



Hearing Transcript

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

00:00:07:14 - 00:00:21:27

Okay. It's 1130. And time for issue specific here in one. So you continue with agenda item eight on population. Can I just confirm that the live stream recording has commenced, please? Thank you. Yes, sir.

00:00:22:28 - 00:00:57:18

Sorry, sir. Um, Danny Gazelka for the council. Just one small point about TMP. Um, but I said I'd come back to you. Um, um, we've just had a quick chat, and, um, there was a possible slight wording change that we might put into the, um, tmp to agree, putting the figures from the traffic assessment into the TMP. And I know there's some other discussions that the applicant and, um, at the our traffic officer needs to speak about. So the hope is that will be a further meeting between then to discuss some of the wording aspects of that and possibly the DCO as well.

00:00:57:26 - 00:01:15:16

Um, I've just been informed that Mr. Duncan isn't around next week, so I wonder, sir, if it will be helpful as a possibly an action point for them to meet a minute deadline for there be a new version of the MP to take in those matters. Um, if the applicant is open to that.

00:01:17:12 - 00:01:35:04

Mr. Griffiths. Thank you sir. Rich Griffiths on path applicant. Um, yes, we're open to that. We agree. We want to try and resolve all things in one go. So there's kind of one final version of the TMP before you as quickly as possible. So we'll work to differ. Thank you. That seems sensible. We'll know that as an action point for deadline for then.

00:01:37:08 - 00:02:10:08

Okay. So agenda item eight population. The effects on businesses and mitigation are listed separately on the agenda. However I will cover some of the mitigation measures under item A with B focusing specifically on field E 23 and the proposed replacement land. Just to make a note, we'll also cover noise effects separately under agenda item ten of the agenda and air quality separately as well where that is relevant.

00:02:11:20 - 00:02:17:22

So moving on then. And to begin with, in relation to critical national priority,

00:02:19:13 - 00:02:49:19

uh, the examining authorities, 33 questions. This is Q 1.7.1, sort of using whether the exception to critical national priority. I set out a national policy statement M one paragraph 4.2.15 would apply as there could be an unacceptable risk to unacceptable interference with human health and public safety. Due to the role of Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences in providing medical supplies to the NHS and beyond.

00:02:50:12 - 00:03:07:25

The applicant's response to this deadline two. And that's rep 2087 states that the exception does not apply, as there is no evidence to suggest that they would jeopardize the future of the business, and also no evidence that there will be a measurable impact on the functioning of the of the NHS.

00:03:11:02 - 00:03:34:26

Preston Farms and also responded to this question and that's up to 107. To reiterate the point, that is the only farm of its kind in England and Wales, and TS Baron Sciences is the only operation in England, Wales supplying donor blood animal products for clinical microbiology, and reiterated its importance in terms of the supply chain in meeting this need.

00:03:37:25 - 00:03:58:29

A question, first of all to Preston Farms. Um, I'm following up from the applicant's response. Um, is Preston Farms able to provide any further details to respond to the applicant's points, that there is no evidence that the effects of the developments would have a measurable impact on the functioning of the NHS.

00:04:02:17 - 00:04:39:01

James Burton. Sir, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. Yes, sir. Um, and, um, it really, um, shouldn't be rocket science and it won't surprise you to hear we say this is one of very many examples of the applicant failing to understand my clients, to assess my clients, to properly apply its mind to our clients. The, um, the document, um, provided by um, bifida.

00:04:39:06 - 00:05:12:18

So the British In Vitro Diagnostics Association, which is the one I'd like to start with because it's an independent body. So let's not have it just from my clients, which we appended to our written representations. That explains that and are just for now. I'm focusing on the NHS and very much taking your questions, sir. And I noted the applicant's rather surprising and my submission response that there is no evidence of a measurable impact on the NHS.

00:05:12:23 - 00:05:45:28

The document, of course, explains that more than 60 million blood containing agar plates are used annually in the UK, requiring over 50,000l of donor animal blood each year. Now, in a minute, Mr. Preston and Mr. Williams will say something more about this. But as you as you know, my clients are the only supplier of animal donor blood in England and Wales and one of only two in the UK.

00:05:46:06 - 00:06:21:08

The other concern, which is in Scotland, is in fact Smaller. Now, the nature of the product and you've now had the benefit. You're in a very small number of people who've actually seen what you have seen is highly sensitive. It's fragile, it's time sensitive, it's physically sensitive. And all of these things, um, the numbers speak for themselves. We know what those 60 million agar plates the NHS uses a for their to diagnose infectious people, infections, diseases or all the rest of it.

00:06:21:10 - 00:07:04:02

They are they are vital. And what this does to say in addition of course to confirming which they do on page five of their document that um, that there's only one other company which is the one in Scotland. In the UK they have a section addressing the national consequences of disruption. Um, and

they say the need for constant supply of fresh donor animal blood products must not be underestimated. Any significant disruption, whether from disease, outbreak, infrastructure products and so on, means delayed or misdiagnosis of serious infections increased inappropriate antibiotic prescribing.

00:07:04:12 - 00:07:42:12

Collapse of antimicrobial resistance. Surveillance, higher hospital admissions and health care costs reduced national resilience against emerging infections. The applicant, respectfully, is making the wrong point. It's asked itself the wrong question in seeking to back this away on the basis there's no measurable impact. You don't need some precisely quantifiable, measurable, measurable impact to know immediately that any interference without my client's operation is an unacceptable risk.

00:07:43:11 - 00:08:04:02

I say that by way of introduction. I'm now going to turn to Mr. Mr. Mr. Preston and see if he and Mr. Williams see if they have anything else to say. And I suspect this is probably the moment if she's online for Miss Dent to be ready to say anything she has to say, because I hope she is hear from bifida. Thank you sir.

00:08:04:13 - 00:08:05:07

Thank you.

00:08:06:19 - 00:08:38:08

Uh, James Preston, Preston farms. I absolutely reiterate everything that's just been said. Um, I think just to go back to the beginning, we were founded 60 years ago, uh, with the express, um, intention to create, uh, sterile donor animal blood. Um, the key is the stress free environment, and obviously, uh, an adherence to aseptic techniques that remove any chance or reduce the chance of contaminations getting into the blood.

00:08:38:10 - 00:09:05:15

So obviously, there's the element of contaminated blood being unusable, but there's also obviously the concern that contamination in the blood, when the blood is being used as a clinical diagnostic tool, could actually misdiagnosed what was wrong ultimately with with the patient. Um, I don't know what other detail you would like me to add at this point. And obviously Gareth from HTC's Biosciences perspective can speak as well.

00:09:08:07 - 00:09:09:08

Yes, please.

00:09:11:23 - 00:09:36:23

Um, Gareth Williams, uh, on behalf of TCS Biosciences. And just really to add, um, to what Mr. Preston has said, the other key point with the product itself is a necessarily short shelf life. The product can't be stockpiled and customers can't stockpile the product. We are dealing with weeks, not months in terms of, um, the stability of the product. So effectively any impacts would be felt very quickly indeed.

00:09:39:14 - 00:09:58:13

And so just just so you're you're you're clear. We're not at this point unless you invite us to dealing with the other part, as it were, of the question which is, well, would there be impacts on us? Um, if you want us to address that now, we will.

00:09:59:17 - 00:10:10:18

In terms of the specific impacts, run access, etc., we will be coming to that. Yeah. Um, at the moment I'm just trying to establish the effect on the health care sector in, in the UK effectively.

00:10:10:20 - 00:10:16:18

I correctly understood that. That's great. Thank you sir. I don't know if miss miss dent is sorry.

00:10:18:12 - 00:10:23:03

Is is Miss Dent online? I don't I don't know how I'm asking into the ether really but.

00:10:23:20 - 00:10:24:20

Yes I am.

00:10:27:01 - 00:10:32:09

Mr.. Over to you. Do you have any further points raise. Thank you.

00:10:33:08 - 00:11:04:13

Good morning. Helen Dent, chief executive of the in relation to Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. So, um, yeah, the impact on the UK health system as well as externally is actually quite is incredibly significant. So you've been told about the numbers. Um, and to put things into context is you have the day to day use of the NHS in primary care, GP's, doctor's surgeries, walk in centres and hospitals.

00:11:04:16 - 00:11:37:25

That's day to day and that's where the vast majority of these agar plates use. And that is literally to identify what is wrong with the patient. If you don't identify what is wrong with the patient in the first place, then you will treat them incorrectly. If you treat them incorrectly, you've got risk of obviously death, which is which is significant, but also by treating them with the wrong drugs and antibiotics. So everyone in the room will have heard of superbugs. Superbugs is a media way of explaining antimicrobial resistance. It's where the bugs are resistant to the drugs because they are exposed too much to them.

00:11:37:27 - 00:12:24:10

Basically, the use of these agar plates identifies it so that you can target those illnesses and those infections directly. And there is no other way of identifying the specific strains of these bugs that people are presenting in hospitals with recent examples, which you will all be able to contextualize as the meningitis outbreak. The plates were used to identify what strain that was so they could treat them. The hantavirus is works in the background with that. And um, a couple of years ago you had the strep A that was all identified and managed by these plates, by the health system, who are actually looking after those in the background, in the public health laboratories, in the NHS laboratories and identifying infection outbreaks.

