

Hearing Transcript

Project:	One Earth Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 5
Date:	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: 02:15:50

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:17:22 - 00:00:26:16

Okay, everybody, it's now 2:15. If I can ask you to retake your seats and we can re, uh, commence.

00:00:29:03 - 00:01:05:06

So, uh, Richard Gibson, just before we move on to. I think we're still on Elvia. And about to do the last question. Before we do, I just got a point on residential amenity. I'd like to, um, just to close out. Um, just to clarify, um, clarify on that on residential amenity. We will I confirm we'll do the plan as requested, showing, um, residential properties affected and which we visited and did not visit. And what we'll also show on that plan, which I think will be helpful, is, uh, in relation to each of those properties.

00:01:05:12 - 00:01:39:24

So properties we did visit and indeed did not visit the mitigation and design detail that we applied to that property. And I think that's a key point there that mitigation has not just been applied to properties, um, that we visited, but actually to properties we did not we could not visit. And if in the whilst you're waiting for that plan, um, table 11.10 of chapter 11 of the environmental statement, um, identifies the residential mitigation. And that table uh includes properties that were visited, uh, such as Mrs.

00:01:40:01 - 00:02:15:03

Walker's and uh, that has got the mitigation, uh, for her property in there as well. And, um, the properties we did not visit. So I just wanted to make that clear that we have mitigated and designed for properties that we could not visit, but we'll produce the plan, which I think would be helpful in one place. Uh, going and actually explaining in more detail the design and mitigation we put in place around each of those properties. Um, as the table 11.1 was helpful, it is a high level summary, and I think be more helpful if you saw the extensive, um, detail that we've gone into in the design of this, of the project.

00:02:19:12 - 00:02:23:15

Thank you. Uh, is it table 11.10 of chapter 11? Was it?

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

Yes. That's correct.

00:02:24:23 - 00:02:25:14

Thank you.

00:02:35:03 - 00:02:58:11

Okay. Thank you. So I think then if we move then on to just, uh, in respect to public rights of way, understanding the approach you've taken in assessment of effects on the public rights of way. And

then if you can explain how you've determined the separation distances for, for mitigation. Um, that would be helpful. Thank you.

00:03:00:22 - 00:03:19:05

Um, Ben Gurney, on behalf of the applicant. So the process of identifying, um, those receptors, those uses of the public rights of way. Um, is kind of the more general, uh, process of identifying them. Um, that's detailed in, in, in the in the. Yeah.

00:03:19:09 - 00:03:30:01

Sorry. Can I ask? Um, it was pointed out to me before. I'm sorry to interrupt you. If you can put the microphone a bit near you, I think potentially it's not being picked up as well as it might be.

00:03:30:03 - 00:03:31:09

Thank you. Is that better?

00:03:33:20 - 00:03:38:11

Yeah, I'm getting a nod and I'm failing to use the microphone now, so. Yeah. Sorry. Thank you.

00:03:38:13 - 00:04:14:16

No problem. So yeah, as I was saying, the process of identifying visual receptors and that is the people who would experience changes in views, um, for example, residents or use of public rights of way. That's detailed in, in chapter 11 Yes 017. And that's across the pages 41 or 42 at paragraphs 11.4.8 0 to 11.4.90. Um, that that process has involved a series of computer generated zone of theoretical visibility maps, followed by some field work across 17 days.

00:04:15:07 - 00:04:44:06

Um, between November 2023 and September 2024. Um. Table 11.9 from pages 50 to 65 of chapter 11 provides a summary of the visual receptors, the associated representative viewpoints, and their visual sensitivity. And then in line with GLP A3, this provides judgments on the susceptibility of change, um, of each visual receptor and also the value attached to the particular views.

00:04:46:14 - 00:05:09:07

Um with regard to people using promoted walking and cycling routes. These are just to have a high visual susceptibility with regard to people using local public rights of way or local roads, these are judged to have a medium visual susceptibility, and this difference is attributed to the level of attention or interest that these people are assumed to have on the surrounding landscape.

