

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	One Earth Solar Farm
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 4
<b>Date:</b>	10 July 2025

**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.

File Length: 01:30:50

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:23:05 - 00:00:31:19

Okay, it's now 12:10. So if people can start to get themselves ready and back into their seats so we can reconvene, please. Thank you.

00:01:09:11 - 00:01:45:07

So I initially had a question relating to the, uh, the Bess and the proposed drainage systems that were going to be used for them because it they mentioned in the drainage strategy around, um, sustainable drainage and it being permeable, permeable materials. Uh, Mr. Thwaite said that it was actually going to be an impermeable, um, material that would be there for the for the drainage around the base, for the firefighting water.

00:01:45:10 - 00:02:01:13

I just want to check. I mean, I'm guessing it's probably with Mr. Thwaites what the capacity of that is, what the capacity is being catered for there. And is it just enough for the fire water firewater, or will it be for rainwater as well? And?

00:02:03:14 - 00:02:40:23

Absolutely. And Craig fights for the applicant. Um, just to clarify on that point, um, there will be permeable surfacing, so it'll be sort of a gravel surface, for example. Um, however, there will be an impermeable lining beneath that subbase to prevent infiltration through to the ground. So just a slight clarification on that point. Um, with regards to capacity, um, the so the basins, um, have been sized. Um, this is just more a general point, but have been sized for the 100 year plus 40% climate change rainfall event, um, which is essentially the design event for the drainage system.

00:02:41:12 - 00:03:15:03

Um, however, for the, um, fire water storage, we have also looked at, um, the potential for a fire to occur at the same time as a rainfall event. So we would have that influx of polluted water to the basin at the same time as it raining or within sort of a similar timescale. Um, so what we've looked at on that basis is, uh, the firefighting water at a rate of 1900l per minute, um, for two hours. And that is based on guidance, um, from the National Fire Chiefs Council.

00:03:15:09 - 00:03:49:10

Um, and it's grid scale, energy, sorry. Grid scale battery energy storage system planning guidance for FRS. Um, and we've also looked at a rainfall event with a 1 in 10 year return period. Um, which is in line with um the guidance set out within Syria C736 and containment systems for the prevention of pollution. Um, so to summarize, yes, we have looked at basically a combined event of a of a, um, rainfall event happening at the same time as a fire event and having runoff from that fire event.

00:03:50:22 - 00:03:51:22

Great. Thank you.

00:03:57:08 - 00:04:12:06

Moving on to the maintenance regime then for um, the scheme in terms of watercourses, ditches, suds. Uh, can somebody explain that to me? Um, what the approach was and ensuring that

00:04:13:24 - 00:04:23:12

all the drainage features, uh, will throughout the lifetime of the scheme will work remain in working order? Thank you.

00:04:26:00 - 00:04:51:02

It's common for the applicant. Um, so in the outline operational environmental management plan, there are general provisions in there in terms of the responsibility of the um environmental manager, in terms of ensuring. Um, ensuring compliance generally with all the provisions of the OMP and that includes um site inspections and walkovers and a compliance log and that sort of thing. So are there definitely general provisions, but in terms of more specific, um, aspects, I'll pass you over to Mr. Thwaites.

00:04:53:18 - 00:05:25:04

Thank you, Craig Thwaites, on behalf of the applicant. Um, just to cover off the first question, I think, um, regarding maintenance. Um, so within table 410 of the Fra and document reference as 051, um, we've included an indicative, um, maintenance schedule. Um, so that sets out the typical tasks, um, that we expect for the permeable surfacing swales, filter drains and detention basins. Um, as well as the frequency that, um, that, that, that those tasks need to be undertaken.

00:05:25:16 - 00:05:56:02

Um, these, uh, maintenance tasks would be the responsibility of the applicant. Um, and will be maintained for the lifetime of the development. And just for information, the maintenance task and frequency that we've set out. Um, is in line with the Sirius subs manual. Um, C7 five three. Um, that sets out essentially the design sort of standard for such features, really. With regards to the appreciate, there was a comment there on existing ditches and watercourses as well.

00:05:56:09 - 00:06:28:14

Um, so the applicant, as the riparian owner, um, will be responsible for the maintenance of those ditches, um, and watercourses. Um, that includes just, I guess, in terms of their responsibilities. Um, ensuring that normal flow isn't impeded. Um, so removing obstructions. Um, maintaining the beds and banks, the watercourse, uh, maintaining any structures like culverts, bridges, etc.. Outfalls. Um, and the fundamental is that those watercourses need to continue to be able to accept upstream flows and transfer that flow, um, without obstruction, pollution or diversion.

00:06:29:05 - 00:07:33:19

Um, just to note, um, we have included for ten, uh, offsets from the ordinary watercourses and main rivers. Um, to ensure that, um, you know, access is allowable for any sort of emergency procedures from the IDB or Environment Agency. Um, and that is set out, um, within the fra, um document reference as 051 and within commitment. 38 of the commitments Register, which is app one eight is seven. Um, there are also some uh mention within the app, which is app 179 um, which essentially states and I will read it here because it's not specifically my text, but um, it states that ongoing management of drainage ditches will involve the clearance of any silt build up as required outside of

the main bird breeding season, with the aim of clearing no more than one third of each deer at each ditch in each year, and from one bank side only, um, bankside vegetation will be cut every other year in autumn, alternating from one bank to the opposite bank, maintaining vegetation cover all year round.

00:07:34:01 - 00:07:36:13

Um. Thank you.

00:07:38:23 - 00:08:15:21

Thank you, Mr. Thwaites. So just one question, um, relating to table 4.1 that you referenced. Um, within that in some of the frequencies it has as required for for a lot of it, and I appreciate that it's in line with the guidance. Um, but given over the over half the site is in flood zones two and three. Would it be better to have a more sort of proactive frequency there to ensure that it is always in a, in a situation, in a state that it can work properly?

00:08:17:15 - 00:08:50:16

Uh, Craig Thwaites, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. The the items were there as are referred to as, as required. Um, are sort of specific maintenance activities that perhaps you don't need to do every time you come to, uh, sort of monitor or inspect the feature. So that is things like removal of weeds, for example, and permeable surfacing if you've got some weeds growing up. Um, if there aren't any weeds there, then obviously we don't need to do it. Um, so that's kind of the basis for most of the, um, as required items. Um, I can provide some more examples of when that kind of is applicable.

00:08:50:22 - 00:08:57:03

Um, but does that provide you with the sort of, um, information as needed?

00:09:01:23 - 00:09:03:00

Yes. Thank you.

00:09:03:17 - 00:09:04:07

Thank you.

00:09:11:14 - 00:09:47:09

I think I only have one final question on the drainage element. It has to do with the Western, uh, Bess, which you set out, uh, some detail on within the, uh, flood risk assessment and drainage strategy, which is as 051. Um, I if I've understood it correctly, you're going to do a cut and fill for the best to, uh, change the level to ensure that it is, uh, a minimum of 300mm above the predicted flood level.

00:09:47:11 - 00:09:53:08

So maybe if I can just clarify that my understanding of that is correct in the first instance.

00:10:03:07 - 00:10:33:13

That Craig Thwaites, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. There is reference to um, a slight sort of cut and Phil, um, assessment that would be required. Um, that is on the basis that the Western best could, in theory, um, be within the residual breach flood event. Um, now I think the, the, the, um, any raising

of the, um, sort of battery storage areas to be 300mm above that. Um, it's a very conservative approach to it.

00:10:33:18 - 00:10:44:12

Um, and the it's mentioned within the Fra that that would only be undertaken outside of the flood extent, um, to ensure that there's no impact on floodplain storage. Um, as a result.

00:10:45:04 - 00:10:45:20

Thank you.

00:10:46:24 - 00:10:51:15

Yeah, but what I'm not quite understanding is,

00:10:53:06 - 00:11:18:09

is the intention to raise the level on of the Western best so that the, the whole structure is actually going to be elevated relative to current ground levels? I appreciate if it's a cut and Phil, it'll be higher at one end and lower at the other subject to current ground levels. But is that a correct understanding because it it.