00:12:24:14 - 00:13:01:15

So that's from the NHS perspective when you're talking from a wider perspective. So my organisation works with UK government across UK government to deliver health care policy and that includes defense policy. These agar plates are also used in defense to determine any bioweapon hazards, anything that might be attacked. So the Salisbury attacks many years ago, for example, that is the use of these plates. So on a day to day basis, these plates are used to manage the health of the nation and the patients and to identify and to get people better for the wider perspective.

00:13:01:27 - 00:13:40:18

Pandemic planning, the ability to surge test the ability to identify what pathogens might be there in order for vaccine development, in order for drug development. It is absolutely critical. And the points that have been made here about the numbers on the day to day are very important. However, we also need to remember that it's the wider long term disruption in supply. So to have a disruption in supply or even a risk in disruption to supply when we've already got a negative situation with only two providers of that in the UK, and they also go externally.

00:13:40:20 - 00:14:29:04

These products are also used by manufacturers, innovators and R&D in order to bring new products to market, to combat antimicrobial resistance, but also to combat and to bring new products for newly identified diseases or diseases that haven't previously been able to be treated. So any disruption in the supply chain or any risk of disruption in the supply chain, including the quality of the products that are produced by Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences, and any increase in the fragility of NHS supply for critical and emergency response planning for both infection diagnostics, pandemics and global biosecurity is absolutely critical and therefore I would completely disagree that there is no impact.

00:14:29:06 - 00:14:59:12

I've been having conversations separately to this as there is a process within government which is about designating critical national infrastructure, we consider this. So I've been talking to the Office of Life Sciences, Department of Health and also UK Health Security Agency about how we can ensure that critical supply, which is the fundamental baseline of our ability to respond to any health infection, is actually protected through national critical infrastructure.

00:14:59:14 - 00:15:12:08

This situation here is an unusual situation that is unique and is unprecedented, but the impact is absolutely catastrophic if there is a failure to supply in this area.

00:15:14:09 - 00:15:44:27

Thank you. Um, and staying with the point around the effects on the NHS, and this may be a question that Preston Farms isn't able to answer for commercial or other reasons, but is it able to provide any indication around the the percentage share of relevant supplies that it supports with the with the NHS. Um, in terms of the products that it provides to the NHS. How reliant is the NHS upon Preston Farms for the products that have just been described please.

00:15:46:12 - 00:16:10:14

Uh, James Preston, Preston Farms. Um, correct. I feel some of that is commercially sensitive. Uh, probably the simplest way of looking at it is that there are two providers, and we are the larger of

those two providers. Um, I think more detail than that. We would probably need to discuss internally if we're willing to share or potentially in a closed format.

00:16:12:13 - 00:16:13:26

Noted. Thank you.

00:16:15:17 - 00:16:49:10

Um, turning to the council, um, I note that the council's response to our festering questions suggested that the test potentially could be met in terms of the exception from critical national priority, but it would need further information to form a view. It may review further submissions in light of comments that are aligned to. Does the council have any further points to raise on whether or not critical national priority may apply at this stage, in light of what it has seen at deadlines on ahead and today?

00:16:49:13 - 00:17:23:09

Yes. Thank you sir. Um, I'll make some points. It's possible as well that I'll bring in Anna Morris, who hopefully is online. But just as a starting point as you've seen there, we accept in principle the policy can apply. Um, and to be honest, I didn't understand the applicant to say the policy couldn't apply. It's just that they don't believe the test is met, but they may be able to clarify, um, that. So in that sense, I think we're in the same position. Um, obviously we've heard more information here now, and it is a movable picture, and we invite them, TCS and Preston Farms to bring forward as much evidence as they can.

00:17:23:13 - 00:17:59:16

Um, our position is that, um, we haven't done the assessment. We haven't seen an assessment in the ES, which even deals with this question of, you know, the sensitivity of this particular asset, the magnitude of effect. So it's hard for us externally to then come to conclusions without that as well. All of that being said, we consider that it's important that the effects are properly assessed. We can see that this could meet the test. And I know internally we have concerns about, um, what we're hearing and the effect of the scheme will have.

00:17:59:18 - 00:18:26:03

You will note that I'm not going as far to say and we think the test is met here, but that's more from the perspective of the position that we're in to assess. You shouldn't at all take that as a you know, we are reluctant to say that the test is met because we don't think the test is met. It's a much more neutral position than that. Um, I'll ask if Anna Morris is online, if she has anything else to add. Anna is our population human health expert from Atkins. realities.

00:18:26:12 - 00:18:27:06

Thank you.

00:18:28:00 - 00:18:28:21

Um,

00:18:30:06 - 00:18:31:18

I can see. Oh.

00:18:32:02 - 00:19:05:05

That's working. Anna Morris, representing Buckinghamshire Council, has done and said I, I'm a population human health specialist. Um, with this particular matter, I think that I don't have, um, a great deal to expand upon other than to say that this is one of a number of instances that the council has identified where we have reservations about the underlying sensitivity judgments that have been applied to the receptors. So this particular receptor would fit into a group of receptors that we feel the applicant has identified as less sensitive than.

00:19:05:07 - 00:19:37:04

We believe that that evidence is provided for them to, to be considered in that way. And how that flows through an assessment terms is that then we're in a different scale of significance. So ultimately, as far as Buckinghamshire Council is concerned, if the underlying sensitivity is incorrect, potentially the impact magnitude in this instance particularly is probably incorrect. It would lead to an under assessment of significance, and it would lead to an absence of mitigation that's appropriate. I have other things that I can say later points in this agenda, but I'll leave it there for now.

00:19:38:10 - 00:19:59:24

Thank you. Um, over to the applicant then. Really, it'd be easy to hear. Um, it's comments in light of what it's heard. Um, regarding the whether the critical nationality test applies or not. Um, but also if you could comment on the assessment in the ES as well and how that's been approached as outlined by the council, please.

00:20:03:10 - 00:20:06:19

Thank you sir. Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant.

00:20:09:12 - 00:20:11:01

Sir, if I understand.

00:20:11:03 - 00:20:11:18

The.

00:20:11:20 - 00:20:44:21

Position correctly, from what has just been said by Preston Farms, TCS is that they're effectively saying that it's given the nature of their business, There is no need for them to evidence. What they're claiming should be obvious in terms of risk of supply on the NHS, and therefore we should just rely on their assertion and the numbers in the document. We would disagree with that, that there should be evidence to confirm the risk of supply.

00:20:47:26 - 00:21:21:24

I would also say that the applicant has indeed taken. Um, Preston Farms and TCS extremely seriously throughout its evolution of the project, uh, including detailed conversations with them about the project, uh, and the mitigation required. And just I won't go into the EPs just yet, but in terms of the last point from the local authority, the, um, this business has been classed as, um, a very high sensitive rating.

00:21:21:29 - 00:21:28:17

Um, so we haven't, um, underestimated the sensitivity. It has been classed as very high.

00:21:30:23 - 00:22:03:26

But if I may say, I am a bit surprised to hear the phrase that any interference is unacceptable. Uh, on the business. And I say that, um, because I think it's important for the examining authority to understand the nature of, uh, Preston Farms or TCS or Preston Farms landholding with the Claydon estate, the landlord.

00:22:05:05 - 00:22:46:04

And I'm referring here specifically to field numbers E 23, E 21, E 22, 2011 E ten, and also plot. 712. So that's land reference plots. Six. 13. Seven. Three. Seven. Nine. Seven. 12. Effectively, the one's colored pink on the lamp plans. And my point here is that, um, those that element of Preston Farms, from which the applicant is seeking solar PV and the Rose field substation is held on a farm business tenancy.

00:22:47:17 - 00:23:05:11

And we understand that that farm business tenancy at San Hill Farm has exceeded its initial fixed term and is therefore now currently running on an annual periodic basis, unless it's brought to an end by service of a notice to quit by the landlord.

00:23:07:29 - 00:23:33:07

So my point is that, uh, that part those fields are on an annual periodic on a rolling annual periodic tenancy that the closing estate can, regardless of this project, bring that tenancy to an end. And so I'm rather surprised to hear that any interference unacceptable when there is that element, that lead that position on their landholding,

00:23:35:01 - 00:23:44:23

and as part of the mitigation and as part of designing the scheme, there have been conversations through the estate to,

00:23:46:12 - 00:24:26:26

uh, provide Preston Farms with a more certain, uh, land position elsewhere on their landholding. That is the what's class in this application replacement land. And that would therefore give the Preston Farms that long term security. So I just want to make that point that I find it that, uh, in terms of the nature of what we're talking about here is there are those fields that are that the landlord as it is right to do regardless of this project? Uh, um, serve that notice and use that land for whatever the landlord wishes to do as it's entitled to do.

00:24:26:28 - 00:24:43:27

I think that's an important consideration in in your assessment here. And because of that, that's one of the reasons we do not consider the CNP test to be engaged. And on top of that, the applicant has.

00:24:46:15 - 00:25:03:26

Carried out significant mitigation. Um, on which we'll come on to go into that. Now, if it deals with road noise, the plume, etc. specific mitigation, um, to deal with the concerns of of of of, of uh, Preston Farms.