00:05:11:10 - 00:05:42:16

And the value of each recreational receptor or use of polarizer way is specific to its context and determined in line with the criteria set out in table six on page 15 of appendix 11.2, app 130 and the assessment of magnitude change then considers the effects on the proposed development on those receptors in line with the criteria set out in table nine on page 17 of appendix 11.2, app 130.

00:05:43:23 - 00:05:50:03

Um. And then finally, photo montages have been used to represent the likely changes to those views.

00:05:57:20 - 00:06:28:19

And if there were no further questions on the kind of technical approach, I'll hand over to Mr. Griffiths to talk about the separation. Separation distances to mitigate any harm. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you sir. Sam Griffiths, for the applicant. And with regards to the separation distances. We started off with the project vision, and I'll not read you the whole vision, but it's worth noting one phrase in the project vision that says the project would engage in meaningful conversation with communities and will be sighted to take account of the local environment and people's visual amenity.

00:06:28:21 - 00:07:06:09

So this has been a proactive thing done from the very beginning and is echoed in the design principles, two of which I'll just read out. One is to protect and enhance places of value, and the other is to protect features that are important to the local community, which public rights of way clearly are. So this has been embedded in the project approach from the outset. And therefore we set a name where we can to keep one side of a public right of way open. That was our initial, um, starting point. Of course, that was not possible in all scenarios. And therefore we set a minimum distance offset of 15m one five to the first solar panel, uh, ten meters to the first fence.

00:07:06:20 - 00:07:38:11

Um, however, I must emphasize that is indeed a minimum, um, in many instances with far exceeded that as we've gone through our site specific surveys, where there are those wider views, we've sought to extend those offsets in some instances measuring over 100m. Um, from a public right of way in terms of those offsets to the closest, uh, fence or solar panel. Um, once those mitigation distances have been determined, uh, we then proposed mitigation planting, typically hedgerows and trees on the near side of the fence to screen and the development beyond.

00:07:39:05 - 00:08:09:08

Um, it may also just be worth noting, of course, public rights of way. Uh, we often think of, uh, people walking along them, but there are several bridle ways that cross the all order limits, and therefore we have designed the project. With reference to the British Horse Society guidance titled Advice on Solar Farms near Routes used by Equestrians. Published in April 2024. Three points are particularly important here. The first of which is the guidance recommends a minimum usable width of four metres between fences along bridleways.

00:08:09:18 - 00:08:29:03

Um, they go on to say this usually means fencing at no less than a five metre corridor. In response, the proposed development proposes a fence of no closer than ten metres and therefore a total 20 metre corridor. Although I would add, we have always sought to avoid a corridor type effect by varying that distance from wider amenity perspective.

00:08:30:18 - 00:09:06:20

The guidance goes on to state that the use of open mesh fencing is preferable to close board fencing or metal palisade type fencing with sharp points on top, and therefore in response. And this is with reference to the outline design parameters app. 172. Fencing around the solar panels will comprise deer fence of wooden posts and metal wire mesh. Therefore, again meeting that recommendation. And the final point here is um. Once again, the British Horse Society guidance also states that large developments are opportunities for increasing access.

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

There may be a chance to upgrade a footpath, to ride away or to gain an additional route. And this again goes back to those design principles, one of which is to provide value beyond the immediate scope of the project, i.e. to produce power. We can also provide wider value to communities. So in response to that, um, the project includes 6.1km of proposed permissive paths. Um, now, whilst they will be open to all users, um, 2.5km of those um are specifically tying into existing bridleways and therefore specifically enhance that access for equestrians.

00:09:46:11 - 00:09:55:16

I should just note to as a formality, all of these offsets mentioned are secured via the works plans, which is app 014.

00:09:59:14 - 00:10:43:11

Thank you. So obviously the work plans are the scale that we've got. The math is difficult to discern the difference from those um or the distance I should say. Can I clarify then the, the offset that you're talking about of ten minute, ten meters to the fence and 15m to the first panel, that's presumably in either direction away from, uh, the right of way. So, so you'd have a minimum of a 20 meter corridor and 30m between, uh, panels for a path, a right of way passing through any of the solar arrays.

