent in, in the um any consented development.

01:08:41:14 - 01:08:47:19

Thank you. So the results would be taken on board and reflected at a later date, when they become available.

01:08:47:26 - 01:08:50:27

At the appropriate time. When they become available. Yes.

01:08:51:26 - 01:09:14:13

Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Chris Jordan, on behalf of East Cleaving Parish Council. No, thank you for that. We look forward to seeing those results. Thank you. Unless we have any further points to raise from anybody in the room or online in relation to cultural heritage. I will move on to agenda item seven transport on access.

01:09:17:26 - 01:09:26:07

I can see no hands. So I'll move on to agenda item seven A, which is the applicant's assessment of transport and access matters.

01:09:28:01 - 01:09:58:20

Um, in relation to the mode share. Um we note the updates to the outline construction traffic management plan a deadline two. That's rep 2065, paragraph 4.10.4, which states that the mode share targets for the staff travel plan will be agreed with Buckinghamshire Council prior to where it's commencing, and will be in line with those presented in the environmental Statement assessment

01:10:00:06 - 01:10:02:03

and first to the applicant.

01:10:04:10 - 01:10:17:06

Does that update to the Construction Traffic Management plan suggest that the mode share might vary from that assumed in the assessment in line with? Would it be the same as.

01:10:20:25 - 01:10:27:24

Good morning sir. Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So they would remain the same as has been assessed.

01:10:28:25 - 01:10:44:27

Thank you. On that basis, I wasn't quite clear what the council will be agreeing. So it would just be the same as what was in the environmental statement. It just seemed to imply there would perhaps be a little wiggle room on those, um, modal share targets set.

01:10:48:00 - 01:11:13:08

Excuse me. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. Um, the the whole of the, um tmp sir would be subject to agreement with the council. I think this was just more just clarifying matters there. Um, if we can do better on modal share and encourage more sustainable access to the site, then that would also allow us to increase that as well. In terms of the use of staff buses or indeed car share to the site as well.

01:11:15:01 - 01:11:17:24

Okay. Would they cancel that comment, please?

01:11:21:06 - 01:11:23:09

Um, thank you sir. Um, I'll.

01:11:23:11 - 01:11:23:26

Go.

01:11:23:28 - 01:11:29:10

Possibly to, um, to James Duncan first. Hopefully he's on the line.

01:11:35:21 - 01:11:53:10

James Duncan for Buckinghamshire Council. Um, there's not not a lot to comment on that. Um, yes. We agree that, uh, The chair is set in the documents before you. Um, and that, um,

01:11:54:27 - 01:12:10:16

we would expect to see the detail of that, um, within the, the detailed CMP and, and what have you. So it's ensuring that the objectives set out within the framework documents are.

01:12:14:15 - 01:12:24:18

To confirm, sir, was the was the concern rather about whether it's sufficiently secured in a sort of DCO drafting sense?

01:12:24:20 - 01:12:27:08

My reading of it was there was a degree of ambiguity.

01:12:27:24 - 01:12:58:03

Right. I say, um, I know I've discussed with Mr.. Um, with Mr. Duncan before the question of making sure that this figure is achieved or beaten, which, um, I think was referred to um, because it's also relevant to air quality. And our air quality expert has raised that with us. And if it's included in the TMP with the requirement to substantially comply with the TMP, and I think the council will be satisfied. But that's the normal drafting you see in a DCL.

01:12:58:05 - 01:13:12:03

And I think it maybe goes back to the sort of similar issue you had with the outline lamp yesterday. Um, so, um, I think we understand where it is secured and it will be enforced through the outline and then detailed plan.

01:13:12:11 - 01:13:16:20

So the council is satisfied with the updated text and the construction traffic management plan.

01:13:16:25 - 01:13:24:17

I'll just triple check the wording, sir, again for you, but I think so. Yes, but I will check that of the brick if that's okay. Just absolutely confirm.

01:13:24:20 - 01:13:25:29

Thank you. Noted.

01:13:30:18 - 01:14:02:19

Moving on. Um, in relation to concerns that the council raised in relation to, uh, temporary traffic control signals in the council's local impact report states. RET 1-112 identified possible impacts on the traffic. Temporary traffic control signals the length of which on the highway may introduce unqualified delays, with no assessment made of the ability of two way traffic to be accommodated at either end of the signals, where queues awaiting traffic may form.