00:25:05:24 - 00:25:17:05

So I'll stop there for a moment. I'll bring in Mister Mike Humphreys, who is the author of the Environmental Statement chapter, to discuss the sensitivity point raised by the council and the and the assessment. Thank you.

00:25:22:28 - 00:25:23:15

Thank you.

00:25:23:18 - 00:26:05:03

Mike Humphrey for the applicant. Um, I would start by being clear that we acknowledge and understand the important nature of the materials produced by the, uh, business in question. Um, we've been clear that that has affected our understanding of the sensitivity of that receptor, the business as a receptor, and due to the confidential and sensitive nature of that operation. The detail underpinning that that's been discussed by representatives in this meeting before me hasn't been included in great level of detail in the application documents.

00:26:05:11 - 00:26:45:14

However, I would say that what we have done is we've applied standard criteria and where that guidance and criteria is available. Understandably, that's limited because this is a very specific, uh, undertaking. But we have provided we have used standard guidance and criteria to identify both the sensitivity and the magnitude of the effect on the operation. Um, as Mr. Griffiths identified, we have identified, uh, TS Biosciences under the, uh, non-agricultural business use within a wider agricultural landholding as a high sensitivity receptor, which is the maximum level of sensitivity that can be accorded to that receptor.

00:26:45:16 - 00:27:17:02

And that's covered in paragraph 14.1.15 in the population s chapter, which is Rep 2033. And going back to the application of guidance. Um, it's understood that there is limited available standard and statutory guidance on the application of sensitivity to these receptors. It's common practice to apply the limited guidance that is available, and that is the design manual for roads and bridges.

00:27:17:04 - 00:27:51:23

LA 112 Population and Human Health document, which provides some direction when assessing the impacts in relation to population and human health effects that helps to identify the factors that contribute to both sensitivity and magnitude in that regard. Um. Sensitivity, where it's high or very high, is identified by, uh, understanding of the ability of the receptor to absorb or respond to change in such that any change would affect its viability as an operation.

00:27:51:25 - 00:28:29:06

So, as I say, we've applied the very high criteria to this, uh, receptor in particular. The other element of the impact assessment of, obviously, the application of magnitude and the magnitude of change to the operation of the receptor. That's also clearly defined by the available guidance, and that draws on

whether there is a discernible change to the viability and the attributes and the quality and the vulnerability of such an asset. We've identified that change, taking into account design measures and embedded in additional mitigation to be minor.

00:28:29:08 - 00:29:08:06

And as Mr. Griffiths mentioned, we will go on to talk about the specific design and engagement and additional mitigation that's been applied through the various management plans to specific environment and change effects. But the clear position that we've got to, based on the mitigation and compensation that's been agreed or is in the process of being agreed through. Terms of reference, heads of terms on land swaps speaks to the magnitude of change, which, in order to identify a major or moderate Change would require a complete or partial removal.

00:29:10:16 - 00:29:30:17

Of land and the acquisition of land without adequate Re provision, which we are of the opinion has been provided for through the agreements that have been identified. And that's the process that we went through to identify the level of significance that has been accorded to this effect, which is not significant.

00:29:30:19 - 00:29:31:23

In the view of the applicant.

00:29:32:18 - 00:29:45:12

Yes, it's the combination of the high sensitivity receptor and the minor magnitude of change would result in a minor significant adverse effect that is non-significant.

00:29:46:15 - 00:29:48:21

Thank you. Um.

00:29:50:25 - 00:30:25:16

Mr. Burton. Um, first of all, I think it may be helpful to perhaps take up, uh, Mr. Preston's offer of perhaps taking away What they can share in terms of the measurable impacts on the NHS. Taking account of commercial sensitivities, etc. but perhaps if some further information could be submitted to substantiate the and quantify the impact on the NHS that may occur for any disruption of supply from from the company, that would be helpful, please, if that's possible, to take as an action point.

00:30:27:18 - 00:31:01:14

Yes, sir. James Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS. We will take that away, sir. However, I robustly rebut the suggestion that evidence has not been provided, which was the suggestion Mr. Griffiths made. Um, my point about it being obvious is not the one that he understood. It is really as simple as, um, 60 million agar plates used by the NHS each year.

00:31:02:02 - 00:31:17:22

We are one of two providers in the country. It's a time sensitive product and we're the larger of the two providers. But yes, we'll see what more we can provide to you and we'll take it that way as an action point.

00:31:18:06 - 00:31:20:05

Would that be deadline three?

00:31:22:17 - 00:31:23:08

Or four?

00:31:23:10 - 00:31:36:08

There are. I mean, there are brows furrowed here because it won't surprise you to know, sir, I've had these discussions with my clients and they are very concerned about the commercial sensitivities around this. Um.

00:31:42:22 - 00:32:13:27

Okay, well, could we could we come back, um, with, as it were, where we've got to running through the commercial side of things. A deadline for, sir. But we will. We have already a number of additional letters from various people that we will submit at deadline three. So so the applicant will at least have something further and you will have something further to consider at deadline three. But I think the commercial side of things will take a bit more anxious wrangling.

00:32:13:29 - 00:32:19:14

I appreciate that, but I'd welcome some further input as to how far you can go on that point. Thank you.

00:32:20:04 - 00:32:27:19

Thank thank you. We will do that, sir. Could I, could I please? It seems like the appropriate moment. Could I respond to some of the other things that were said?

00:32:27:21 - 00:32:29:13

Now I was about to invite you to do that. Yes.

00:32:29:15 - 00:33:10:01

Please do. I'm very grateful. Thank. Thank you very much. Um, sir, it's not it's not accepted for one minute that the, um, uh, my clients have been I think the term used was, um, have been taken extremely seriously by the applicant or even seriously. And I will give you, um, a few, I hope, striking examples of that. The first one which we had up on screen yesterday is the initial proposal that the applicant threw.

00:33:10:12 - 00:33:42:24

I think it was the Clayton estate's land agent at the time, but actually came to my client's with and of course, that initial proposal was difficult for my client because it still took two of their fields but had a much smaller parcel, three to it. If we were being taken seriously, why on earth did they extend down into the heart of our holding? You'll find no explanation of that anywhere, and we still haven't heard any explanation of that.

00:33:43:03 - 00:34:21:21

And I come back to some of the earlier points I've been making about alternatives and what the what, as it were, the proper, the proper control to apply to alternatives is, um, if we've been taken extremely

seriously. Why is it that the applicant had us in the US as a business employing one farm manager? I understood why is it and this is the applicant's own admission. Um, including in the document that it specifically uses to respond to our written rep, appendix one of its responses to the written reps and annex A within that which is noise.

00:34:21:23 - 00:34:42:03

It acknowledges there's no assessment in the yes of to take the example. Noise impacts on horses and sheep. We've not been taken seriously, I'm afraid, let alone extremely seriously. They've expanded on to us the points that were made about

00:34:43:21 - 00:34:48:20

the Claydon estate. Um, you sirs

00:34:50:15 - 00:35:20:17

need to apply a, well, a causation test a but for test. What would be happening in the absence of this project? Mr. Preston can say say more in a moment, but my understanding is that my clients have been tenants of the fields that Mr. Griffiths referred to under the farm business tenancy for decades. In the absence of this project, they would not be under threat. That's that's the obvious reality.

00:35:20:19 - 00:35:39:22

It's the only inference to draw. This project is the reason they are under threat. And so my response to the applicant on that point is it's a complete red herring. They wouldn't be being kicked off their land. Were Rosenfield not here asking that they be kicked off their land? Um,

00:35:41:09 - 00:35:44:25

could I? Can I just ask Mr. Preston if he has anything he wants to

00:35:46:13 - 00:35:46:28

know?

00:35:47:09 - 00:36:26:05

And to be honest, I didn't entirely understand Mr. Griffith's point. You know, we have always had a very strong and good relationship with the Claydon estate. Um, so if he could expand on that, that would be helpful. I mean, just just to follow up, we have been tenants. Um, we've said in our written representation how we've benefited from a strong and stable relationship, and we've been tenants of the area in question since the, the 1980s. And I guess the other thing I would just like to say is, you know, we'll submit a timeline of our engagement and deadline three, but we aren't objecting to the project in principle.

00:36:26:07 - 00:36:37:12

We really are just trying to suggest some very reasonable alternatives, and that we think that will reduce and unnecessary risk that the project brings to us.

00:36:39:11 - 00:37:09:14

Um, I think and, um, and two additional points, um, from me. Um, firstly, um, The applicant cannot, um. It can't hide behind the non-disclosure agreement, the NDA to excuse its lack of assessment of us and its failure to respond to and accommodate us in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy.

00:37:09:18 - 00:37:54:21

Um, and, uh, I think, um, when when asking yourselves and now we're starting to stray into the impacts upon us, which I know we're coming on to, but that that was, I think, where Mr. Humphries went. Um, one can't get to, we say, even remotely feasibly the conclusion of no significant impact. Um, and that's very much taking into account the replacement land, which my clients will say and say again, because they they, of course, treasure their relationship with their with their landowner and they're very now very worried, and they're very grateful for the replacement land.

00:37:54:23 - 00:38:13:06

But that can't hide the fact, and it can't obscure the fact that the impact on them will be severe and not ameliorated sufficiently to make it not severe by the replacement land. And that's before, of course, we get to the construction impacts and so on that I think we're going to come too soon. Thank you sir.