00:11:21:16 - 00:11:41:18

Within figure 318 and then um, seems to be reference to a nine metre minimum height, which would potentially be an increase in certain areas of 2.78m. I'm just wondering if I'm understanding that correctly.

00:11:58:22 - 00:12:13:11

Craig Thwaites on behalf of the applicant. So that that 300 mil raising um, would only be um, within areas where the, um, where any best could in theory be within the extent of the potential breach. Um,

00:12:15:10 - 00:12:17:03

if that clarifies the question.

00:12:22:01 - 00:12:24:10

I'll try. I'll try a different way. Um,

00:12:26:07 - 00:12:32:17

the the ground level varies on the location of where the the western best is proposed, and.

00:12:35:23 - 00:12:45:03

You're ending up with a flat site on which all of the equipment would sit. So what height is that going to be at?

00:12:48:10 - 00:13:13:05

Thwaites on behalf of the applicant. Um, I don't believe that we are ending up with a flat, um, uh, site for the best areas. However, if Mr. Sneddon would would like to interject. I'm happy for him to, um, on that. Um, it was for the point that we have made within the Fra is just that where required, um, levels would be raised above sea level, would be raised.

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

Sorry.

00:13:14:18 - 00:13:45:06

Oh. That's fine. I'll see if Mr. Sneddon can assist. I have to say, look, delighted when you mentioned him, though. Yeah. Thank you. Thanks. You and Sneddon for the applicant. I'll need to come back to you on that one. Okay. That's fine. Do you understand the points I make? I'm seeking clarification. Really? Because I'm trying to understand not just the, uh, relationship with regard to the water environment, but then ongoing in terms of understanding the landscape effect.

00:13:46:01 - 00:14:10:14

And, um, if it is going to have a large for sake argument, concrete base that's being raised out of the ground with then the equipment on top of it, what has the landscape assessment assessed? What is the consequential visual effect? So I'm trying to get that broader understanding. And it may be that, um.

00:14:12:20 - 00:14:45:03

An illustrative plan showing us what, uh, is likely to be, uh, the, uh, design. I appreciate it won't be final, but I think that might be actually helpful for us to understand how it would work relative to current ground levels, because particularly if it's not going to be a single, uh, flat site, but it's potentially going to be tiered or stepped in some way. again. I don't think there was any understanding, certainly from my point, that that was one of the possibilities.

00:14:47:08 - 00:14:51:07

You internet and for the applicant. So just to confirm what you would probably like to see would.

00:14:51:09 - 00:15:01:20

Be like an elevation drawing showing the existing ground, the made ground and the, the heights relative to a cart through the middle of the.

00:15:02:07 - 00:15:39:07

A section through and an elevation. And again, I appreciate it won't be a final, um, thing because the design is yet to be concluded, but just to get a, an understanding of extent, the extent of what's likely to occur. And then obviously that can link back to what the ES has assessed in terms of heights and so on, so that we can get clarity on that particular aspect, both in terms of the the water environment, but also the landscape environment.

00:15:40:03 - 00:15:41:14

Thank you. I'll take that away.

00:15:49:07 - 00:16:04:23

Okay. We just might need to just take a pause for a moment with my colleagues having an IT failure. Um, so if I can just, uh, adjourn for a couple of minutes whilst we see if we can, uh, assist on that. Just bear with us.

00:19:16:04 - 00:19:20:06

So thank you for bearing with us. Uh, apologies for the,

00:19:21:21 - 00:19:29:18

uh, interruption. So if we can resume the hearing. Um, I think, uh.

00:19:34:03 - 00:19:34:18

Yeah.

00:19:34:24 - 00:20:10:00

Yeah. Okay. So I think we just have one final question on the, uh, water environment. And that was in respect of the Water Framework Directive, and I invite the applicant to explain their position with respect to compliance with the Water Framework Directive. Um, and it may be that you need to respond in writing to this because, uh, we've got a specific point raised by, um, Mr. White in his relevant representation, and he makes reference to various legal requirements that he's concerned potentially you don't comply with.

00:20:10:14 - 00:20:26:15

Um, but if you want to give us a brief summary in the first instance or defer it to writing, then, then that's fine. But I'm also going to, uh, seek a view from someone from the Environment Agency as well whilst we're here. So I'll start with yourselves to see what you wish to do at this stage.

00:20:26:18 - 00:20:54:05

Miss Kim, for the applicant. Thank you sir. Um, so we've done the, um, WFD screening, um, assessment, which I understand is being discussed with the EA. So Mr. Thwaites might give an update in a moment, and I'm sure the EA can as well. Um, will respond to the detailed points for Mr. Wyatt. Deadline one when we respond to the relevant. So I will definitely take you up on the the offer to respond in writing there. Um, if Mr. Thwaites has anything to add specifically on the engagement with the EA, um, and then hopefully the EA will confirm.

00:20:54:12 - 00:20:56:05

Thank you, Mr. Thwaites.

00:20:57:23 - 00:21:42:02

Thank you. Craig Thwaites, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes, I echo what Miss Coleman just said. Um, in the, um, discussions were held with the Environment Agency, um, prior to submission, um, regarding the water Framework Directive screening assessment, um, and what was agreed is that we would submit that screening assessment with the application and that further discussions on the sort of outcomes, um, can be undertaken. Um, following that, um, I'll note that there are and I'll let the Environment Agency speak as well. Obviously, um, there are some minor ongoing discussions still being held with the Environment Agency, um, relating to some sensitivity of existing or new watercourses and based on conditions of ground, uh, one particular groundwater body.

00:21:42:12 - 00:21:51:04

Um. Other than that, we haven't had, um, any concerns raised from the Environment Agency on the sort of approach or conclusions of the screening assessment.

00:21:51:18 - 00:21:52:08

Thank you.

00:21:53:19 - 00:21:57:09

Thank you. If I can then come to the Environment Agency, please.

00:22:00:12 - 00:22:23:14

Good afternoon. James Cordell from the Environment Agency. Um, yeah. So we are we've been in discussions with Craig and his team, and we are waiting to see the assessment. Um, all the points we've raised on the, um, condition of the existing water bodies has been brought up in our relevant representations. So we're just waiting to see what the screening assessment says when that comes through.

00:22:26:18 - 00:22:29:17

Could I just. Sorry, Craig, I apologize.

00:22:30:05 - 00:22:38:19

Sorry. I got the impression from what Mr. Thwaite said was that the the screenings, uh, assessment had had been submitted. If I misunderstood

00:22:40:09 - 00:22:41:23

this. In fact, if Mr..

00:22:44:07 - 00:22:47:24

Craig fights on behalf of the applicant. Yes, yes. You're correct. That's been submitted.

00:22:49:17 - 00:22:54:21

Okay. So if I. What's the Environment Agency's understanding then please.

00:22:55:20 - 00:23:07:05

Um, I'll have to take that away and look into that one. Um, yeah. I can't just from the top of my head. I can't remember seeing it just yet, but, um. Leave that with me, and I will respond in writing.

00:23:08:08 - 00:23:14:12

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Thwaites, can you let us know what date it was that it was submitted, please?

00:23:15:21 - 00:23:23:13

Um, miss Kim, for the applicant. I can, um, respond to that because it's with the application documents, so it's, um. App 097.

00:24:21:24 - 00:24:23:15

I'm sorry. Are you trying to find the date?

00:24:24:08 - 00:24:34:23



Sorry I didn't lose you waiting for me. Um, apologies. I was submitted with the application, so it will have been from, um, all the documents that were uploaded with the application when it was accepted in February this year.

00:24:36:05 - 00:24:37:18

So it was submitted at the same time.

00:24:38:02 - 00:24:41:22

Sorry. That was the application reference app 097I think I said.

00:24:41:24 - 00:24:45:17

Yes, you did. Yeah, I was just I hadn't quite. Sorry. I didn't.

00:24:45:19 - 00:24:46:09

Realise.