01:14:03:14 - 01:14:30:18

The applicant has responded to that in 2-85, and suggested that the actual extend to road subjects temperature signals would be much shorter than those stated and schedule two, part two of the Draft Development Consent Order. That's rep 2004. And to the council, then, is it satisfied with the applicant's response? Um which appear suggest that no further assessment of highways is required on that basis?

01:14:32:02 - 01:14:35:15

Yeah. Thank you sir. I'll go to Mr. Duncan again.

01:14:39:29 - 01:15:18:05

Uh, James Duncan, the council. Um, I'm satisfied with the response of the intention, um, from from the applicant. Uh, however, I do still have concerns, and we have received some suggested amended

wording from the applicant, um, which I believe will be, um, submitted at deadline three. Uh, we can confirm that if I'm correct. Um, my my concern remains that we need to to have satisfied ourselves and yourselves that the wording is, is clear and understood, that that's what it means.

01:15:20:24 - 01:15:29:18

Thank you. The applicant let's respond, please. Particularly in relation to what may be coming in at deadline three. What what is that and where will it appear please.

01:15:31:11 - 01:16:14:19

Thank you sir. Gordon, on behalf of the applicant, um, in terms of, um, The suggested change that Mr. Mr. Duncan for the council had suggested. We we've been having various discussions and I'm very grateful to him and his colleagues for those ongoing discussions that we've been having throughout this process. We have made some suggested comments to try and clarify that the traffic signals would be there for the formation of the site access junctions and solely for that period of undertaking those those roadworks there and other road modifications required to provide access to the site and the safe and efficient manner.

01:16:14:27 - 01:16:49:13

And then afterwards there will be no further need for traffic control on the network. We have suggested some draft text that has been put forward to the council. I'm hopeful that we will have a meeting either tomorrow or early next week just to have a discussion. Um, in terms of the transport of, you know, officer to transport consultant regard, but also in terms of my my learning colleagues on the legal profession, given that it is a legal document that those changes are being made to and you wouldn't want me to make them so without reference to the lawyers.

01:16:49:15 - 01:17:02:11

But we are hopeful that those discussions were happy will happen early next week, and that we will be able to provide an updated set of comments for your consideration, hopefully by deadline. Three sir.

01:17:02:19 - 01:17:05:22

Thank you sir, the change to the draft consent order.

01:17:07:12 - 01:17:26:07

Richard. Excuse me, Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the. Yes, sir. It's article 17 to the draft consent order, which is traffic regulation measures. And we propose some amended drafting to that which is, um, which is with the which we wish to discuss with the authority.

01:17:26:24 - 01:17:31:21

Thank you. So we'll note as an acting point, make on deadline three for an update to that.

01:17:32:05 - 01:17:32:21

Yes, sir.

01:17:32:28 - 01:17:34:09

Thank you. Thank you.

01:17:40:21 - 01:17:44:07

Moving on then, to abnormal individual loads.

01:17:45:24 - 01:18:12:18

The applicant's response to the examining authority's first written question in its Q1 1918 states that full details of the abnormal individual load, or AIL traffic management measures, will be undertaken once the selected Ale configuration has been confirmed, post determination, and that the measures will be outlined in the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan as required in the Development Consent Order.

01:18:14:16 - 01:18:35:17

Buckinghamshire Council's response to the same question, and that's rep 2-85, appears to indicate that the Ale route survey appended to the transport assessment, and that's at 131, should be a supplement to the Outline Construction Traffic Management plan. Just a question. First to the council.

01:18:37:06 - 01:18:50:16

Is it seeking further updates to the Outline Construction traffic management plan to reflect the Ale route survey at this stage, or is it satisfied with the applicant suggestion that further information will provide that the detailed design stage?

01:18:52:21 - 01:18:57:27

Thank you sir. Because I'll come to the council, I'll go to Mr. Duncan first when I'll pick up the remaining points about security afterwards.

01:18:57:29 - 01:18:58:21

Thank you.

01:18:59:29 - 01:19:23:27

Thank you. Council highlights. Um, we're accepting of the the current position. The ale movements will be under separate, um, orders and processes, and therefore the further information will come through as a part of that process for which, um, the applicant will have to apply at the time of need for those movements.

01:19:26:01 - 01:19:27:18

Thank you, Mr. Gazelka.

01:19:28:04 - 01:19:39:23

Thank you sir. Danny, because I prefer the council. So it's sort of a the parallel position means that we're satisfied that the two things interact such that it gives us what we need in the circumstances.