00:38:14:21 - 00:38:44:25

Sorry, sorry. If I just may add one more thing and we are very grateful for the replacement land, but I would suggest in terms of an awareness of what we do, the replacement land was not offered, um, to us until a considerable time after we were told we were losing land. So it's I would I would put it as a later stage mitigation versus as part of an original design around what we do and as a sensitive receptor. But again, we'll add that into our timeline at deadline three.

00:38:46:03 - 00:38:51:26

Thank you. And we will come on to discuss replacement plans shortly. Um,

00:38:53:20 - 00:39:15:16

Mr. Griffiths, um, would you like to respond to the points raised? And keep in mind that we are coming on to the specific impacts later on in the agenda. Um, so if we could focus more on the the overall effects on the healthcare sector, for instance, and critical national priority, if there's anything you'd like to respond to on those points, please.

00:39:16:24 - 00:39:21:16

Thank you sir. Um, obviously we look forward to seeing the additional submissions

00:39:23:03 - 00:40:00:11

from Preston Farms at Deadline three and potentially deadline four, and I hope that also contains an explanation as to how they consider the various fields. Solar farm could affect the pathways to threaten the supply affecting the NHS. Our position is as I know and I don't want to come into the impacts given your direction. Um, that, uh, um, with the mitigation proposed and the and the Claydon Estate offering the replacement lands, that's obviously not in the applicant's gift.

00:40:00:13 - 00:40:33:26

That is, uh, what the Claydon estate has provided the tenant. Um, that the conclusions are as set out in the environmental statement. And my point regarding the landholding is, was just quite simple, that it

is just rolling on an annual tenancy. Um, that's a legal point. It's a rolling on annual tenancy that could be brought to an end by a notice to quit now. And I don't deny there's probably a very good relationship with the estate, but doesn't stop that position being the fact. Uh, and a landlord can do what they want, um, under that tenancy.

00:40:33:28 - 00:41:11:19

And, uh, the landlord has decided to do that now and served that notice to quit. Um, so that is the basic Point, which does have to go into your weighting of the in the balance. In terms of the assessment, uh, look, Mr. Humphries has anything to add on that at this point? No. So I think we're happy we'll respond further in writing. Um, but I would just make the point going back on, um, uh, not listening or I think yesterday, uh, the assertion was that, um, uh, the applicant has not listened to them to Preston Farms, and I, I disagree with that.

00:41:11:21 - 00:41:44:19

And we're not going to reach agreement on this point clearly between us and Preston Farms. Um, but we have made various design changes, uh, to take into account their position. Uh, so we removed field E 23 as an option for the battery energy storage system. Uh, the battery energy storage system has been moved to D8, uh, or field D9 with a 15 meter early planting, um, woodland buffer, which is early planting um, Fields say 35 to 45 were removed as an option for the construction compound.

00:41:46:23 - 00:42:11:29

The Roseville substation is now located on E11 or E20 in recognition of the need to move livestock through. E 23 you've got the design commitment in G2, so there's been various design iterations and changes in response to listening to two Preston Farms, but I don't want to go backwards and forwards on that. We're wasting examination time. Um, that's all I have to say at this point.

00:42:12:28 - 00:42:24:13

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. Could you perhaps elaborate on why the applicant thinks that the tenancy position of Preston Farms is relevant to the Secretary of State in determining the application for solar farm?

00:42:26:27 - 00:43:05:20

Thank you. Sir. Richard Gibson, the applicant. It's it's a relevant point because it's, um, excuse the security of tenure, um, that the a a regardless of this particular situation, um, a landlord could serve a notice on their tenants, uh, through a notice to quit, and then that tenants would have to leave, um, a year later. Uh, and that is the case that that is just a position. It's not a security of tenure, 40, 50, 60 years. It is a rolling annual tenancy that could be brought to an end when the landlord wants to decide how to use it to land, as a landlord is entitled to determine how to use his land or their land.

00:43:05:29 - 00:43:44:05

Um, so I think it's a relevant point in terms of the security, uh, of of that position. You can't say that, uh, um, there is no risk of a landlord never serving you with a notice to quit. If I was a tenant of a piece of land under a farm business annual periodic tenancy, I would always know that there could be a risk of a landlord of my landlord serving that notice, because it's not secure. The in this situation, um, that is the position and the proposal from the estate to Preston Farms is the replacement lands that are my understanding.

00:43:44:07 - 00:44:03:20

I'm not involved in these negotiations, but my understanding is would give them that security for a considerable length of time, which I think is a benefit to the long term business as indeed as they've outlined. It's important. So I think that that should be taken into account in the mix.

00:44:04:18 - 00:44:05:03

Thank you. Mr..

00:44:05:05 - 00:44:19:06

We'll put more in writing. We haven't put this in writing to to the examining authority and appreciate others may want to comment on that. So we will put this in writing. Um, uh, and liaise with the estate. So I'll commit to that for D4 deadlines for.

00:44:19:08 - 00:44:31:23

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Burton, before we move on to discuss some of the more direct effects and mitigation. Do you have any further points to raise in relation to the tenancy point that's just been raised there, please?

00:44:32:04 - 00:44:43:22

Uh, yes. Thank you sir. James Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and TKS. Um, well, it is a little regrettable to be, um.

00:44:46:09 - 00:45:00:07

I mean, frankly, it almost feels that one is being threatened at the examination with the, uh, the sword of Damocles, um, through the medium of the relationship between the applicant and, um, and the freeholder.

00:45:02:07 - 00:45:36:03

What I would like to observe, sirs, is that the clear reality is if the applicant had, um, if it had stuck with its original proposal that I showed you yesterday and, um, kept parcel three to to what it was and not come down and into into us, there is no realistic world in which anyone would be seeking to turf us off, for example, A23 or any of these other.

00:45:36:13 - 00:45:59:17

These other fields. And I would suggest that that is the correct way to approach this, this matter. If the applicant now did what we say is the right thing and did actually take us into account, took E 23 out, um, I can't imagine we'd be having this discussion. Thank you sir.

00:46:01:25 - 00:46:07:01

Thank you, Mr. Burton. So moving on then, to some of the effects.

00:46:07:11 - 00:46:12:27

Um, apologies. Could I have a quick comment on the, uh, the point.

00:46:12:29 - 00:46:13:14

On.

00:46:13:16 - 00:46:15:27

Uh, effects on agricultural businesses?

00:46:16:00 - 00:46:17:14

Please, please go ahead. Yeah.

00:46:18:05 - 00:46:56:00

Thank you very much. And Helen Hamilton, on behalf of the Clayton Solar Action Group. Um, I'd like to go back, please, to site selection, I'm afraid. Um, if you if you could look at all or you may have seen it that at all. Um, a deadline, one representation. We included a map with certain features of the landscape, and that included our understanding of the ownership of the Clayton's estate, the landowner with whom Rose field has reached an agreement.

00:46:56:11 - 00:47:41:13

What we are unable to understand from the site selection process is the what consideration was taken of the tenant farmers on these holdings and whether there was land within that ownership, um, which was in hand, and therefore we wouldn't be having this disruption to the tenant farmers, including several very long term, um, multi-generational tenancies and that includes the Noel Hill Farm which we visited on the site visit, which feels like a very long time ago now.

00:47:41:16 - 00:48:34:16

Um, and we talked to the farmer there who described his management of the land and the caretaking of that land over many generations. And we saw an extremely healthy crop and some very healthy cattle. He talked in particular about the problems arising from calving two fields in half, because of the way that the drainage and the watering systems were managed over there. What we haven't seen anywhere in the site selection process is any consideration of whether or not there were alternatives considered, which would not have resulted in or required the termination of these Tendencies, and that would include HTC's and Preston Farms, as well as Knowle Hill and and Barnwood Farm.

00:48:34:29 - 00:48:35:15

Wonderful.

00:48:36:06 - 00:48:37:17

Thank you. Thank you,

00:48:39:10 - 00:48:40:10

Mr. Griffiths.

00:48:41:28 - 00:48:50:29

We will be coming back to the specific effects on the Hill farm later on the agenda, and probably you could deal with some of the other points, please. Uh.

00:48:51:16 - 00:48:55:17

Yes. Thank you, Sir Richard Gibson. Um, I don't know whether Miss Price is on the.

00:48:58:02 - 00:49:04:09

Line. Um, who is the author of the site selection can perhaps provide a response to that.

00:49:04:28 - 00:49:17:15

Yes. I'm sorry, Sarah Price for the applicant. Um, I am, thank you, Mr. Griffith. Um, I can see another hand has gone up. But, sir, are you happy for me to answer that point first, please?

00:49:17:17 - 00:49:18:04

Yes.

00:49:18:10 - 00:50:04:15

Thank you. Um, so, in response to the query, um, raised by Miss Hamilton from the sailor Action Group. Um, I've referred to the site selection report before, just to remind people listening that it's at appendix one of the planning statement, and I'll just get the reference for that in a moment. Um, but the applicant was considering a range of factors as set out in that report, which included, um, planning and environmental considerations and also just the commercial and viable viability realities of bringing forward a large scale solar project.