00:10:44:06 - 00:11:17:24

That is correct. But with the caveat that's a minimum has often been exceeded, and it may be worth drawing your attention or later reference to the design approach document. Uh, page 65 and 66 deals with this issue specifically and quite right. Quite understand the works plans are difficult to get a sense of scale. So within that design approach, document sections are provided to show that, um, as an elevated view, just to try and understand the relationship of the width of the offsets relative to the height of the panels.

00:11:19:19 - 00:11:21:01

Thank you. That's helpful.

00:11:25:17 - 00:11:45:15

My final question really is when you were deciding that ten meters was the the minimum. How do you decide that ten meters is a suitable minimum and is there a Standard against which you can judge that by? Or is it purely a professional judgment?

00:11:49:00 - 00:12:27:06

As Sam Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, there is not a standard. Um, it very much comes down to the potential impacts. And therefore we have to start to look at, um, essentially the potential height ratio of the panels and therefore the width, uh, to try and make sure it does not feel overbearing to somebody walking along those footpaths. Um, so through, uh, site surveys, walking along those routes, that ten metres was set, as I say, that was, um, to the fence. Um, and therefore the reason that's a minimum is because there are some views across the site that are particularly open, um, and therefore where we have been able to, to extend that beyond that, that minimum.

00:12:27:08 - 00:12:32:23

So, um, it was through in summary, site, uh, specific walkovers.

00:12:37:01 - 00:12:53:08

Okay. So so it's a judgmental. Correct? It's a judgment that's been made. Okay. Thank you. And are you able to let me know whether that's a consistent approach with other schemes that have gone before us in, uh, other DCS?

00:12:54:06 - 00:13:03:07

Yeah, in my experience, that's pretty consistent. Um, but we can confirm with a few examples in writing as part of our follow up. Thank you.

00:13:06:19 - 00:13:13:13

Uh, I'll just then open that to the room to see if anyone has any further follow ups that they would wish to pursue on this particular topic.

00:13:23:02 - 00:14:02:00

Stephanie Hawley, County Counsel. Um, I don't think we've got any particular points on separation, distances and setbacks, set offs, etc.. Um, but so if we are reaching the end of the landscape item, um, I just bring to your attention that Mr. Brown, who's our landscape consultant, um, would have some points to make about cumulative landscape effects, which may or may not sit here or under 8.8, uh, on the agenda, given the timing and Mr. Brown's, um, childcare commitments, it looks like very likely that he might not be here at eight point days, depending on whether a decision is taken to to have certain things off to writing or not.

00:14:02:09 - 00:14:11:23

Um, but so if we are going to hear anything aurally today about cumulative effects on landscape, I think now would be the moment if that would be acceptable.

00:14:12:11 - 00:14:22:07

Yes, that's absolutely fine. So do you do you want to lead on that? Mr. Brown, identify two as the concerns that you have in that regard.

00:14:24:02 - 00:14:24:17

Of course.

00:14:24:20 - 00:15:00:04

Yeah. Thank you. Uh, Oliver Brown for, uh, post authorities, multiple post authorities. Uh, I'll keep this brief. I mean, obviously, the, um, the idea does cover, um, and the ES cover, um, the cumulative effects. Um, but what we we what we want to draw attention to is the concern we have about the extent of, um, energy and solar development across the region. We're not just talking, um, this site and within a two kilometre area.

00:15:00:23 - 00:15:43:05

Um, so we're looking at two different aspects there. Uh, we provide further detail, uh, with the within the local impact report. But in landscape terms, the key concern is a change of land use. Uh, and to calibrate that, looking at several of these schemes across a regional landscape, character area,

potentially a national character area. At the moment we're looking at specific features that characterise this landscape. It's agricultural, it's rural. We judged that with the building and development of these schemes, solar will become a defining characteristic of this landscape across an extensive area on a regional area.

00:15:44:02 - 00:16:15:15

So we want to make that point. The second point was on visual terms separate to landscape. We're not suggesting that you were going to be able to see one or multiple additional schemes from one static viewpoint. The concern we have, and again, we elaborate this more in our assessment of the Elvia is moving through this landscape, that sequential effect of seeing solar development, other energy development in this landscape.