01:19:39:25 - 01:19:42:11

Thank you. So no, no further concerns on that point.

01:19:45:24 - 01:20:21:22

Moving on to junction drawings again, the outlining construction traffic management plan was update at the deadline two nights at 2065 to provide minor updates to the access junction drawings in annex two and to the applicant. First of all, can you just clarify what the changes were that were made to annex two and why? It appears as though some features have been annotated, although it's not clear what for. Um, or it does appear the swept path analysis for Claydon Road North and South do appear provide greater clarity on the junction layouts.

01:20:21:24 - 01:20:28:26

Um, I couldn't find any explanation as to what the changes were set out there. Perhaps if they happened to describe what has changed and why the first please.

01:20:31:02 - 01:21:01:15

Thank you sir. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, sir, there was a general tidying up of the the junctions in order to ensure that they fully aligned with the latest version of the master plans, but also to provide a response to the council's request for further details in terms of swept path analysis. Um, there was just some minor tidying up of the junction pack, the sorry drawing packages there. Um, there was nothing substantial in terms of the changes there.

01:21:01:17 - 01:21:07:22

Um, but obviously you've referred to the the conclusion there of the swept path drawings.

01:21:08:10 - 01:21:15:14

Thank you. And do the council have any comments in terms of whether or not they satisfy their request for further details on on those drawings?

01:21:15:16 - 01:21:17:23

Um, thank you sir. Mr. Duncan.

01:21:22:12 - 01:21:27:04

James. Councillor. Um, no. Nothing further to add match that.

01:21:29:21 - 01:21:32:10

Satisfied with what we have received.

01:21:33:18 - 01:21:34:11

Thank you.

01:21:39:10 - 01:21:42:26

Moving on then, to rights of way.

01:21:45:05 - 01:21:47:14

Apologies, sir. If I may just make.

01:21:47:16 - 01:21:48:01

A.

01:21:48:03 - 01:21:48:18

Brief comment.

01:21:48:20 - 01:21:50:15

On behalf of the action Group.

01:21:50:22 - 01:21:51:15

Please do.

01:21:51:20 - 01:21:53:09

Uh, Helen Hamilton, on.

01:21:53:11 - 01:21:54:23

Behalf of Clayton Solar.

01:21:54:25 - 01:21:59:26

Action Group. Um, it is a broad point, really, but there is a.

01:22:00:06 - 01:22:00:21

The.

01:22:00:23 - 01:22:31:10

Action group is concerned about the level of detail that is left over for consideration. Post your determination, disapprobation, which will be decided by the Council and therefore not open to public consultation. There are so many variables that we have drawn attention to. For example, the construction of the prison. HS2. HS2, we've just heard, is now going to be delayed for another two years.

01:22:31:12 - 01:23:08:14

So there's that construction period is going to continue for a long time. Which which means that there are going to be, you know, traffic interruptions with those, but they're also going to be interactions in terms of construction workers. And so it's unclear whether even the, you know, the proposals for managing many buses to bring workers in are really going to work. And all of this is is very dynamic at the moment. But what it means is that we really can't be certain that what we're looking at is a reasonable worst case scenario.

01:23:08:16 - 01:23:48:23

And the concerns in particular for the for the action group are about the impacts on amenity and on fear and intimidation and so on from road users that have already had very high levels of disruption for several years from the amount of development that has been going on in the area. And you will have seen we've we've tried to give a picture of some of that disruption. And so I think we would like to see, um, greater assessment and a and a more clear worst case, reasonable worst case scenario presented at a at an earlier stage.

01:23:51:04 - 01:23:58:18

Thank you. And would the action group also be looking for, uh, further detail in the outline construction traffic management plan?

01:23:59:10 - 01:24:00:09

Yes, please.

01:24:03:03 - 01:24:05:05

Would the applicant like to respond to that, please?

01:24:07:09 - 01:24:46:21

Thank you, sir. Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of cumulative elements, we already have assessed that, um, using the information at present, the tmp Process under the DCO requires the local authority to oversee the review and consider that we have a signed statement of common ground or finalized statement of Common Ground with HS2, and on that side that commits the applicant to regular and ongoing discussions about transport and access matters, and through the the evolution of the final ICMP.