00:24:46:11 - 00:24:52:07

You joined the dots. The same date was the date that it was submitted to the Environment Agency.

Yes. It's okay.

00:24:52:09 - 00:24:58:22

Oh, sorry. I don't know when it was sent to the Environment Agency. Um, Mr. Thwaites might need to confirm that. Apologies for that misunderstanding.

00:24:58:24 - 00:24:59:16

Okay.

00:25:03:01 - 00:25:07:02

Great. And have the applicant. Sorry. I don't know the date it was submitted myself.

00:25:08:04 - 00:25:29:01

Okay, well, um, hopefully someone can clarify that for us in due course. And then I would expect, obviously, you to have those conversations with the Environment Agency so you can update us on the progress of, uh, the screening and, uh, if that highlights any issues of concern. Thank you.

00:25:31:03 - 00:26:04:02

Uh, Mr. White, I see you have your hand raised. Is there a point on this that you would wish to erase? Yes. If that's okay. Thank you. Um, the, uh, with regards to the Environment Agency, we did write to the Environment Agency about, uh, the drinking water protected area. And it did seem, uh, through one of the zone, uh, minutes that the Environment Agency failed to provide a WFD specialist on this.

00:26:04:13 - 00:26:36:23

But, uh, my issue is or our issue is that, uh, risk assessments and, uh, uh, environmental impact assessments haven't addressed the issue of decaying electric cables and microplastics. They seem to have left that to the developers to provide to say whether it's going to be an issue. Whereas we would

have expected the Environment Agency to do their own risk assessments and environmental impact assessments on microplastics.

00:26:39:08 - 00:26:40:15

Due to buried cables.

00:26:42:19 - 00:26:44:09

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. White.

00:26:47:00 - 00:27:22:09

If I can then just come back to the Environment Agency on that point. Can I just ask that when you, um, look at the documentation that's been submitted with the application, but also if you can have specific reference to the relevant representation from Mr. White, uh, if you can provide clarification to us on, uh, any concerns that you have with regard to, uh, obviously drinking water protection or, uh, water protection areas and then any risks of contamination.

00:27:22:11 - 00:27:25:09

We'd appreciate that clarification from you.

00:27:28:12 - 00:27:30:21

James could have the Environment Agency. Yeah. No problem.

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

Thank you.

00:27:38:02 - 00:27:39:05

Thank you as well.

00:27:42:07 - 00:27:46:05

So moving on now to the next item. Traffic and transport.

00:27:50:04 - 00:28:02:10

And the applicant start by explaining their methodology and evidence used in the assessment of traffic and transport relating to the construction, operation and decommission of the proposed development. Please.

00:28:03:15 - 00:28:09:23

It's common for the applicant. Thank you. I'm going to introduce my colleague, Mr. Gordon Buchan, sector director at Paul Fishman.

00:28:12:15 - 00:28:14:15

Good afternoon sir. Um, which.

00:28:14:17 - 00:28:20:17

You've listed a, um, a series of bullet points. Would you like me to go through them individually or as one.

00:28:22:06 - 00:28:24:07

Go through it as one. That's fine. Thanks.

00:28:25:18 - 00:29:06:17

Thank you, sir. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, with regards to your first bullet point, which was the management of construction traffic on the road network, construction traffic will be managed via a construction traffic management plan, a comp. The outline comp is provided in the application documents as app dash 181 the CT. Yeah, get my teeth in. Sorry. The CT MP sets out the access routes to be used by cars like goods, vehicles, leaves and heavy goods vehicles HGVs during the construction phase and would be a contractual requirement for the contractor to adhere to um.

00:29:06:19 - 00:29:51:19

The CMP is a requirement of the DCO and is secured by this requirement. The CMP sets out the agreed access routes, noting that there may be other routes that can be included in the list of barred routes, as noted in section 4.2 of the Oct MP app. One. Eight. One. And I'm very grateful to Nottinghamshire County Council for the opportunity to liaise with them later this month, to have further discussions on this point. The Oct MP sets out general traffic management measures, the creation of a traffic management group to help with transport liaison, contractor requirements, signage or wear and tear agreement, training facilities, on site parking arrangements and staff travel plan.

00:29:52:01 - 00:30:15:20

On site access management measures. The management of the KT MP itself, and includes a review and complaint process, and a commitment to try and work with other neighbouring developers. The Oct MP has been based on recent experience from other renewable projects across the United Kingdom, to ensure that best practices from other schemes can be captured and adapted for use on the proposed development.

00:30:21:06 - 00:30:27:03

Thank you to any of the councils or anyone else. Have any comments or questions on that?

00:30:28:22 - 00:30:59:11

Sarah Hancock County Council. Um, we've been given a a response already. Quite a detailed response in the, um, uh, relevant representations. Um, there. I think the problem that we're raising or have raised is that some of the routes haven't been properly considered. So, um, and I think specifically the A 1133 to the south of North Clifton.

00:31:01:08 - 00:31:01:23

Um.

00:31:15:12 - 00:31:22:13

Thank you for that. Are there any other issues that, particularly from your developer representation that you want to raise now?

00:31:24:02 - 00:31:24:17

Um.

00:31:25:03 - 00:31:27:05

Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:31:29:07 - 00:31:40:04

Not in terms of the routing. Obviously. The routing is, um, you know, sort of within the, uh, CMP. So there are issues there. Um.

00:31:42:08 - 00:32:03:12

But I think I would raise a query over how a contractual obligation could be enforced in terms of using the routing, because there are several routes that haven't been addressed in the transport assessment. So we would be looking for some, uh, comfort on how that how that would be enforced or how that could be enforced.

00:32:05:06 - 00:32:05:21

Thank you.

00:32:06:12 - 00:32:08:07

Um, the applicant, let's come back on that.

00:32:11:16 - 00:32:46:24

Thank you sir. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant in terms of the, um, the enforcement measures that are available. Obviously, the supply of materials and goods for use on the site, um, is subject to a contractual arrangement between the, uh, the applicant and the contractors, um, via either a principal contractor or individually. Um, within those contractual agreements, the set routes for accessing the site, um, along with other measures, uh, can be specified within the CMP.

00:32:47:01 - 00:33:28:18

There will be measures on how uh, access routes will be monitored. Um, and examples that could include um, vehicle identification numbers on lorries, which are quite common in terms of CcpA. So I can assure you it is only water on KT MP, uh proposals. Um, and that uh, there will be spot checks undertaking the ability for public to report any errant traffic using routes that it shouldn't be using. These are measures that we've used extensively on other renewable projects around the UK, and have been proven to be very effective in ensuring that, um, people stick to the routes that they are required to stick to.

00:33:29:02 - 00:33:45:03

And if there are, um, drivers, uh, deviating from those, uh, routes, then that becomes a disciplinary matter and may result in their exclusion from the project. Um, but these have been tried and tested around the rest of the country.

00:33:46:22 - 00:33:50:17

Okay. Thank you. Um, you've got any other further comments on that?

00:34:05:04 - 00:34:29:10

I think, um, some, some routes have been barred, actively stated as barred. but other routes haven't. And there's no explanation as to why they haven't been barred. But there's also no explanation as to why one in particular has been barred, which is Main Street that goes through Ragnar. And that creates another issue that we'll probably get onto with access strategy.

00:34:33:11 - 00:34:34:01

Thank you.

00:34:35:23 - 00:34:46:07

Thank you sir. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, we could maybe address the point about Ragnar, about the access. The access strategy point. Would that be more helpful, sir?

00:34:46:13 - 00:34:47:12

Yep. That's fine.

00:34:47:14 - 00:34:48:04

Yeah.

00:35:02:00 - 00:35:17:23

So, moving on to the construction phase. Staff travel plan. Um, that's obviously quite fundamental in terms of how your approach to reducing the amount of construction traffic. Um.