00:50:04:18 - 00:50:54:09

One of those factors was the use of agricultural land, which included consideration of how the land was formed at present, um, and that in accordance with policy in NPS and one and M3 took into account the agricultural grading of that land and the extent to which the solar farm would be using land that was best and most versatile, and what MPs, M1 and M3 says in relation to this is that whilst it's not a predominant factor affecting site selection, applicants should prefer using lower quality land over higher quality land.

00:50:54:13 - 00:51:44:21

And I appreciate the point made by Miss Hamilton in terms of how the farmers are using that land. But in terms of the available information to the applicant at the time of site selection, one of the factors that that drew the applicant towards looking at at this area and then subsequently talking to the Claydon estate, was that, um, a large proportion of this area is categorized by Defra as grade four, which is not the best and most versatile land, and in fact, as referenced in the site selection report, once further studies was done, 1.51% I think it is of land in the order limits and is categorised as as not the best and most versatile.

00:51:44:28 - 00:52:17:08

Um, so. So that was one of the factors that was considered, as well as discussions with the Claydon estate, once that land had been identified, um, in terms of their knowledge of how the land was used, um, and land that could be potentially put forward for solar compared to being retained for agricultural use. Um, so, so that that was the extent to which those matters factored into the site selection process.

00:52:17:10 - 00:52:53:02

But as described before, there needs to be a balance of a range of factors, including impact on heritage assets and impact on ecological designations. Um, impact on people's homes as well, and including

appropriate setbacks from there. And so the applicant considers they've struck the right balance between those. Um, and that's, you know, the reasons for that is set out in our application documents and the site selection report, but I'm happy to take any further questions on that.

00:52:53:25 - 00:53:06:23

Thank you. So so the applicant's position is that the site selection process had regard to best and most versatile soils. To what extent do we have regard to effects on tenant farmers?

00:53:09:00 - 00:53:56:23

So the the applicant was working with the landowner to identify appropriate land that might be available to it. Taking into account their knowledge of how the land was formed from a farming tenancy perspective. That's that site selection stage. The applicant is then subsequently, through detailed design of the order limits, including some of the information that's been referred to earlier about the changes that were made to consider, for instance, the representations made by Preston Farms as to the precise impact on tenant farmers from a detailed scheme design perspective.

00:53:56:25 - 00:54:16:11

And as I said, that, you know that there's an appropriate balance to strike. And there, you know, there might not be agreement between parties that where that balance has been struck. But the the applicant's considered that they, you know, they had due regard to that in the process.

00:54:18:13 - 00:54:21:01

Thank you, Miss Hamilton. Do you have any further comments?

00:54:21:19 - 00:55:05:10

Sorry for, um, can I just. Just a few quick points falling off from Miss Price then, uh, it makes sense. Thank you. Did you give us on path the applicant? Um, just to be clear, um, in terms of the application, 1.51% of our application is BMV land. Um, um, and I think it's graded three B just to I think that, uh, Mr. Vice Mayor said grade four, it's three B, so I just want to correct that record. Um, and I would also say that in terms of our design, um, uh, because of, um, impact on tenants, that this scheme design has, um, not use certain plots that actually could have, would have been, um, uh, beneficial to the scheme because of its impact on the tenants, uh, on tenants.

00:55:05:12 - 00:55:36:17

And then my final point, quick point was um, that, of course. Uh, so large utility scale solar, um, the location of utility scale solar is inherently has to be located in in locations in in the. In the rural landscape where there you're not going to avoid um or likely to avoid um, uh, um tenants. What we've sought to do is minimize, uh, those those impacts as.

00:55:36:19 - 00:55:41:04

As we can through the iterative design process as has been outlined.

00:55:42:12 - 00:55:44:10

Thank you, Miss Hampton.

00:55:45:20 - 00:56:18:14

Uh, thank you, sir. Helen Hamilton, on behalf of the Clayton Solar Action Group. Um, I understand that we're going to be discussing soils later. Um, we might have some small comments on that. Um, I think the simple answer from the applicant is that, uh, either. No, they did not consider the impact on tenant farmers at all, or there may have been some advantage in, uh, in choosing this land that we have that we do.

00:56:18:16 - 00:56:22:16

We haven't been made aware of. Um, that's all I got to say on that.

00:56:23:01 - 00:56:28:13

Thank you. Um, conscious. We have a hand online. Is it? Miss dense.

00:56:32:09 - 00:56:34:26

You have a point to raise this point in the agenda.

00:56:35:13 - 00:57:10:28

Yes. Thank you. Helen Dent, in relation to Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. I just wanted to answer a point previously made regarding the landowner and the tenancy by Mr. Griffiths. I just wanted to outline something which I think is really important to consider in terms of that argument, is that the inter government liaison and alignment in relation to something like this for national critical infrastructure, if we were not restricted with statutory delegations within a planning process.

00:57:11:00 - 00:57:40:00

Those organizations which are actually concerned about this particular issue would be able to go directly and address any issues that happened outside of this, because it's related particularly to a planning process, and we're unable to actually comment directly except through these actual intervals and evidence provision that if there was, in the very unlikely event, a problem with that tenancy, it would be dealt with directly by the organizations which it directly impacts.

00:57:42:18 - 00:57:47:20

Thank you. Mr.. Mr. Griffiths. Do you have any comments in response to that, please?

00:57:48:14 - 00:57:54:12

No, I will look at that in writing when we see what's what's put a deadline through.

00:57:55:25 - 00:57:57:22

And your response will be aligned for.

00:57:59:28 - 00:58:04:00

Yes. If we see this information at D3 then we'll do it for D4. Yep.

00:58:04:02 - 00:58:05:02

Okay. Thank you.

00:58:09:18 - 00:58:10:17

So sorry.

00:58:11:08 - 00:58:12:03

Mr. Burton.

00:58:12:05 - 00:58:12:20

Sorry.

00:58:12:22 - 00:58:47:01

Just. Thank you. James Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. Just, um, very briefly, sir. Um, it may be a lack of understanding on our part, but, um, we cannot understand how it can be said to be minimising the impacts on us to have expanded onto our land from the original starting point with a smaller parcel. Three. We just can't compute that. And what you keep hearing from the applicant is, well, we we took this filled out.

00:58:47:03 - 00:59:22:02

We took that field out. Um, again, that does not make sense. You can't expand down onto our land and without having obvious impacts on us and then say, oh, but we're going to retreat a bit or whatever it is. And I come back to the point that I made earlier about the need to really understand what it is we're comparing with when we're talking about site selection and alternatives, and what the applicants told us in its documents is it wants an end set, so it wants more than 50MW.

00:59:22:11 - 01:00:02:03

It says in the site selection document it wants up to 500MW. It says in the planning statement it wants 250 to 500. And our position is very simple. Anything taking the applicant's case at its absolute highest and being really charitable to it, and looking at what it said in its planning statement rather than its sites, its reasonable alternatives document and its need doc. Taking the 250 as the minimum on its own case, anything that gets it to 50MW meets its objectives in terms of capacity, and that's how it should be approaching this.

01:00:02:05 - 01:00:03:02

Thank you sir.

01:00:07:15 - 01:00:08:12

Thank you, Mr. Christopher.

01:00:09:04 - 01:00:52:21

We heard that statement earlier, sir, and we'll respond in writing. I would just say that there was a it was a 250 to 500MW was our starting point to identify land. We still have a under policy and onus to maximize, um, efficiency of the grid connection that is available and to deliver a viable, um, scheme. Um, so whilst 250 at the lower end might meet that, uh, 250 to 500 megawatt, uh, um, uh, um parameter, um, doesn't mean it was a reasonable alternative at 250 to meet, uh, to maximize the grid connection that we had been offered, uh, or viability.

01:00:52:27 - 01:00:59:17

Um, we'll respond more in writing. Uh, but we're not going to able to take this point further. Um, so thank you.

01:01:00:24 - 01:01:41:03

Thank you. Okay. So moving on to some of the more specific concerns around impacts. Um, and just to start, clearly there's a great deal of difference between the two parties, the Preston Farms TCS and the applicant. Um, and we do have limited time today, so I suspect we won't be able to, um, reach agreement on many points. But I would stress, um, the examining authority's desire for the two parties to continue discussions outside of the examination forum, uh, in the background, to try and work through as many of these problems as far as possible for the conclusion of examination to see what can be resolved.

01:01:41:20 - 01:01:50:23

Um, because clearly we have limited time in this setting. Thank you so much about that. Clear at the outset. I'm sure there are discussions ongoing, but just to emphasize the point, really.

01:01:52:00 - 01:02:19:28

Richard, give me some path for the applicant. Thank you sir. Yes, I know discussions are continuing and we'll endeavour to to to keep discussing. And I think as we set out in our response to the written representation. And we welcome further dialogue with Preston Farms and understand, um, uh, um, some of the points they raised in their own written representation. Uh, for example, moving of livestock, etc.. So absolutely, you agree with that point you made.

01:02:20:00 - 01:02:51:18

So thank you. Okay. So coming on to consider some of the, um, construction traffic, uh, concerns. Um, first of all, can the applicant share figure 3.9 d of the environmental statement proposed development description figures. That's Rep 1049, please. Uh, and if we could scroll up a little, please.