01:24:46:24 - 01:25:22:10

Any further cumulative matters can be addressed within that, and there is flexibility within that to accommodate HS to if there are changes to its programme and indeed its transport in terms of the staff travel arrangements, that is a requirement of the DCO. Therefore, it is a legal requirement for the applicant to abide by the mode share targets that are published within and agreed within the TMP. In addition, the applicant is requiring their contractors to abide by the CTM fully.

01:25:22:12 - 01:25:35:16

So there is a double lock there. So of a legal obligation and a contractual obligation for those working at site to secure the modal shares that are proposed within the documents. I hope that gives some clarity.

01:25:36:12 - 01:25:41:15

Thank you. Um, Miss Hamilton, do you have any comments in response, please?

01:25:42:20 - 01:25:44:15

Uh, apologies, I have no further comment.

01:25:44:17 - 01:25:47:16

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Burton.

01:25:50:12 - 01:26:11:01

Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. So before you move on to public rights of way, it won't surprise you to know that we do have some points and queries we'd like to bring forward regarding the access arrangements concerning Granby Road. This seems to be the appropriate item to do so. Would you like me to hold fire on that?

01:26:11:08 - 01:26:24:10

Yes, please. We will be covering that under population. Um, so there will be some discussion around the specific issues around Preston Farms access requirements under the population item. If you could hold back until then, please be appreciated.

01:26:24:12 - 01:26:38:16

I will hold back, sir. I hope I'm not asking too much of an indulgence of the applicant that it retains its transport expert. I'm here for that because I think they are properly transport points. Thank you sir.

01:26:40:18 - 01:26:41:16

Mr. Griffiths.

01:26:41:22 - 01:26:48:09

Thank you sir. Mr. Griffiths on the applicant. Yes, we fully intend to have our transport expert for that agenda item.

01:26:48:11 - 01:27:19:02

Thank you. Um, moving on to right away. Um, the outline Rights of Way and access strategy was updated at deadline two to include a minimum reference and reference to a minimum two metre width and newly created footpaths subject to survey at the detailed design stage, as well as the commitment to survey the scope for stairs and gates to identify potential mobility gates provided within the old limits to improve access for the mobility impaired.

01:27:19:24 - 01:27:27:13

Um, this was a concern raised by the council, I believe. Do the updates. The deadline to address the council's concerns.

01:27:29:19 - 01:27:31:22

Thank you sir. Daniel Gazelka for the council. Yes.

01:27:33:10 - 01:27:47:20

Thank you. Um, at this point, can the applicant please share the streets rights of way and access plans? Sheet one. That's 1-006 on the screen, please.

01:27:59:25 - 01:28:02:15

If you could just scroll up little.

01:28:06:08 - 01:28:13:01

And down again. Sorry. Just want to capture the. Yes. That's fine. Yeah. Thank you. Um.

01:28:15:11 - 01:28:22:01

So just pick it up on some of the council's concerns around diversions in the vicinity of the Pond farmhouse. Um.

01:28:24:19 - 01:28:56:07

I know that the council has raised concerns around the diversion to the northwest of Pond Farmhouse and Parcel one. Um, with two right angled bends at S.W. 40. Uh, which unnecessary inconvenience in

the view of the council, as they do not follow the design lines of the right of way. Um, I think it helps for the applicant if sorry, the council could just describe the the concern in relation to what we see on plan and what it would like to see instead.

01:28:56:09 - 01:29:15:06

Yes. Thank you sir. Daniel Gazelka for the council. Just give me one second. I actually think that this point may now have been. Yes. In fact, I can see not on the other side as well. Um, I think this position has been resolved. I can see is our, um, is, um, Jonathan on the. Sorry. Jonathan Clark on the line.

01:29:16:05 - 01:29:16:20

Yes.

01:29:16:22 - 01:29:17:07

Good morning.

01:29:17:09 - 01:29:20:20

Great. Thank you. Jonathan. If you're able to speak to it. But I think I think that is where we are.

01:29:21:25 - 01:29:49:25

Yes. Good morning. Jonathan Clark, on behalf of the council. Good morning. Yes. This matter has been resolved, but subject to an assurance that those footpaths wouldn't be fenced off for the 40 year life of the scheme. And it's just, uh, I wish to secure, um, an assurance in that regard. Um, I believe that falls in the applicant's court. Now, to, um, put that in one of the documents.

01:29:51:23 - 01:29:53:00

Oh, is the applicant.