00:35:21:08 - 00:35:34:18

A question around the the 80% target within that. I mean, how are we a list of 80% of staff arriving by minibus? Um, how realistic is that target? Um,

00:35:36:08 - 00:35:53:22

how will the applicant ensure that staff working on the construction phase will be local, as it states within that? And how will it be enforced? How enforceable is that? What sort of corrective action could be taken if the targets are not achieved? Thank you.

00:35:56:10 - 00:36:32:23

Thank you, sir. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the the applicant, in terms of the, um, construction staff, um, share targets that are stated within the, uh, the CTM. Well, the travel plan is a section of the CTA. I'm going to stop saying it within the travel plan, within the traffic management plan. Um, in terms of the um shares modes that are noted within that, they are based on experience from other projects in terms of bringing construction workers into the site.

00:36:33:10 - 00:37:12:06

Um, and those have been used on, on, on previous projects. The ability of these share targets to be, uh, met, um, come again through the contractual obligation. Um, in that, um, the contractors bidding for the scheme will be well aware at the start of their bidding process that a staff travel plan is a requirement of the contract and will be making sure that, um, they are aware of the requirements of bringing staff in by minibus and and and coaches, but also in terms of car sharing and other sustainable measures.

00:37:12:12 - 00:37:13:05

Uh, there.

00:37:13:15 - 00:37:14:14

Um, we.

00:37:14:19 - 00:37:52:14

Do not want to build vast car parks on the site for construction workers. That that's not something that's particularly helpful for the scheme and bringing people in in a sustainable manner. Um, you know, fits entirely with the ethos of, of the scheme, uh, in terms of management. Again, the staff travel plan will have a review process within it, and it is all contained within the Ctmc, um, in terms of its measurements, its performances and, uh, you know, the ability for it to adapt and change for other, um, uh, target measures there.

00:37:54:15 - 00:38:05:22

Okay. Thank you. So would there be any sort of mechanism for an external body, like planning authority or a higher authority to get involved in the, uh, essentially enforcement or of that?

00:38:07:20 - 00:38:17:11

Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, generally would be dealt with by the the either the applicant or the contractor in experiercer.

00:38:20:14 - 00:38:21:04

Thank you.

00:38:36:09 - 00:39:09:03

So moving on to access point strategy. Um, but also um, it relates to that. There's obviously an overlap with a lot of these issues, but the how the construction and construction traffic is going to be managed on the road network. Uh, when we were on the first, uh, unaccompanied site inspection, we noticed that there's some obviously some lanes Crabtree Lane, Moore Lane, Polley, Taylors Taylor's road. They're very narrow, and they don't allow two way traffic to pass.

00:39:10:03 - 00:39:31:00

Um, I didn't notice within the OC tmp that, um, any specific mitigation for those routes, it just says it it'll be managed. It doesn't really say set out is to what measures would be in place to to manage that. So what if you could expand on that please.

00:39:33:11 - 00:39:54:04

Yeah. Thank you sir. Um, Gordon Buchan, on behalf of, uh, the applicant, in terms of the, the the, uh, kind of more minor network, uh, areas there, um, we can set out further detail, um, for your consideration, um, in an updated comp at deadline one, if that would be of assistance.

00:39:55:01 - 00:39:56:05

That'd be good. Thank you.

00:40:00:00 - 00:40:02:07

Any other comments on that particular matter?

00:40:15:06 - 00:40:28:24

So move. Moving on to access points. Um, I mean, first question I have is around the number of proposed access points.

00:40:30:17 - 00:40:56:00

The seems to be. So for example, the illustrative master plan has got access points marked on it. Um, I appreciate that it's illustrative, but it has more as a higher number of access points than is within the to or the plans that are provided for the access points. So I'm just wondering which which one of those is correct please.

00:41:03:06 - 00:41:13:22

Gordon Buchan on behalf of the the applicant, sir, in terms of the public road access points, then the transport assessment would be the document.

00:41:13:24 - 00:41:14:14

That.

00:41:14:24 - 00:41:19:12

Identifies the location of the access points.

00:41:22:17 - 00:41:43:18

I think the key question is if you could review those different documents and ensure that they are coordinated so that we don't have different documents showing different access points, so that everyone can be confident that, uh, which access points it is that we are, uh, to be included.

00:41:47:10 - 00:41:53:22

Gordon Brown, on behalf of the applicant. Thank you sir. We will, um, uh, make sure that both, uh, correspond with each other.

00:41:54:22 - 00:41:55:13

Thank you.

00:42:43:09 - 00:42:49:03

Has a, uh, road safety audit stage, one being undertaken for each of the proposed access points.

00:42:52:04 - 00:42:55:08

On behalf of the applicant. Uh, no, not as yet, sir.

00:42:58:05 - 00:42:59:20

Any other comments on that?

00:43:02:13 - 00:43:10:17

Terms can't cancel. That just reflects our, um, request for those access points to have some preliminary checks done on them.

00:43:20:14 - 00:43:30:16

Do you have a timing where you might anticipate undertaking those, or is it something you're not intending to do at this stage? Could you clarify that for us?

00:43:34:05 - 00:43:53:15

Uh, Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, um, we have a meeting with the council scheduled for later in the month. Um, more than happy to engage Mr. Hancock on on at that point there. And then if it's okay. So we can come back to you with a timetable for further actions, if that is okay with yourself.

00:43:54:18 - 00:44:39:04

I mean, I think we need Clarification ultimately as to what it is your committing to doing or not, as the case may be. And then if you are going to do something, what the timetable would be so that we can understand where that would fit within the examination and, uh, give the opportunities for both of the high authorities to respond accordingly. So if you can have those conversations with both county councils, um, and then give us a response at deadline one, as to both the progress, but also an indication of, uh, what your intentions are from there and then any timetable that flows from that that would be helpful.

00:44:41:10 - 00:45:07:23

Excuse me, sir. Um, Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant, uh, if it is of assistance and I don't know if Lincolnshire's. I think Mr. Field, uh, they're experts on holiday, um, this week, but he has commented that he seemed to be content with the access elements within Lincolnshire, and I can see the council nodding there. Hopefully that, you know, helps assist on that one half of the of the development area.

00:45:08:15 - 00:45:10:15

That's helpful clarification. Thank you.

00:45:18:11 - 00:45:29:07

And moving on to abnormal indivisible loads. What's the latest progress on routes being agreed with all the Highways all relevant highway authorities?

00:45:32:05 - 00:45:44:08

Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant in terms of abnormal loads. So would it be helpful if I just explain the strategy behind the abnormal load movement? Or would you like me just to go straight into the.

00:45:45:07 - 00:45:47:03

Strategy would be good first.

00:45:47:05 - 00:45:57:17



Thank you. So in terms of the abnormal load movements, um, there are two substation sites on either side of the River Trent. Um, a route survey.

00:45:57:22 - 00:45:58:12

Um.

00:45:59:16 - 00:46:37:15

Reviewing the abnormal access has been undertaken, and it's contained within the transport assessment, which is app 136. Um, two separate routes have been looked at simply because abnormal loads are not able to cross, um, the the Dunham Toll Bridge in terms of its vertical geometry, and particularly primarily so we have undertaken a review of ports of entry. We have looked at facilities close by, such as at Cottam. Um, but we've had to discount them because of the, um, uh, the kind of ownership constraints or the level of physical mitigation that would be required to depart the facilities there.

00:46:37:20 - 00:47:08:15

We have looked at other key facilities on the River Trent, such as Guinness and others, but they've all been found to be unsuitable for the size of load that's being considered. Uh, the use of Goole and Immingham that the ports there, um, are both physically suitable for the proposed loads, and a detailed review has been undertaken from both ports to the two. Um. Access to the two substation access locations. This is considered all the horizontal vertical weight constraints on each route.

00:47:09:01 - 00:47:43:01

Uh, at various points of mitigation works in regards of street furniture, modifications or minor load bearing surfacing has been proposed. Um, and we've also set out traffic management measures to accommodate the eye movements within the CMP. Um, we have undertaken a consultation with the various authorities, uh, on, um, those, uh, those movements and the results of those are contained within the route survey report, which I believe in appendix C of that report.