01:02:53:11 - 01:02:57:04

Yeah. I think that I'm too far.

01:03:00:06 - 01:03:01:00

Thank you.

01:03:03:28 - 01:03:09:12

The plunger provides some useful contacts for the site. Um.

01:03:11:19 - 01:03:15:06

First of all, can you confirm?

01:03:16:26 - 01:03:35:27

I think as of this already that there are no other options available for construction traffic, um, that have been set out in the application. I think the applicant's previous response has been that it's sought to avoid construction traffic passing through the villages. Uh, and that's led to the current access arrangement that's proposed. Is that correct?

01:03:37:14 - 01:03:43:10

Which is on behalf of the applicant? That is correct. But I'll see if Mr. Buchan has anything further to add.

01:03:43:19 - 01:03:56:08

Uh, Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. That is correct. So we wish to avoid bringing any construction traffic through Port of Clayton or East Claydon. And that's why we're proposing access from the south.

01:03:57:00 - 01:04:08:02

Thank you, Mr. Burton. I think prisoner farms have alluded to perhaps other possibilities. They'd like just to explore those, please, if you're able to comment on that particular point.

01:04:08:20 - 01:04:51:02

Yes. Thank you sir. James Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and Spires, Hines says, yes, um, we are. Um, I think that, um, Mr. Williams is going to be the one who who walks you through this. Can I just check with, um, Mr. Williams, whether that is a figure he can work to? Or should we ask, perhaps through the examining authority to to allow the other figure up? Yeah. Would it would it be acceptable, sir, for you to, um, um, have shown to you instead the, um, figure that's in the outline construction traffic management plan that shows the blue and the and the red lines.

01:04:51:04 - 01:04:59:08

Let me just give you a give give you the reference for that. So that's rep 2065. At page seven. Would that would that be all right, sir?

01:05:00:13 - 01:05:03:17

I'm happy as long as he is able to accommodate that request.

01:05:07:13 - 01:05:14:15

Thank you very much. So Rep 2065 and page seven. It should be at page seven.

01:05:18:23 - 01:05:22:09

I'm afraid you'll have to. Really. You have to pump it up.

01:05:27:12 - 01:06:03:12

Yeah. Thank thank. Thank you very much. Um, so as, as you know, says what we all what you're seeing there and there's some helpful text underneath it, actually, which I'd invite you to read if you get the opportunity. But what what you're seeing there is, um, the red line is the ale route. Um, and the the blue is, the is the other is the other route. Now, um, you've seen Grandpa Road. And of course, the applicant's traffic assessment itself acknowledges how very narrow it is and so on.

01:06:03:14 - 01:06:41:24

And that's before we get to the impacts on on my clients with a lots of movements and the junction going in right by our our silage clamps. Now, um, what we can't understand, and this is entirely consistent with the applicant's desire to avoid the villages, is we can't understand why the strategic road network isn't being used to come off the blue line, get round and join onto the red line, avoiding the need to use Granby Road to access parcel three and instead coming in on on the Winslow Road.

01:06:41:26 - 01:07:05:22

Now, I think Mr. Williams is going to be able to say something about that. Could I just draw your attention as back to my theme here regarding the objectives of the scheme. One of the objectives of the scheme, if I'm not much mistaken, is to use the strategic road network, and Grammer Road is clearly not to that. Can I pass to Mr. Williams?

01:07:08:00 - 01:07:47:15

Gareth Williams, TCS Biosciences. Yep. So to follow on from what Mr. Burton was saying with regard to access to parcel three specifically, there is a perfectly suitable alternative route available, um, specifically for vehicles travelling from the M40, which is sort of the cross you can see towards the left hand side of the screen in blue. Um, vehicles could travel from the A34 and M40 via Bicester, um, along the A41, which is to the north of Bicester, um to Buckingham, which would allow them to pick up the existing red abnormal load route through Winslow on the A483, uh, allowing access to parcel three via East Claydon Road.

01:07:47:17 - 01:08:07:00

Now, I'm Aware that that's probably not very easy to follow on the screen. So I'm very happy to stand up and point that route out on the screen if appropriate. Um, I think the other thing important to say is access to parcels one and two could continue as proposed by the applicant.

01:08:09:14 - 01:08:13:22

Would you like Mr. Williams to come and point to what he means, sir?

01:08:14:00 - 01:08:15:23

I think that that could be helpful.

01:08:15:25 - 01:08:18:04

Yes, I think, Mr. Williams.

01:08:18:06 - 01:08:19:23

I'm not sure which screen he'll be able to use.

01:08:20:03 - 01:08:24:17

You can go to the go to the one at the front so everyone can see what you mean.

01:08:25:15 - 01:08:26:09

Thank you.

01:08:36:14 - 01:09:03:14

So as I referred to, you've got Vista here. This is the junction of the A34 and M40. Effectively vehicles could move up to Vista around the ring road follow the A41. Um, up to, um, Finn, Mira and a village called Tinge Wick and then across the A41 to Buckingham, joining the red Abnormal Load Road, and then coming down through into Winslow and accessing parcel three through East Claydon Road.

01:09:05:02 - 01:09:05:28

Thank you.

01:09:06:07 - 01:09:07:00

Thank you.

01:09:08:10 - 01:09:09:10

Mr. Griffiths.

01:09:18:19 - 01:10:01:18

Thank you sir. Now that Mr. Williams has explained that, could I add this, that, um. And you may have read this already. I know you have read the Satara inspector's decision letter, but you'll see in that relevant assessment and conclusions reached, of course, regarding that the very routes that we're talking about and of course, what Mr. Williams has just shown in terms of how to get in to to pass all three was very much approved, as I understand it in the terror case, and equally obviously adverse comment made regarding the use of the the grammar or college or grammar road.

01:10:01:20 - 01:10:02:08

Thank you sir.

01:10:04:22 - 01:10:07:18

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. Do you have any response to that please?

01:10:07:24 - 01:10:31:14

Thank you so much, Griffiths. On the applicant, I think the objective being referred to is, um, be readily accessible from existing strategic road network to facilitate construction access. So there wasn't a commitment objective to say all, um, everything has to be via the SRN, but be readily accessible from it. Um, I'll just pass to Mr. Buchan to comment on that proposal put forward.

01:10:33:16 - 01:11:04:13

Thank you, Sir. Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So there are several elements here. The first element is that we do not wish to bring construction traffic through urban areas, and the route that was outlined there would bring construction traffic through urban areas. In terms of Buckingham and Winslow itself, by avoiding that route, we also avoid cumulative traffic impacts on those communities and those residents and those businesses affected by that route.

01:11:04:15 - 01:11:38:09

But the main reason that we are looking at using Granby Road is for construction efficiency and for safety in terms of having one site rather than two disparate sites. Our proposal allows for all construction traffic to go on one access route from the A41 into the main site compound, where it can then register itself within the um CDM requirements under health and safety within the main site, and then those elements requiring to go to the

01:11:39:26 - 01:12:44:00

area three the eastern section there. Then proceed from there to site that ensures it's a fast delivery. It's an efficient delivery. We can keep control and tabs on vehicle movements on on the access road network. Granville Road has a number of proposed measures in terms of providing passing places and

localised widening of the the access roads there. You will note from the transport assessment and in fact from the discussions that we've had from the local authority as the relevant highway authority, they have no in-principle objection to the use of Grand Bur Road in terms of the road's ability and its function to carry the construction traffic that we have proposed, and we have provided a solution that is appropriate, that is sufficient for the construction purposes that we are proposing, and that the relevant local road authority has not objected to the use of that road in terms of accessing the site.

01:12:45:19 - 01:13:27:04

Would you give me some part of that? And just to build on that and the use of that access point. Um, uh, is not, um, can't be seen in isolation, has to be seen in the context of the, uh, myriad of other mitigation measures being put forward. Um, on such as biosecurity measures, the commitment to follow the press conference, biosecurity measures, um, that we're proposing. Um, and, um, a continuous, uh, dialogue with them regarding, uh, construction programs so that the access point can't just be seen in isolation as to be seen with a raft of other mitigation measures being put forward.

01:13:28:06 - 01:13:36:11

Thank you. Just just turning to Buckinghamshire Council. Um, I think it agrees with the construction traffic route. Is that is that correct?

01:13:36:27 - 01:13:38:04

Would you say I didn't capture.

01:13:38:06 - 01:13:40:06

Does the council agree with the construction traffic?

01:13:40:08 - 01:14:00:27

Um, thank you, sir. Um, Danny Gazelka for the council. So I did ask about our expert about this point. Yes. We don't object to the, um, construction route. However, I asked this. We've not assessed anything special or specific about TCS Biosciences and Preston Farms, so we've just addressed it from a pure standard highways perspective.

01:14:01:10 - 01:14:02:27

Yes. Understood. Thank you.

01:14:04:15 - 01:14:05:26

So we have hand at the back.

01:14:06:15 - 01:14:33:22

Yep. Gareth Williams, TCS Biosciences. Um, just to address the first point that was made around sort of avoiding sort of densely populated areas, the route that I pointed out, I don't believe would, um, impact any, uh, towns or villages any more than the current proposed route does. Um, effectively, the route pointed out, would be one of the main routes from Buckingham into Bicester anyway, across maybe the M1 to the M40 corridor. Um, with the A43 further north being inappropriate.