00:16:16:04 - 00:16:40:20

And it's almost that fatigue of moving through that landscape on routes, admittedly on roads you're going to see more and more frequently. And then on public rights of way, there's less chance of that, maybe less infrequently. But we feel that that experience of users within this landscape will be affected cumulatively across a very, you know, an extensive area. So we just want to sort of get that point across really.

00:16:43:13 - 00:16:56:14

And is that with regard to particular routes that you're concerned about, or is it more of a, a general, uh, thing covering the area as a whole?

00:16:57:22 - 00:17:28:11

Yeah, it's a fair point. And, um, the guidance often talks about, you know, specific routes and more high value routes. However, and we we can identify some of those. And I think a task for me after today is to go away and provide that and provide more information in writing to identify those routes that are a key concern of ours. But I think, you know, we've got to look across this landscape. A lot of these routes will be passing through multiple schemes and through multiple changes to the agricultural landscape.

00:17:28:13 - 00:17:40:08

So we can highlight some specific routes. I don't have those with me today. We'll provide that. But I think as a general comment, it is just that wider, uh, change to that experience moving through a landscape.

00:17:41:18 - 00:17:42:23

Okay. Thank you.

00:17:44:14 - 00:17:55:12

Um, I'll come back then to the applicant to see how you would wish to respond if you wish to, or whether you want to, uh, wait to see what is submitted in due course.

00:17:56:04 - 00:18:28:04

Richard Gibson, part of the applicant. I mean, we'll obviously wait to see what the law says, but, um, as Mr. Gurney mentioned earlier, um, uh, the cumulative effects have, of course, already been have

been looked at in other projects ahead of this scheme and determined by the Secretary of State. Uh, and one of those that was mentioned was Cottam. And figure one, figure 14 of the examining authority's report shows all projects considered in the assessment of cumulative effects. Uh, and that includes one Earth.

00:18:28:16 - 00:18:42:18

Uh, this application and, uh, Mr. Gurney read out the conclusions from the examining authority in that in his statement. So, um. That's what I've got to say. But obviously we'll wait to see what the council's produce in evidence.

00:18:45:16 - 00:18:46:07

Thank you.

00:18:57:03 - 00:19:04:15

Just whilst, um, we move on, then to heritage. But before we just commence that, um,

00:19:06:13 - 00:19:36:23

are there parties within the room who have particular time limits that they would need to be leaving by? And just wondering whether I need to adjust a sequence or whether we need to be considering setting aside a particular topic for for written submissions in due course. So can I just try and get a an idea around the room? What sort of times people are going to need to be able to work to?

00:19:46:01 - 00:20:12:09

Stephanie. So I'm going to lose Mr. Brown soon, but I think we've addressed that point, so I don't think I will due respect to Mr.. I don't think I need him anymore. Um, uh, so I think he, uh, we dealt with that topic. Um, so my indications from those sitting around me are that they're fine for time. I personally would need to draw stumps at 5:00 for my own childcare issues. Um, my rest of my team are fine.

00:20:14:00 - 00:20:14:15

Okay.

00:20:15:03 - 00:20:18:07

Sir. Um, which group's on the applicant? Um.

00:20:24:17 - 00:20:48:06

So on our side, um, uh, our transport, um, consultant has to get back to Edinburgh. Um, so any transport cumulative impacts? Um, we'd obviously want him here. Um, a few of us don't have accommodation for tonight if we can't get back to London. So trains would be the only other constraints. Um, so, uh, apart from that, we're pretty flexible.

00:20:49:22 - 00:21:06:05

Okay, well, I wonder then, if it's sensible to to do the question on cumulative transport now, and that will, uh, potentially alleviate any issue there. So is the member of your team.

00:21:08:14 - 00:21:09:09

Think we're just.

00:21:09:15 - 00:21:11:03

Going downstairs to collect him?

00:21:11:06 - 00:21:12:21

Okay. Okay.

00:21:12:23 - 00:21:14:01

If he hasn't left already.

00:21:14:08 - 00:21:15:09

No, no.