00:47:43:03 - 00:47:45:23

We've had no further commentary from.

00:47:46:06 - 00:47:46:21

Um.

00:47:47:04 - 00:48:02:17

The structures or, um, the abnormal load. Allude um consultees uh, as yet from either route. Um, and we've not heard back anything from National highways, but I don't know if they're in the in the room today.

00:48:04:10 - 00:48:06:11

I don't believe they are, but thank you.

00:48:20:12 - 00:48:30:06

Okay. So I'll just, uh, clarify whether the highway authorities have any further follow up following, uh, having heard what the applicant said there.

00:48:32:14 - 00:48:43:03

Sarah Hancock, Nottinghamshire County Council, uh, not in relation to the abnormal loads, but I would appreciate the opportunity to revisit a point on the access, if possible. Is that.

00:48:43:17 - 00:48:47:15

Yeah. What what's the particular point that you're you're wishing to go back to.

00:48:48:02 - 00:48:56:01

The introduction of, uh, access on the A57. Um, because a route has been barred without justification.

00:48:58:18 - 00:49:03:19

Are you able to respond to that and explain the the rationale?

00:49:05:08 - 00:49:41:14

Thank you sir. Um, Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant. Um, the reason that we in terms of the access strategy that's been developed for the site, um, the the philosophy that we've followed is to try and avoid bringing a construction traffic through communities and villages as far as possible within the route. Um, we were very keen to obviously look at not bringing construction traffic through if we could avoid it. Um, the access strategy that we've adopted or proposed would bring the construction traffic away from the village.

00:49:41:17 - 00:50:21:12

It would remove, um, the disruption and significant potential significant effects on that community. But it would also allow that the, um, construction traffic would then, uh, leave the road. The public road network as soon as possible, um, avoid further, um, traffic impacts and wear and tear on the public road network and would allow us to put the construction traffic onto purpose built access tracks, uh, as quickly and efficiently as possible. It would also be of benefit in the west side for the abnormal loads, removing them from other road users faster than bringing them through the, the um, the settlement at, at Ragnar.

00:50:22:11 - 00:50:36:07

Um, and we believe that we can provide a suitable geometric, uh, design to accommodate an access junction at that location. But we welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the county council, uh, in the coming weeks.

00:50:39:07 - 00:50:39:24

Thank you.

00:50:41:03 - 00:50:55:19

Hopefully that as we look forward to your ongoing engagement on that particular point and, uh, see what clarity it brings. I notice the hand up at the back. Mrs. Walker, just wait for the microphone to be brought to you.

00:51:06:24 - 00:51:41:23

Thank you. Sir. Rebecca Walker, resident of North Clifton. Um, I note under the barred routes for HGV and LGV traffic. There's obviously mention of a number of roads. Um, however, it mentions Mill Lane and more Lane. There are several Mill Lane and Mall Lane in the area. Uh, some are in North Clifton, some are in South Clifton. Uh, so that isn't very clear as to which ones that's referring to. And you noted about the master plan having different site access points.

00:51:42:13 - 00:52:02:13

Um, on the master plan, there was an access point on Mall Lane North Clifton, which isn't on the other one, but we were told that that was inaccurate. But I'm just wondering if Marlene North Clifton is also a bad route, as it was raised as one of the concerns in the master plan.

00:52:03:24 - 00:52:10:21

Thank you for Mrs. Walk. Perhaps. Are you able to clarify that now or that's something that you'd need to follow up on.

00:52:12:09 - 00:52:35:09

Gordon Buchan on behalf of the applicant. So if it would be of assistance to yourselves and to others, um, we uh when we revise the comp, we can provide a map showing the, um, suggested bar routes and then hopefully that will provide clarity along with the, um, revised plan showing the the access junctions, if that would be of assistance to help.

00:52:35:12 - 00:52:38:04

I think that would be of great assistance. Thank you.

00:53:12:00 - 00:53:17:06

Hey, um, now move on, then to, uh, landscape.

00:53:19:23 - 00:53:20:16

Um.

00:53:21:16 - 00:53:23:07

So sorry, but.

00:53:23:20 - 00:53:24:10

Before.

00:53:24:12 - 00:53:25:02

We do, we've.

00:53:25:04 - 00:53:25:19

Got some musical chairs.

00:53:25:21 - 00:53:29:06

Just to take place. Uh, if you give us 30s. Thank you.

00:54:32:02 - 00:54:57:05

Okay. Um, so our first question in respect of, uh, landscape, if I can ask the applicant to explain the approach that you've taken to landscape assessment, including with regard to cumulative effects with other projects, and then go on to explain your proposed mitigation strategy and subsequent maintenance regime for for that. Thank you.

00:54:57:17 - 00:54:58:24

Thank you sir. Richard Griffiths.

00:54:59:01 - 00:54:59:16

I'm part of.

00:54:59:18 - 00:55:21:16

The applicant. I'm going to introduce our landscape experts. Uh, first to speak on the approach to landscape assessment and cumulative, uh, will be Mr. Ben Gurney, associate. I'm senior projects and I'll be followed by, um, Mr. Sam Griffiths, director at ICC projects, on the mitigation strategy and the maintenance regime.

00:55:22:06 - 00:55:22:21

Thank you.

00:55:25:02 - 00:55:56:16

Yeah. Mr. Gurney, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so I'll start by giving an overview of the technical approach to landscape and cumulative assessment before handing it over to Mr. Griffiths to talk about the efforts we've gone to to embed the mitigation into both this development. Firstly, the methodology for the assessment of likely significant landscape effects is set out and for what? At appendix 11.2 of the years app 130 with a summary in chapter 11 of the ES S017.

00:55:57:16 - 00:56:27:03

The assessment of visual effects, just to note, is also set out in the same same appendix. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, or Elvia, is based on best practice and industry guidance as set out in appendix 11.2, app 130. On page three. On page three. Paragraph 8.11 .1.4. One of the key ones being the guidelines for Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. Third edition, commonly known as GLP three.

00:56:28:18 - 00:57:03:03

An overview of the stages involved in the assessment is also provided at appendix 11.2, app 130. On page two, paragraph 8.11 .1.2. This comprises five principal steps, the first being a review of published landscape assessments. Relevant supporting evidence based, evidence based documents. Aerial photography and OS based mapping followed by the field work. Second is iterative design development to embed those mitigation measures into the proposed development.

00:57:04:08 - 00:57:37:24

Third is the consideration of the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors based on an assessment of their respective value and susceptibility to change. The fourth consideration of the magnitude of effect resulting from the proposed development based on the assessment of scale, geographical extent,

duration, and reversibility. Then fifth, and finally, the combination of the receptor sensitivity and the magnitude of the effect to determine the resultant level of effect. The other key things to point out. The study area is determined to be a two kilometres radius from the order limits.

00:57:38:10 - 00:57:53:11

And this was arrived at following an initial analysis of a wider search area up to a five kilometer radius. And this is explained in more detail at paragraphs 11 .3. 2 to 11 .3.1. Chapter 11,

00:57:55:02 - 00:58:02:15

paragraph 11 .3.9 of chapter 11 confirms that the two kilometer study area has been agreed in consultation with the host authorities.

00:58:04:21 - 00:58:42:16

Also, the landscape and visual receptors have also been agreed in consultation. And that's confirmed in paragraph 11 .3.2 of chapter 11 of the year. In terms of assessment scenarios, the assessment has been undertaken for a peak construction activity in winter year one of operation in winter. Year 15 of operation of winter and summer and decommissioning in winter. Paragraph 11 .5.7 of chapter 11 notes that all features and commitments relied upon in the assessment of landscape and visual effects are embedded in the proposed development, and the method for securing the motions is listed, and Mr.

00:58:42:18 - 00:58:45:16

Griffiths will provide a bit more detail of these in a moment.