01:29:53:07 - 01:30:08:08

Thank you, sir. Rich Griffiths on the applicant. Yes. Um, just to confirm that it is agreed. And we'll be amending, um, the design commitments, uh, uh, for deadline three to make that, um, that commitment regarding the fencing.

01:30:08:29 - 01:30:11:25

Thank you. We'll note that as a as an action point.

01:30:12:14 - 01:30:43:20

I just go back to the previous two items that were raised upon which we agree. But again, the mechanism by which the widths are secured hasn't been agreed. And I think, as with other DCO projects such as East-West rail and uh, the primary legislation for HS2, they included a table of highways to be amended, which is included here. But in column four there needs to be the minimum width so that we can record that in the definitive statement.

01:30:46:00 - 01:30:46:18

Thank you.

01:30:46:20 - 01:31:05:25

So that's column four of the table of highways to be amended. And for the styles and gate survey. I would very much appreciate if the British standard for for gaps, gates and styles could be mentioned in the documents as well. That's BS 5709 2018.

01:31:08:13 - 01:31:09:27

That's it for me. Thank you.

01:31:10:03 - 01:31:10:26

Thank you.

01:31:14:03 - 01:31:16:14

Can you respond to those two points, please?

01:31:16:23 - 01:31:32:01

Yes. Thank you sir. Richard Griffiths on the applicant. Yes. We will add in the minimum width for column four and, um, the British Standard as well. Uh, in the uh outline in the public sector strategy document.

01:31:32:13 - 01:31:33:23

Is that for deadline three?

01:31:34:18 - 01:31:35:07

Yes.

01:31:35:26 - 01:31:38:08

Thank you again. We'll note that as an action point.

01:31:41:11 - 01:32:03:27

Okay. Um, at this point I'd just like to revisit a point raised, I think, by Mr. Jordan yesterday, um, under agenda item four regarding flood risk at the proposed access points, um, I believe the applicant requested that we consider it today when the appropriate people were in the room. Is that correct?

01:32:05:17 - 01:32:15:11

Richard griffiths Yes. Um. Uh, we can cover that now. Um, I'll pass out to, uh, Mr. Buchan to, uh, to give his answer.

01:32:17:29 - 01:32:57:05

Thank you, sir. Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the design of the site access junctions, the site access junction will not just review the geometry of the road to junction its kerbs, its formation, etc., but will also include the drainage elements required to provide a satisfactory performance of the junction and the surrounding road network and indeed the access track going into the site. Um, we are in, um, going to be undertaking a technical degree of technical, um consultation and agreement process with the council in terms of the formation of those junctions.

01:32:57:07 - 01:33:36:10

And I believe yesterday there was discussion about that. The the local highways authority had looked at it and other parties had looked at it. We have the advantage, sir, in terms of the technical approval process with the council and having access to the fields. Sir, you have the ability to undertake works on the public road, within the verge of the medium of the road and also in the field, sir. So in terms of identifying the course for the flooding there, that can be remedied within that design process and providing a benefit not just to safe and efficient access to the site, but also to other road users as well.

01:33:36:12 - 01:33:36:27

Sir.

01:33:37:25 - 01:33:41:09

Thank you. Does the council have any comments on that, please?

01:33:43:03 - 01:33:51:16

Um, I will ask, um, Mr. Duncan if he's still on the line, whether there's any comments there.

01:33:57:24 - 01:34:01:10

From the council. Um, no further comment to make on that.

01:34:02:28 - 01:34:03:22

Thank you. Thanks, sir.

01:34:04:19 - 01:34:35:06

Mr. Jordan, is there anything you'd like to say in response? Thank you sir. Chris Jordan, East Clayton parish council. I think our concern is not simply the point of access is subject to flooding, but also the fields beyond the access point that are subject to flooding. I think this is particularly the case for fields access from Granbury Road and also the ale access from East Claydon Road.

01:34:35:10 - 01:34:54:17

In the field there is, as I mentioned yesterday, is frequently under water. I don't know what the gross weight of the ales is, but I just wonder how that's going to be managed. And similarly, what damage is going to be caused to the fields accessing from Granby Road?

01:34:58:03 - 01:34:59:00

Mr. Griffiths?

01:35:02:13 - 01:35:31:04

On behalf of the applicant. So I can't really comment in terms of flood elements within the site because that is covered by a separate expert there. In terms of the performance of the access tracks, they will be designed to accommodate the suitable um, axle loadings and gross vehicle weights of the abnormal load in that regard. But it with regards to flooding matters, I would have to defer to the expert on those matters, but I hope that clarification on ale weights is of assistance.