00:21:17:12 - 00:21:18:02

Okay.

00:21:22:07 - 00:21:48:07

Well, perhaps whilst he's being found, if we do commence on heritage and then perhaps we'll come in to bring him in once we've done the heritage side. But that might be the most sensible thing. Okay, so if we look at then on the, um, can we ask the applicant then to explain the methodology and evidence used in the assessment of effects on heritage assets and their setting? Please.

00:21:50:02 - 00:21:51:17

It's common for the applicant. I'm going to.

00:21:51:24 - 00:21:59:12

Introduce, um, Mr. Roger, associate director at our senior projects, who's done the assessment in terms of, um, above ground heritage asset.

00:22:01:02 - 00:22:01:19

Thank you.

00:22:01:21 - 00:22:35:07

Um, on behalf of the applicant, um, so the methodology that we use for the cultural heritage assessment and related to above ground assets is summarised in section 10.3 of chapter ten on Cultural Heritage, which reference Ape 039. Um, this methodology was agreed with relevant stakeholders throughout the process. So that's Historic England conservation officers at Nottinghamshire County Council, Lincolnshire County Council, Bassetlaw, Newark and Sherwood and West Lindsey. Um, and that's confirmed in table 10.5 of the of the aforementioned document.

00:22:36:04 - 00:23:06:18

And as set out in sections 10.2 and 10.3, the methodology. The methodology follows legislative and policy requirements and best practice guidance. So that relates to regulation three of the the Infrastructure Regulations 2010 um National Policy Statements um N one, N3 and N5, with particular

reference to section 5.9 of N1 um, i.e. Guidance on Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and Historic England guidance um including uh guidance on setting, which is a good practice.

00:23:06:20 - 00:23:42:02

Advice in planning note three colloquially referred to as GPA three and uh, Historic Environment advice. Note 15 um on commercial renewable energy development. Um uh Aitchison, 15. As it's often referred to, and the methodology and evidence that's, uh, been used in assessment can be summarised as follows. Um, the heritage assets and the surroundings were identified using the National Heritage List for England GIS and Historic Environment Record for both Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. Local listings were available so that related to Bassetlaw and local Conservation area mapping.

00:23:42:10 - 00:24:15:02

Um again, this is confirmed in um ABP 039 um in the chapter um in sections 10.3 and 10.4. Um heritage asset mapping has provided at figures 10.1 and 10.2, which is reference ABP 055. Um, a two kilometres study area, um and a scope of heritage assets within the study area. Um were identified for assessment. Um, that is in a 10.31 for the study area. And table 10.6 for the assets grouped into the assessment.

00:24:15:04 - 00:24:46:03

That's still, um, app 039, and the scope of assessment was agreed with relevant stakeholders. And that summarized at table 10.5. Um, this narrowed, uh, the number of heritage assets within the two kilometers down to the ones that were most likely to be affected. Um, and that was there were 76 designated heritage assets and 63 non-designated heritage assets, which were agreed. Um, we, uh, also looked beyond the two kilometer radius.

00:24:46:09 - 00:25:31:04

Um, at scoping stage, um, and through discussions with stakeholders in particular, Historic England agreed that there were no assets, um, outside of two kilometers that, um, required assessment. So following the following this, the identified the identification of the scope. Um, we then undertook an assessment of significance, um, which is also referred to as value. And that included the contribution of setting um to value. Um, and this was based on sources that were already mentioned, plus research including historic mapping, historic landscape, character and topography, and a description of the elements that contribute to significance, can be found at appendix 10.2, which is reference app one, two, seven and app 128.

00:25:31:21 - 00:26:07:22

Um, and the overall level of value identified is that table 10.6 of chapter ten, which is app 039. And following that, an assessment of impact is undertaken in section 10.6, which considered the potential impact on the significance and contribution of setting to significance, um, that included consideration of both visual effects and non visual effects, um in line with Historic England guidance, and this was supported by um, the Z TV ozone of theoretical visibility analysis, and the winter and summer photo montages that were undertaken as part of the Elvia.