00:58:47:04 - 00:59:18:19

And consultants, who the applicant understands are now advising Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Bassetlaw and Newark and Sherwood. I noted that the EIA methodology was in conformity with the approach adopted up here, which was accepted as best practice. The applicant has since had further correspondence with the host authorities to formally agree that the approach is in accordance with industry guidance for the Statement of Common Grounds, and these discussions are ongoing. Now, moving on to the accumulative assessment, and I appreciate there is a separate agenda item on cumulative later.

00:59:19:09 - 00:59:52:02

But just to say, the approach to assessing cumulative landscape visual effects is consistent with the planning Inspectorate's guidance on cumulative effects. It follows a proportionate methodology as outlined in Java three. The applicant has considered both intra project effects and into project effects. Intra project effects can be found in section 18.4, in chapter 18 of the iOS app 047. At paragraph 18.4 to 18.18 .4. 3 to 18 .4.8.

00:59:52:07 - 01:00:32:12

Significant landscape visual effects from the proposed development in isolation were considered for the potential interactions with other individual aspect assessments that had also identified significant effects in isolation. In this case, cultural heritage. Overall, this concluded there would be no significant intra project cumulative effects. Then moving on to the Inter project effects. This can be found at section 18.5 of chapter 18, app 047. This focused on the combined landscape effect,

landscape and visual effects of each individual short listed cumulative scheme within the two km LVA study area.

01:00:32:18 - 01:01:06:12

Together with the proposed development receptors assessed as negligible from the process alone, were excluded from the quantitative assessment, and this is on the basis that negligible effects are typically imperceptible and therefore unlikely to contribute meaningfully to cumulative impacts alongside the proposed development. On the topic of other developments, there was a long list which was agreed with the host authorities and is presented in ES appendix 18.1, app one for five, alongside stages one and two of the Cumulative Assessment.

01:01:07:22 - 01:01:42:10

Table 18.3 of chapter 18, AIP 047 sets out the final and fourth stage of the cumulative assessment, and those developments that are likely to give rise to significant cumulative landscape and visual effects can be found on pages 29 and 32 of the same chapter. The applicant notes the concerns raised and some of the relevant reps about the potential for cumulative landscape impacts with solar schemes in the Gainsborough area, namely Cottam, West Burton, Tilbrook and Gate Burton on national and regional landscape character areas.

01:01:43:01 - 01:02:15:04

The applicant would like to highlight that the potential effect or cumulative effects of one Earth and these other solar schemes around the Gainsborough area were considered previously within their respective examinations. For a joint report on interrelationships between the intercepts and, this found there to be no significant potential for no potential for significant cumulative effects with one off solar farm. The primary reason given was no indivisibility with one solar farm, due to the distance between the scheme's intervening topography, built structures, and vegetation.

01:02:16:08 - 01:02:51:00

Furthermore, in the Secretary of State decision letter for Cottam Solar Farm reference DL 4.21, examiner authority also reached the same conclusions with regard to cumulative effects on regional landscape character areas, the examining authority found, and I quote, that identified no significant cumulative effects that arise as a result of the proposed development, along with other cumulative development. It points to the screening provided by the embedded and additional mitigation, and the ability of the landscape to accommodate some change without undue adverse effects.

01:02:51:02 - 01:02:54:15

And that's paragraph 3.6.68.

01:02:56:04 - 01:03:29:18

With regard to cumulative effects on visual receptors, the examiner authority concluded no significant visual effects as a result of the proposed development, with other committed and planned development, including other solar projects that had been identified. And that's at paragraph 3.6 on zero eight. And finally, the potential for cumulative landscape of visual effects was discussed between the applicant and consultants on site just on the 25th of June, 2025. It's agreed then, to await further clarity from the council's Local impact report before we discuss further.

01:03:30:16 - 01:03:35:24

Now, I hand over to Mr. Griffiths to talk about the proposed mitigation strategy and our proposed maintenance regime.

01:03:36:14 - 01:03:42:15

Thank you. Before Mr. Griffiths comments, can I just clarify a couple of points with you? Sure. Um,

01:03:44:08 - 01:03:49:06

the joint report that you've just referred to is that's been submitted to this examination.

01:03:49:21 - 01:03:51:10

I don't believe it has. No.

01:03:51:14 - 01:04:25:15

I think appreciate it if it is so that we can see that evidence for ourselves and how how it, uh, just help us, inform us of the full picture. Thank you. Um, you said that you had agreed the visual receptors with each of the local authorities. And when you're talking about the visual receptors there, that's not including residential properties, I'm assuming. But did you include residential properties within that?

01:04:26:17 - 01:04:27:07

Uh.

01:04:27:10 - 01:04:31:16

Mr.. Go now on behalf of the applicant. Yes. That that did include residential receptors.

01:04:34:00 - 01:04:54:23

Okay. Well, I'm going to come back to that in the next item agenda. But thank you. Um, and then the joint agreement with local authorities, you listed a number, but I wasn't sure whether all five authorities are in agreement or whether we have an outlier or not. You just clarify that for me.

01:04:56:23 - 01:05:01:03

Mr. Kenny, on behalf of the applicant. Um, on which point is that? Sorry.

01:05:01:11 - 01:05:17:04

You listed that, um, was just after you were discussing the visual receptors. You said that you had agreement with the local authorities, and you you listed a number of them, but I, I wasn't quick enough to keep up to understand whether it was all five.

01:05:19:05 - 01:05:40:20

Yeah. Mr. Kenny, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah, that was in in relation to, I believe, the, um, LVI methodology. And that was um, with the correspondence with RH consultants. And I believe now that uh, advising Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Bassetlaw plus Newark and Sherwood. So the outlier is West Lindsey.

01:05:42:04 - 01:05:42:20

Thank you.

01:05:50:06 - 01:05:52:21

Sorry. I just may be able to assist. Um, so Stephanie.

01:05:52:23 - 01:06:17:16

Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. So Mr. Brown, who sits to, to my right, um, is from RH consultancy. He's the landscape consultant, engaged, as Mr. Gurney quite rightly points out, jointly by Lincolnshire County Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council and Bassetlaw District Council, but not West Lindsey District Council.

01:06:19:10 - 01:06:28:08

Yeah, no. That's helpful. So can I come to West Lindsey then to ask whether you agree with the methodology that's been used.

01:06:32:17 - 01:06:38:20

Uh, what I would say in terms of that, sir, as we are taking our documents to our committee next week.

01:06:38:22 - 01:06:39:12

Where.

01:06:39:14 - 01:06:48:05

We should get committee resolutions. So I appreciate it a little limited until until we've had that. I don't think, however, that so far we've raised.

01:06:48:07 - 01:06:48:22

Questions.

01:06:48:24 - 01:06:51:01

As to the methodology. No, sir.

01:06:52:01 - 01:06:53:06

Okay. Thank you.

01:06:56:16 - 01:06:58:02

Sir. Thank you.

01:06:58:11 - 01:07:29:06

Thank you sir. Now turn to the second part of the question, which relates to mitigation and also to maintenance, I should say. Sam Griffiths on behalf of the applicant. And I'm just taking a bit of a step back. We've had an overarching strategy, uh, to embed good design from the outset of this project. And that's perhaps most clearly demonstrated by the fact that the applicant appointed a design lead from the very beginning. And as design lead, we, um. Then, uh, what? We defined a series of design principles.



01:07:29:08 - 01:07:59:20

And these were established early in the development and have informed that overall design process and these have spanned issues, um, highlighted in the National Infrastructure Commission guidance for design principles that you may be familiar with and therefore span issues on climate, people, place and also value. And these project specific design principles are listed on page 34 of the Design Approach document, which is examination library reference as one as 013.

01:08:00:22 - 01:08:44:00

And these design principles, I should note, um, were established with input from the wider project team, not just a few individuals. Um, including all of the environmental specialists and these same environmental specialists also fed into the, uh, refinement of the order limits throughout the iterative design process. So part of the way that we've embedded mitigation into the project has been by removing land that was deemed to have the greatest potential for significant adverse effects early in the design process, and this approach has included landscape and visual mitigation, avoiding more elevated ground and perhaps rolling topography where this would potentially increase the visibility and therefore the associated impacts of the proposed development as one example.