01:35:31:17 - 01:35:42:17

It is. Thank you. I think perhaps a response in writing on the on the wider Fleurus point might be appropriate. If that's possible, please, Mr. Griffiths. Deadline three.

01:35:44:23 - 01:36:00:06

Which gives an applicant I can't confirm deadline three because I haven't. I can't speak to our consultant, but we will take it as an action and aim for deadline three. If not deadline four. And we will let you know at deadline three. If it's not in 30th at deadline four. Yeah. Thank you.

01:36:03:04 - 01:36:34:28

Okay. Unless we have any further points to raise. We do. Mr. Jordan. I'm sorry, but Penny turns up again. Chris Jordan, on behalf of East Clayton Parish Council. I think one of our concerns, um, particularly having experienced for many years east west rail, HS2 and so on, damaging roads and the threats to other road users is that the applicant has failed to consider non-motorized road users.

01:36:35:05 - 01:37:18:20

Um, they are really quite dismissive of cyclists, pedestrians, equestrians and they set a very high bar in terms of, uh, impact significance on, um, uh, fear intimidation. The local road network is used very widely by cyclists, both individuals cycling groups and also by pedestrians and equestrians, and the prospect of HGVs travelling down narrow country lanes is extremely threatening because there's no escape route, there's no footpath, there's no no, no street lighting.

01:37:19:02 - 01:37:54:06

Um, Snake Lane will have a 470% increase in HGV traffic. Now the applicant's um uh, threshold for fear and intimidation being significant is 90% increase. So these are very significant impacts on local road users. And just one second point is the other issue we've experienced with HS2 in EWR is failure to control, um, traffic, be it HGVs coming through our villages when they shouldn't.

01:37:54:08 - 01:38:28:08

But also is the issue the large number of non HGV traffic bringing staff, 600 staff to the site and so on, which comes through the village's um speeds, through the villages and so on. And the applicant says they will instruct their drivers not to, uh, not to speed and so on. But the level of control is never very good. And so particularly with non-motorized, uh, road users, I would like to get some response from the applicant as to how they intend to manage that issue.

01:38:28:10 - 01:38:31:24

Thank you sir. Thank you. I was the applicant.

01:38:32:27 - 01:39:05:09

Yeah. Thank you sir. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, sir, if I could, um, direct you to the construction traffic management plan. Um, the latest version is rep two, dash 065. Um, the, um, there is a section 4.11 on non-motorized road users that sets out, Various measures there to protect and look after pedestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. This will also be expanded upon within the finalised document.

01:39:05:18 - 01:39:52:23

One of the measures that several measures that were mentioned there, um, in terms of policing. The vehicles on the access routes, we have a range of measures there. So that include the provision of GPS tracking on vehicles. We have spot checks, we have tachograph records. We have everything in terms

of knowing where vehicles are, what speeds they are undertaking and those that break the rules will no longer be on the site. Sir, we have listened to the local residents and we're very grateful for their comments at the various public meetings and consultations that we've held, and we've got a really good understanding of the failings that perhaps other schemes have had in their construction traffic management plans.

01:39:52:25 - 01:40:31:21

We want to do better than that. So we have a range of measures designed to enforce, but also to take action where people do not follow the rules. And that includes exclusion from the site for those that break the regulations of the the applicants operation there. So there's a range of measures within the TMP. And one of the measures that was quite frequently advised during the consultation meetings was that particularly for some of the railway projects where a complaint was made, there was no follow up from that.

01:40:31:23 - 01:41:06:12

We have a guaranteed and set time for responses. If people make complaints, um, about, um, issues that they spot on the road network in terms of wear and tear, we have a wear and tear agreement put in place. There's a whole range of measures that I think exceed what perhaps residents have experienced and understand their reticence from experience, from other projects. But we have learned and adapted from those projects nearby, but also adapted from the experience of numerous wind farm and solar farm projects across the United Kingdom as well.

01:41:06:14 - 01:41:09:09

To try and give you our best in class. Thank you.