01:14:36:16 - 01:15:19:28

And thank you, James Burton. On behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. So what we've heard says, um, is that it boils down to the reason that the applicant is bringing all this traffic into the heart of our site and churning up the air, churning up the ground, risking our biosecurity and stressing our animals is, um, is because of its construction considerations. Um, it's yet again an example of the applicant not actually taking us seriously and not seeking to mitigate for us in accordance with the with the hierarchy.

01:15:20:14 - 01:15:58:02

Um, respectfully, um, Mr. Buckingham's comments. Um, other than that. Well, Mr. Williams has dealt with the suggestion that there be some problem with urban areas. um, he mentioned, without elaborating, cumulative effects. The the route that we are suggesting it. We say it's a positive attraction of the route that other projects have decided. It's a good route that shows it's a sensible place, sensible route to bring construction traffic along.

01:15:58:04 - 01:16:28:09

And unless we start getting to the stage, which no one is suggesting, that the addition of this project would would meet the fairly high threshold, of course, for traffic and effects in terms of congestion. And no one's suggesting that, then there's no reason not to look at the route, it appears. Certainly, we're not being pointed to anything by the applicant that the applicant hasn't looked at the route that we're suggesting to avoid bringing this traffic into the heart of our operation.

01:16:28:11 - 01:16:29:04

Thank you sir.

01:16:29:27 - 01:16:34:19

Thank you, Mr. Griffiths. Any any final points on the construction traffic route.

01:16:34:21 - 01:16:42:21

Richard is on path. Let's bring in Mr.. Then I got another point I want to make to Ben. You probably need to move on to the timing, but, um, Mr. Buchan.

01:16:43:19 - 01:17:16:27

I'm going back in on behalf of the, um, the applicant. So the proposed route would go through Buckingham, Padbury, Winslow. Those are urban and residential areas. Not dwell any further on that. We took a detailed, um, review of all construction route options to this site. Spent considerable time, um, on that to find what we believe is the optimum solution in terms of access. Um, the proposed access junction that we have is eminently deliverable.

01:17:17:02 - 01:17:51:21

Um, having an option to the to the north of the site, um, converting the abnormal load access into a full construction access would result in significant loss of vegetation, trees and other ecological features. um, and the commentary from the representative of TCS Bone Sciences. Um, you mentioned while other routes are using that. That's because that is where they are located. Um, they are located to the north of that road or to the immediate areas there, and had no other route choices to get to the side.

01:17:51:23 - 01:17:54:05

So, so I'd leave it at that.

01:17:55:14 - 01:18:28:08

Thank you. And so it's one part of that. And just to highlight that the commitment at paragraph 2.9.3 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, um, which is a commitment to, um, uh, manage potential disturbance to, uh, livestock. Um, as was referred to in the in from from Preston farms about um, uh, just now, um, that is um, not just a, uh, a couple of days in advance what we're talking about here, and we can expand on this.

01:18:28:10 - 01:18:59:21

We need to Is that we can commit to sharing at least six months, at least six months in advance of any activity. Um, the program. So we can discuss with, uh, Preston Farms. Um, uh, the use of that land, the proposed timing that we're looking at for our construction program. Uh, and to ensure that disturbance to, uh, livestock is produced, uh, or indeed avoided, um, through where, where they may be located.

01:18:59:23 - 01:19:12:21

And that is a commitment of at least six months in advance. And that is one of the points that I think their own noise specialist, um, says is is important. And we can expand on that in 2.9.3 of the Kemp, if that is necessary.

01:19:15:01 - 01:19:23:10

Mr. Burton, do you have any response to that particular point around the commitment to share details in advance to help minimize disruption and effects?

01:19:26:17 - 01:19:27:05

Well.

01:19:27:22 - 01:20:02:26

James Burton, on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS Bioscience, says. Um, clearly it will take anything we can get. It's all it's all welcome. Um, I think, you know, from our written representations that, um, we have we are at full capacity. So it's not the case that there's spare land within our holding that we can move the animals around to without, without impact. So, um, it would be wonderful if it could all be dealt with by liaison, and that would work.

01:20:02:28 - 01:20:11:27

But unfortunately, it can't. They'll still be an impact on us. And a serious one. I don't know if Mr. Preston has anything to add.

01:20:12:10 - 01:20:50:11

Yeah. James Preston, Preston Farms. Um, just just to add on to to what James Burton has said, um, the biosecurity measures, I you know, That they it seriously questions the biosecurity that we have around the farm. The access is directly next to the silage clamp, which is both the source of our food when we're making it and obviously when we're taking it out over the winter. One of the things that we will put forward a deadline three is additional concern around biosecurity and the things that we monitor for and are very aware of.

01:20:50:13 - 01:21:18:09

And it seems again, to us, very unnecessary when there are other routes available that the biosecurity sort of exclusion and risk around our farm will be massively increased by the access where it is. Um, we've also we've highlighted this, you know, for, for at least two years. Um, and again, we, we had to see any serious outcome from, from sharing those concerns.

01:21:22:06 - 01:21:23:02

Thank you.

01:21:26:10 - 01:22:09:01

If we can move on to some of the more localized effects around the the access point itself and the access tracks within the proposed development, um, the applicants response to Preston Farmer's written representation seeks clarification from Preston Farms on the extent to which its concerns regarding access relate to either the construction phase or the operational phase, and it also seeks clarification on details of animal movements over plots six, slash 12 and land plans, which then gives fields, say 46, to SR 50 immediately north of the Granary Road junction.

01:22:09:24 - 01:22:17:16

The applicant also indicates it's willing to work Preston Farms to locate the internal access track to minimize impacts.

01:22:19:12 - 01:22:37:24

Question. First of all, to the applicant the junction that was shown on the plummet on screen previously and the junction point there, the detail of which is provided in the back of the outline construction traffic management plan. The location of the junction is that fixed? It's the track itself that could be relocated.

01:22:39:03 - 01:22:45:23

Richard Griffiths on the applicant. No, it's not fixed. It's. It's flexible to have conversations with Preston fast.

01:22:45:25 - 01:22:51:08

So that comment applies to both the junction and the location of the track itself within the fields.

01:22:55:15 - 01:22:57:29

Mr. Griffiths, on behalf of that. Yes. That's correct.

01:22:59:05 - 01:23:00:02

Thank you.

01:23:02:17 - 01:23:06:07

Mr. Burton, in terms of this particular point, um,

01:23:08:05 - 01:23:25:06

do you have any initial comment on on that response and that the access track, including its junction, could be, um, located to try and minimise effects on the operation? Do you have any initial response to the extent to which that might be helpful for Mr. Preston?

01:23:25:08 - 01:24:19:01

Sorry. I'll take that one, if that's okay. James Preston, Preston farms. Um, without going into too much detail, and we will share a if it's the field that I'm thinking, we will share a map with some movement arrows at the next deadline, but also from the site inspection. Um, I hope that you'll appreciate that corridor where we turned off the road and where those animals are moving to, and how important that is to our operation. So that that is that is a key field in terms of animal movements in, um, and again, you know, I cannot emphasize enough the biosecurity concern that we have, but I think probably most useful to share a diagram and perhaps, um, reference the site inspection and the turning off the road, uh, where we went to as a first stop after the mushroom park, I think it was top three of the site inspection.

01:24:19:18 - 01:24:23:03

Thank you. Yes, I think this is the field where the silage clamp is located.

01:24:25:00 - 01:24:33:10

Yes, yes. That's correct. And and where it then flows across the road into the holding at Middle Farm. Yes.

01:24:33:12 - 01:24:47:19

Thank you. Um, and this may be something that Preston Farms wants to follow up in writing at deadline three, but in response to the applicant's request, is it able to provide an overview of the movement of animals across those fields?

01:24:49:10 - 01:24:55:15

Yes, yes, we will submit, um, some additional maps with arrows at the next deadline.

01:24:57:03 - 01:24:57:28

Thank you.

01:25:05:10 - 01:25:29:05

In relation to access during operation, the applicants response, Preston Farms written representation states that access across Grammar Road would only involve a few movements a day and will be managed with measures in place such as slow speeds and security measures. Can the applicant initiatives clarify how many vehicles would be used in Granary Road during the operational phase per day?

01:25:33:27 - 01:25:35:18

Not quite sure how many a few is.

01:25:38:16 - 01:25:44:06

Would you give us on behalf of the applicant? I'm just trying to find the answer and then it's off the top of my head, I'm afraid.

01:25:47:21 - 01:26:24:29

Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. So the operational phase elements are detailed in the Transport State Transport Assessment 5.6 operational or operational phase. And it states up to 24 LGV movements per day are anticipated. That's for the whole site. So, um, those um servicing the facilities at Granby Road would be a proportion of that, the exact proportion we don't have specified, unfortunately, but it's 24 per day, so it's 12 and 12 out for the whole site.

01:26:29:16 - 01:26:31:10

Thank you, Mr. Preston.

01:26:31:16 - 01:27:09:00

Sorry. Perhaps just a good moment to to to highlight something that I know we've mentioned in our text, but we are licensed by the Home Office. The Home Office license covers the whole establishment. And I think the fact that we're licensed by the Home Office is indicative that it is a more of a national scale project that we undertake. Um, and the idea that we could have, uh, you know, non TCS, Preston Farms employees who have had absolutely no scrutiny from our perspective, just accessing across the holding from a biosecurity and a security perspective.