01:08:44:23 - 01:09:35:21

Turning to more specific matters of landscape and visual mitigation. Section 11.5 of the Elvia, which is chapter 11 of the ES, uh reference as 017, provides an overview of those measures embedded within the proposed development to mitigate potential adverse effects on landscape, character and visual amenity, and also to maximize any associated benefits. And this approach to landscape and visual mitigation is based on the list of considerations identified within MPAC and one at paragraphs 4.7.6, and also paragraph 5.1.27, which includes matters for applicants considerations such as the sighting of key elements relative to existing landscape, character and landform and vegetation, as well as the sensitive use of materials.

01:09:35:23 - 01:10:06:02

So that's how we've structured our landscape and visual mitigation. And so, for instance, the sighting of the project substations and Bess has taken account of sensitive landscape and visual receptors. Similarly, the landscape and visual mitigation has been a key contributor when defining the heights of different elements, such as the solar panels. And this, as well as the colour of equipment where that can be indeed be determined, such as best units, um, and inverter, or as we call them, power conversion stations.

01:10:06:04 - 01:10:34:03

In this application. Um. More details of this are provided within the commitments register, which is app 187. And that also sets out the method for securing each of these measures. And then as we've gone through the iterative design process, further refinements have been made to landscape and visual mitigation, particularly in response to residential dwellings and also public rights of way, which we will come on to some more examples, I think in perhaps the next question.

01:10:38:02 - 01:11:14:00

Then turning to the maintenance regime, the establishment and maintenance of the proposed landscape planting is detailed within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan app 179. And as we know from yesterday, a detailed link will be provided prior to construction under

requirement eight and under the Olympe. Um, it's um important to flag now, again, based on the conversations yesterday, that will indeed cover the operational lifespan of the project. And we've got a few refinements to make that, um, for deadline one, to make sure that full 60 years is indeed reflected within the Olympe.

01:11:14:21 - 01:11:59:15

Now, the overarching aim of that management plan is to integrate the proposed development into the existing landscape pattern. Also to replace any habitats that are lost during construction, and also to provide filtering and screening um, i.e. vegetation, to screen the proposed development from any sensitive receptors. And the olim also details new habitats that will be provided as part of the proposed development, and this includes over nine kilometers of species rich native hedgerow with trees, six kilometres of species, rich native hedgerow without trees, uh 4.2 hectares of woodland and tree belts, and approximately 1240 hectares of species rich grassland, the majority of which is beneath the solar panels.

01:12:01:01 - 01:12:42:10

A five year establishment regime is established for each of those habitats. Um, followed by long term management prescriptions for each of the habitats that are detailed within the Olympe. It's also worth noting here that, uh, particularly within that establishment window, um, and there's a commitment that the planting will be overseen by a landscape clerk of works, and any plant failures that were to arise within those first five years would be replaced, and they would be replaced with a stock of the same size as that that had just failed, such that if it failed at year five, it would not be replaced, replaced with something that would have been planted at year one, it would be replaced with something that had achieved the growth at year five.

01:12:42:23 - 01:13:12:17

And this is monitored by an ecological clerk of works, who will undertake quarterly checks of the plants to record their growth and condition, and lastly, to guard against those failures. We are proposing quite a broad range of species are planted to enhance biosecurity, such that if one were to fail in on the site, for example, a hedgerow would be more resilient. Rather than relying on one species, you'd have six or 7 or 8 to provide that greater level of resilience. Thank you.

01:13:17:05 - 01:13:17:23

Thank you.

01:13:20:24 - 01:13:26:07

Are there any concerns or comments from any parties? Uh, having heard what you have heard.

01:13:31:21 - 01:14:06:16

I'm Oliver Brown, I'm a landscape architect, uh, with RH consultants, and has been explained previously. I'm here representing the majority of the, uh, the host authorities. Um, we've we've carried out a detailed review of the applicant's Elvia and other landscape related issues, mitigation olam, etc.. This will feed into the local impact report that we're getting at deadline one. Uh, and often this this report is appended into this as well to provide the applicants detailed feedback and concerns.

01:14:06:24 - 01:14:42:01

Uh, and just just wanted to clarify just just a couple of points and I will keep it brief, conscious of the time. Yeah. You know, we agree Generally the assessment is aligned with GL three. Uh, it's, you know, it's thorough. Uh, it does identify several significant landscape and visual effects, uh, which we'd expect from a large scale solar, um, scheme and obviously a concern to us. There are some parts of the assessment that we've, we've highlighted some issues with that are detailed within, uh, the, our review that will be in the local impact report. I can provide a quick, quick summary now or if you want to wait until, uh, deadline one.

01:14:43:00 - 01:15:03:18

I'd be happy to wait. So I'm just conscious of the time and we've we'll need a lunch break fairly quickly, I think. And then obviously we've got. You're happy to carry on. I think you might be on your own. Um, but yeah. No. So if that can come in writing and then obviously the applicant will be able to respond in due course. Okay. So thank you very much okay.

01:15:08:10 - 01:15:13:08

Okay. So that just then leads me on to my sort of secondary question. Um.

01:15:15:09 - 01:15:22:11

In. Can you show me within the documentation where the residential receptors are identified?

01:15:27:05 - 01:15:43:04

It's been going on behalf of the applicant. Um, so I'll just start by saying how we've identified visual receptors, if that's helpful. And then we can kind of go into the detail on some of the examples. Residential samples.

01:15:43:06 - 01:15:51:03

Well, is there a plan showing me each of where each of the residential properties are within the order limits? Simple question.

01:15:51:17 - 01:15:54:10

There is not a plan that identifies residential receptors.

01:15:56:03 - 01:15:56:21

Why not?

01:15:57:21 - 01:16:18:19

The reason for that is because we have assessed them as kind of, um, part of uh, or we've assessed the impact on them in particular views. And those views are the representative viewpoints which are shown on, on on a plan, uh, which I can provide the reference for if that would be helpful.

01:16:19:07 - 01:16:20:05

Yes, please.

01:16:43:10 - 01:16:50:03

So whilst the reference comes, might I just explained that our approach to visiting properties. Would that be useful so far?

01:16:50:06 - 01:17:03:02

Yeah I will. I mean I think the reference you're probably looking for is appendix 11.2 to the landscape chapter, which identifies visual receptors. Um, I think in 11 .3.7,

01:17:04:15 - 01:17:06:19

I think that's what you're probably trying to find.

01:17:07:06 - 01:17:20:03

Thank you. On behalf of the applicant. And so the the representative viewpoint locations is found on figure 11 point uh ten, which is uh examination library reference as 029.

01:17:25:09 - 01:17:46:16

Okay. So is it possible to display that plan? Um, so you can then explain to us, uh, the approach you've taken relative to residential properties. Okay. So it's this one, right? Yeah. Be helpful. I think if you could zoom in a bit towards the center of the order limits. Thank you.

01:17:59:03 - 01:18:15:17

Okay. Mr. Carney, on behalf of the applicant. So whilst this plan is useful, uh, it's useful to read it alongside, uh, At table 11.9 across pages 50 to 65 of chapter 11 as 017.

01:18:21:06 - 01:18:23:15

Um, let me know when you have that.

01:18:42:07 - 01:19:12:05

So, um. Yeah. Table 11.9 that that sets out a summary of the visual receptors. And, and within that, uh, let's take an example. Um, 3.5 is representative of residents along the high street in the southern part of Newton on Trent. So in this table, there are the different types of residential receptors that we've assessed, and we've kind of grouped them where they kind of have a similar nature of of you. Um, would you like me to go through other examples?

01:19:21:17 - 01:19:22:21

Yeah. Okay.

01:19:27:23 - 01:19:51:11

The reason I'm so interested is I'm trying to understand how you've assessed the effect on individual residential properties within or adjacent to the order limits, and as you haven't provided us with a list of the residential properties or a plan identifying them. I'm left a little confused as to how you've then,

01:19:52:24 - 01:20:04:15

uh, engaged with, uh, those properties. Understood the possible effects. Um, so that's where I'm trying to get to.