01:41:09:12 - 01:41:41:24

Thank you and sorry if I can put your previous on that. If I can add on that, build on that. That of course, it's in the applicant's interest to ensure compliance with the content of the CMP, given the enforcement mechanisms on a development consent order. So it is absolutely in the applicant's interest to do all the monitoring that has been outlined and to take appropriate action through its own contracts with the workforce to ensure its compliance with the CMP, with the local authority.

01:41:42:28 - 01:41:51:08

Thank you. And does the council have any comments on those points in terms of the effects on non-motorized users, as well as the enforceability of the measures and the.

01:41:51:19 - 01:42:09:27

Thank you, Sir Danny Gazelka for the council, I did. I was messaging Mr. Duncan just as. That conversation was ongoing, but I'm not going to reply. So, um, if I can just bring in, um, Mr. Duncan if he is there. Um, I'm aware that I don't think there's any concerns from our perspective about the TMP, but I will just allow him to come in.

01:42:11:13 - 01:42:13:27

Uh, thanks for the council. Um,

01:42:15:15 - 01:42:33:22

I'm in agreement with with what's being said this far. The the TMP does contain those measures. Um, they they are in excess of or above those measures that were secured for other infrastructure projects. Um, and so

01:42:35:08 - 01:42:42:07

we, we are aware of, of that there is a lot of local concern in the area. Um,

01:42:44:12 - 01:43:09:07

the construction period is, is a construction period. Um, and, and we have to balance that. We need to facilitate those movements that have to take place. Um, so, so in short, I am comfortable that the camp covers what needs to be covered. Um, and does have measures within it to address those concerns.

01:43:11:01 - 01:43:19:07

So the council is satisfied in terms of, uh, provision for the safety of walkers, cyclists, horse riders, etc., during the construction phase.

01:43:19:26 - 01:43:20:19

Correct.

01:43:21:25 - 01:43:22:20

Thank you.

01:43:25:13 - 01:43:27:00

Miss Tinkler.

01:43:30:07 - 01:44:05:15

Carley. Tinkler. Clayton. Solar action group. Um, so I know you said that you didn't want to talk about Lynton glare during these events. However, I think that it's entirely relevant that I just raised my concerns again as set out in section eight of my landscape report, and the point about which I am most concerned is very brief. It is that the Glint and Glare assessment method categorises all people who are using minor roads and public rights of way, crossing the sites as low sensitivity receptors.

01:44:05:22 - 01:44:28:08

And the reason that it does that is because it assumes that only low numbers of people use local roads and public rights of way, and therefore, if there was an accident which was caused by glint in glare, the numbers of casualties and fatalities would therefore be low and not significant. Thank you.

01:44:29:22 - 01:44:35:25

Thank you. Does the applicant have a response to that point at this stage?

01:44:38:22 - 01:44:41:20

It may be something that needs to respond to in writing.

01:44:42:02 - 01:44:53:27

Thank you sir. Rich group is one part of that. Yes. Um, I made a note of that point. We haven't got the author of the assessment here because it wasn't on the agenda. But we will take that away and provide a written response.

01:44:54:07 - 01:44:57:27

But deadline three. I will be determined.

01:44:57:29 - 01:45:06:18

I would hope so. I can't confirm that. So I haven't got the author here. But, um, we will endeavour for next week. But, um, I can't specifically confirm.

01:45:07:13 - 01:45:09:24

Thank you, Mr. Tinkler.

01:45:10:00 - 01:45:42:03

So, yes, it was just to clarify, if we do discuss glinton. It would be helpful to know when it could be, because, um, there have been developments in the field of glint and glare. Obviously, I'm not a technical expert, so I don't attempt to comment on the method itself, but I am aware that on a solar tip called Lime Down that the group has appointed a glint and glare expert and he has, um, serious concerns about the glint and glare assessment method which has been used by this applicant.

01:45:42:15 - 01:46:02:05

I know that it's the same method that's used throughout the industry. Um, and it you know, it's possible that the Clayton Solar Action Group may wish to appoint an expert because it is a matter of great concern. So I just wondered if it is likely to come up at another hearing so that we could be prepared. Thank you.

01:46:02:21 - 01:46:07:00

Well, I can't commit to what may be in the agenda for hearings in July at this stage.

01:46:08:17 - 01:46:32:12

Thank you. Okay. Um, conscious of the time? Um, if there are any further issues to raise in relation to transport and access, uh, we'll move on to item eight. But before then, I think we'll probably do a short coffee break. Uh, so if we adjourn until 1130 and then we'll reconvene with agenda item number eight. Thank you.