01:27:09:12 - 01:27:30:02

Um, I is a major, major concern to us. I think you also heard, um, what Helen Dent mentioned earlier about the position of the business and its importance, so that that seems entirely unnecessary to us, given, again, that there are other alternative routes of access off the Winslow Road. Thank you.

01:27:32:18 - 01:27:35:06

Thank you. Mr. Griffiths. Do you have any response to that?

01:28:07:12 - 01:28:41:04

Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant, I don't want to rehearse the reasons why that access point has been determined. You've heard the applicant's position, so that's stands. Um. Uh, we're committing to, uh, biosecurity measures. Uh, um, their press conference, biosecurity measures. That's a clear commitment. And I understand, um, uh, from the consultant team, there's a public right of way through the field, um, which means, uh, any rambler could walk through that field that may not go through the.

01:28:41:06 - 01:28:46:26

That would not go through the air security measures that we're proposing. So, um, other than that, I have nothing further to add.

01:28:49:07 - 01:29:25:20

Thank you. Um, doctor Jordan. Thank you, sir. Uh, Chris Jordan, on behalf of East Clayton Parish Council. Um, I think one thing you'll be needing to consider is the the nature and the level of risk. Uh, to Preston Farms and takes plant sciences on a number of factors, with its stress to the animals and so on. But biosecurity, I think, is a particular concern. And the applicant has just said, well, someone walking across a public right of way is biosecurity risk.

01:29:25:22 - 01:30:03:01

And of course, there is an element of that. We're talking about a very different scale here. And also I think we need to consider, um, what is being imported onto the site. Um, my understanding is that the majority of the materials, the solar panels, the batteries and so on will be imported from China. If you, uh, just at the moment, there are a number of serious outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in a number of provinces. In China, the prevalence of brucellosis is also very substantial.

01:30:03:03 - 01:30:40:17

It exceeds over 20% in many areas. Now those two diseases can be carried. The virus for foot and mouth and the bacterium for brucellosis can be carried and survived for many months on, on vehicles, on materials and so on. And so a single outbreak of foot and mouth or brucellosis would be catastrophic to um, to TCS and and Preston Farms, not only to them, it would be catastrophic for Hawkshaw wildlife farm.

01:30:40:19 - 01:31:11:22

For the pedigree um, uh, cattle at uh, um Nuttall Hill Farms and to the rest of the farm farms around the area. And so I think, you know, we need to consider what level of risk is, is, is, uh, apparent here. Um, and that needs to come into the judgment of, uh, as to the level of impact not only on Preston Farms and TCS, but also the other farming communities around.

01:31:11:24 - 01:31:23:04

Thank you sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We will be coming on to speak further about biosecurity shortly. Um, but if Mr. Griffiths has any initial response to that, please.

01:31:24:19 - 01:31:27:10

Richard Griffiths on that. Um, it's beyond my.

01:31:29:12 - 01:31:36:27

Expertise. But, um, if there's any evidence that that that bringing solar panels from China spreads, Britain and I would welcome to read it.

01:31:40:04 - 01:32:16:11

Mr. Jordan, do you have any material that could support that particular view in terms of research or. No, but it's clear that, um, importation of materials from China in general, we're seeing an increased incidence of not only sort of bacteria and viruses in Covid, of course, but, um, also live animals, invertebrates and so on are arriving with consignments from from China. These all present a risk, and it's in a sense it's intangible, but it's a real risk.

01:32:16:13 - 01:32:33:14

And the the nature of the business is here is such that a single incidence of importing a disease of any sort is catastrophic. Thank you. Um, a quick question of clarification.

01:32:33:17 - 01:32:39:21

Sorry, sorry, if I may. Perhaps Doctor Jordan could explain why he's qualified to make these statements.

01:32:42:02 - 01:33:11:01

Well, I'm Chris Jordan on behalf of East Claydon Parish Council. All I can say is that I, um, my career was in academia and in pharmaceutical industry and in research and development. So, um, I have some background in that area. And from that perspective, I can endorse the value of the products, the importance of the products that TCS produces in terms of research and development as well.

01:33:12:18 - 01:33:19:19

Thank you. Just just going back to, um, access, um, specifically.

01:33:22:06 - 01:33:41:21

And the point of clarification. Can the applicant clarify if the internal access track to access parcel three that we put in place during construction would be the same use during the operational phase, so would the track remain in situ during both phases, or would there be a different track for the operational phase?

01:33:58:26 - 01:34:22:01

Would you is on par for the applicant. Um, this is a flexible point that it could either be the same or it could be, um, changed depending on what the operational requirements were of Preston Farms on that field for the, for the operation. So it again, is when it comes down to that the mitigation being proposed is is flexible to flex to the needs of the of the landholding.

01:34:23:00 - 01:34:47:02

Thank you. And then a question to Preston Farms. Um, just to query how it currently manages any disturbance from passing traffic, um, or potentially people using rights of way passing through. It's it's holding. Are there any measures that you currently has to to minimise risks of biosecurity but also disturbance to livestock.

01:34:48:25 - 01:35:23:07

James Burton on behalf of Preston Farms and TCS. So I'll bring Mr. Preston in on this if I if I may. It's one of the early questions I asked him, and just responding to the point that was raised a little while ago, I met my Mr. Griffiths. The farm, as I understand it, is in quite a happy position. There are some rights of way across it. Not not many, but they're used very lightly by locals who understand the situation. This is not a Kinder Scout mass trespass position as as I as I understand it.

01:35:23:12 - 01:35:26:02

Mr. Preston will say some more about that. But

01:35:27:19 - 01:35:59:13

as regards the point that the applicant raised and we're hearing something of a drumbeat here, show me the evidence. I would invite you to think of the Preston Farms holding as think of it as a, as a bubble or however you want to to visualize it. You pierce, you pierce that bubble with a with an unknown and an unfamiliar actor, let alone more than one and so on. You add risk. You at risk. Each time that happens and it just builds up and.

01:35:59:26 - 01:36:11:17

Given the importance of this operation, we shouldn't be having to prove that there's a specific risk from a panel coming from this part of China or whatever. Um, Mr..

01:36:11:19 - 01:36:12:07

President.

01:36:13:02 - 01:36:47:20

Sorry, just if I may for a moment. Having having recently been on a refresher of a home Office course, just to give you an idea, everyone else who's on there are focusing on largely research models, um, in a laboratory setting. And I think the thing that is being confused here is that we are an agricultural setting. I mean, originally you heard that, you know, we're we're a grazing tenant with one farm manager. If actually you were to look at us with, you know, people out in the field with PPE in a, in a laboratory setting, there's no way that some of these things would be being proposed.

01:36:47:22 - 01:37:20:17

And I think this goes back to the original point, which is a lack of understanding really about what we do, which I do appreciate because it is unique and quite, quite niche. Um, to talk about rights of way. I think that, um, we have limited rights of way. We manage them as best as we can with signage and biosecurity where appropriate. It's it's not possible, obviously, to completely remove the risk. Probably one of our strongest points is just local understanding of what we do from people who live around here.

01:37:20:24 - 01:37:37:04

Um, it's not particularly easy to walk through a herd of 60 to 70 largely native wild state horses. That can be quite aggressive. Um, so while that's not perhaps a technical answer, local knowledge definitely comes into play as well.

01:37:38:13 - 01:37:38:28

Yeah.

01:37:39:06 - 01:38:01:24

So I think really what we're inviting you to do. Um, and in deadly seriousness is, is it just think of the holding as, Um as a laboratory. It imagine instead of the field you're looking at clean white floors and walls and so forth.

01:38:04:28 - 01:38:05:24

Thank you.

01:38:08:08 - 01:38:12:11

Mr. Griffiths, you have any response back to that before we break for lunch?

01:38:12:17 - 01:38:45:26

Richard Griffiths on top of that, I understand the public right of way is on is the North Buckinghamshire way, the Mid Shire Way, which is a regionally promoted um, route. And I'll just go back to the point that we are looking at, um, we are, we are, we are committing to biosecurity measures. Toolkit toolkit talks uh, in the, in the raft of management plans. That is the the commitment

for construction and operation that there will be biosecurity measures put in place and secured through the development consent order.

01:38:46:26 - 01:39:00:03

Thank you. Um, Conscious at the time. I think it's probably an appropriate time for for a lunch break. If we could adjourn until 155. But we will revisit this point after the lunch break.

01:39:00:28 - 01:39:28:24

So we will get some path up. Thank you. Can I just understand what's in the examining thought is mind in terms of, um, the agenda, uh, how the afternoon, uh, is likely to develop. Um, given, uh, we have items nine through to 13. Yes. Um, so any indication of of your thought process, uh, on how on timing would be very helpful.

01:39:29:04 - 01:39:30:23

We were going to discuss that at lunch.

01:39:31:29 - 01:39:32:14

Thank you.

01:39:32:16 - 01:39:42:21

So we'll we'll share our thoughts when we get back. Okay. Thank you. Uh, the time is now. 109. Um, the hearing is adjourned. Thank you.