01:20:05:02 - 01:20:44:12

So I think I might be able to help there. Sam Griffiths for the applicant. So, um, how we've how we've engaged with those properties is, is via several visits to those individual dwellings. Um, so this has

been, um, a process that started at the non-statutory consultation stage, um, during which um, we myself included, uh, visited 14 of the closest properties, um, to the order limits, either within or well on the edge of those order limits. Um, those 14 properties were then revisited during statutory consultation, with an additional six only visited during Stac Con such that we ended up with a total of 20.

01:20:45:04 - 01:21:20:23

Um, and at each of those uh visits, um, quite quickly during non-static non-statutory consultation, it became very clear to us that there's no such thing as AA1 size fits all when it comes to visual mitigation from residential properties. Of course, it depends on things like the nuance of topography, the orientation of the dwelling, and the character of the view, including also how people use their homes. And so therefore, um, it was very good of certain residents to invite us to, to their gardens, but also some to within, inside the property, sometimes upstairs, so that we could, um, inform the emerging design through those visits.

01:21:21:22 - 01:21:52:00

Um, that, of course, also helped us then in the assessment of uh, residential visual uh, receptors, um, which is then represented in these wider viewpoints provided on this plan. Um, to give just a few examples of how that's helped in the design of the scheme. Um, we've got a 200 metre offset, for example, at Raglan. Now, that is purely on the basis of those visits. We appreciated the proximity of the panels to rationale and therefore that, um, offset was embedded in the design.

01:21:52:02 - 01:22:26:02

Similarly, in Ragnar, we've got 150m from Roberts Close. Um, just so we push the panels just beyond the crest of the hill. Um, so that's the kind of nuance that those visits allowed that would have been more challenging otherwise. Um, I do wonder if it may be useful, just as Mr. Gurney has explained. Um, if you look at the viewpoint plan and the table alongside each other, one can then see which viewpoints are representative of it, which group of residential receptors. If we were to provide a plan that highlighted that spatially, that may just shorten that circuit to make it easier for one to interpret.

01:22:27:21 - 01:22:32:09

I think that would be helpful, but also for us to understand which of,

01:22:34:04 - 01:23:02:02

you know, the 20 properties you've actually visited and if there are other properties that you haven't, uh, because we don't have a complete list of the properties that could be affected, which I think is necessary. And I think we also need to understand where they are. Um, so if you can provide that information. So that will help us do hopefully complete the picture. And um.

01:23:04:21 - 01:23:15:14

Have you provided that detailed explanation of the approach that you've taken to assessing individual residential receptors in the way you've just described within the documentation?

01:23:17:03 - 01:23:54:23

Just to reference on behalf of the applicant, just to pick up on your first point around a map, um, we can provide that. There is one provided within the consultation report which highlights the location of

those 20 properties, but we can make sure that is made clear, um, at deadline one. Um, and then with respect to how those properties have been assessed, um, it's common practice within LVA, not necessarily to have a viewpoint for every single visual receptor, but to rather group them where there are similar views such that we have used that representative viewpoint approach, which is where that that table comes in to explain how they have been grouped.

01:23:58:11 - 01:24:05:13

The way that you set out your essay. Is that clear? Explaining that approach you believe?

01:24:21:10 - 01:24:40:07

So the answer is yes. We're trying to find you a reference to point you to. But the reason that it's a yes is because within the visual appendix, which is a reference for just finding, it is set out by receptor group such that if we're interested to specifically see the impacts on a specific receptor, it's listed there in the detail within that appendix.

01:24:40:16 - 01:25:08:16

Okay. Well don't worry about finding it now. But if when you provide your written submission after this, you can detail that for us. But then then we'll know where to look to to join the dots. Thank you very much. So that then sort of leads me on to my sort of subsequent question in trying to understand, I think I understand now the explanation and justification for different distances of, uh,

01:25:10:15 - 01:25:18:13

different spaces around different properties, uh, because it's very specific to those specific properties.

01:25:19:04 - 01:25:49:13

That's right. And it sounds for the applicant, it may be worth also mentioning, um, as we've just discussed, we weren't able to visit every single one. Um, it was only where we were invited to do so. That covered the covered the majority. But I should say that was then supplemented by, um, the wider landscape and visual field work that was undertaken as part of the preparation of the Elvia um, such that whilst we couldn't go and stand in every garden and we considered each receptor as part of those site walkovers, if that's clear.

01:25:51:10 - 01:25:55:20

But for those properties that you were unable to visit and.

01:26:00:14 - 01:26:17:09

Will it be clear to us which they were? And so we can then sort of extrapolate from that to look at the mitigation you're proposing for those and, and to understand that approach in, in that regard.

01:26:20:01 - 01:26:21:22

We can make that clear. Yes.

01:26:22:19 - 01:26:23:10

Thank you.

01:26:25:11 - 01:26:29:23

Um, Mrs. Walker has her hand up if a microphone can be brought to her. Thank you.

01:26:31:15 - 01:27:02:15

Thank you. Mrs. Walker, resident of North Clifton. Um, I think I'd just like to note that it's one Earth weren't active in seeking out those residents that were impacted. My house is completely surrounded, and I was not one of the people that one earth knocked on the door, despite one of their representatives telling me that they had knocked on my door. And I note in their information it says that they dropped in notes when they visited people. There are a number of properties on that map.

01:27:02:17 - 01:27:37:21

Some of my I don't particularly have neighbors because they're about a mile away. But what I cluster my neighbors that haven't had visits. And I think the from what the conversations that we've had, the visits only took place when the resident actively sought for that, that to actually happen. And I think when you can see on the plan that there are a number of residential properties that are surrounded by panels. Surely it would be for the applicant to have actually actively sought out to visit those residents and their views, with a view to doing suitable mitigation.

01:27:40:13 - 01:27:43:07

Thank you. Do you wish to respond?

01:27:44:10 - 01:28:14:13

Sam Griffith, on behalf of the applicant. Um, any any to, um, I suppose, reiterate what Mr. Walker was saying. The visits were conducted, um, as requested through consultation. Um, so that was indeed correct. That's how it was, um, carried out. Um, and then, as I mentioned earlier, um, other properties were considered as part of the wider landscape and visual impact assessment surveys. Um, I think when we provide the examination library with the plan showing where we did and didn't visit, that may become that bit clearer.

01:28:16:10 - 01:28:25:23

Okay. But you didn't proactively go and, uh, contact each of the residents within the order limits to seek to view from their properties.

01:28:27:02 - 01:28:27:17

No.

01:28:28:14 - 01:28:29:11

Okay. Thank you.

01:28:32:14 - 01:28:46:05

Um, as part of the, um, the launch of the project, door knocks were completed for the nearest 27 neighbours to alert them to the project and its launch. Um, but that is different to, I think, what you're getting at.

01:28:48:09 - 01:28:50:08

Thank you. Uh, Mrs. Walker.

01:28:53:05 - 01:29:24:20

Just like to say that I feel that that is incorrect. When I, I specifically asked at one of the meetings how many properties were directly impacted and you could not give me an answer on that. And as one of the affected properties and my neighbors, none of us were visited. So I'd like it would be interesting to know which were the 27 properties that were visited, because I would deem on certainly the East side. I'm only aware of one person that had a visit from one Earth.

01:29:27:08 - 01:29:28:00

Thank you.

01:29:29:23 - 01:29:43:23

Well, we'll see the submission at the next deadline and hopefully that will clarify. And if further work needs to be done as a consequence, then, um, we'll have a better appreciation of whether that's necessary. Thank you.

01:29:59:11 - 01:30:20:00

Oh, sorry. Press the wrong button. Uh, sensible to take a break. Um, but I'm also conscious that we've still got quite a lot to get through. Um, so if, uh, we adjourn now and come back at quarter past. Is that giving everyone sufficient time to take a break?

01:30:21:15 - 01:30:29:17

Okay, so we will adjourn now and come back at quarter past. Um, so thank you very much for the time being.