00:26:07:24 - 00:26:42:03

So that's um, app 055 and A03 7 to 0 four three, I believe. But I can get the references for those. Um, and then this assessment also took in account of uh, mitigation embedded into the design, which is set

out at section 10.5 of the chapter ten. Um, and this was developed with extensive consultation with relevant stakeholders, both in the consultation periods and outside of that, um, more informally. Um, I'm happy to provide a summary of the effects, if that's helpful, but that sort of summarizes the methodology.

00:26:42:24 - 00:27:15:22

Right? Yes, I'd appreciate that. Thank you. It's only just one follow up point, really. And it's, uh, I don't know whether you've had a chance yet to see the relevant representations, but, uh, at least one part in I think it's, it's to make reference to views of Lincoln Cathedral and, um, that's identified within the landscape assessment that you can see the cathedral from certain vantage points. Can you point out to me within your assessment on the setting of that heritage asset, how that's been taken into consideration?

00:27:18:17 - 00:27:53:24

For the applicant? Yes. Um, so I think I would have to I'll have to go back and find the specific reference from when we did consider that. But that was looked at a very early stage and discussed with relevant stakeholders. Um, and it was, um, decided that the, the setting of Lincoln Cathedral itself, uh, would not be affected due to the, the sheer distance that we are away. However, where where it has been considered is in relation to the setting of the, uh, rim of fortress Scheduled monument, where views of Lincolnshire Ridge were considered to be potentially of strategic importance.

00:27:54:02 - 00:28:14:16

And that's captured um, in view to, I think, of the the Elvia views, which is uh A0 37I believe. Um, and so that was taken into account in the assessment of the rim of fortress, but it was not considered that there would be any, um, effects to the setting of Lincoln Cathedral.

00:28:15:13 - 00:28:16:03

Thank you.

00:28:19:00 - 00:28:36:08

The fact that the view would change with proposed development in place, and the distant view of the tower beyond your concluding, there's no adverse effect on the setting of the cathedral purely because of the separation distance, even though

00:28:38:08 - 00:28:45:04

it's accepted. I think that there would be panels in the view, albeit a considerable distance.

00:28:46:19 - 00:29:31:24

This way for the applicant. So the view, uh, the view, yes. You're correct. And that we, we came to no adverse um, we affects at an early stage when we were scoping this. And this is because the view, the view of Lincoln Cathedral is that it's that quite a distance and it's quite difficult to make out, you know, with the, the naked eye. I'm not saying that it can. It can be. Um. While this view would feature panels. That does not necessarily mean that the contribution of setting to the significance would be affected, because it would still be able to be still able to be appreciated at that prominent, um, raised vantage point, which is a key element of its significance when viewed at a wider distance.

00:29:32:17 - 00:29:51:18

Being able to see, uh, panels or even other, um, bits of development as you would do in these wider views as you're progressing towards the cathedral, does not necessarily affect its significance itself. It's that's more of a, um, a changed context rather than a change to significance. Have I explained.

00:29:51:20 - 00:29:52:10

That.

00:29:53:09 - 00:29:53:24

Personally?

00:29:54:02 - 00:30:11:17

That's helpful. Um, can I just see if Historic England are still with us virtually? And just clarify if you agree with what the applicant said in terms of the setting of the cathedral.

00:30:12:13 - 00:30:31:17

Good afternoon, Hayley James, on behalf of Historic England. Um, I can confirm that the applicant has engaged very proactively with us throughout the process today, throughout the scoping opinion, scoping exercises, um, and they have discussed these with us. So we would be of the same opinion.

00:30:32:22 - 00:30:33:23

Okay. Thank you very.

00:30:34:00 - 00:30:34:15

Much.

00:30:34:22 - 00:30:36:04

That's very clear. Thank you.

00:30:42:24 - 00:30:47:14

Okay. Thank you. So now go to the below ground. I think.

00:30:54:02 - 00:30:58:11

You want us to just. Sorry. Is it the next agenda item that you would like us to?

00:30:58:18 - 00:30:59:08

Yeah.

00:30:59:23 - 00:31:32:06

Is the follow up question is the. It's the continuity. We've obviously dealt with the above ground heritage, and it's now an understanding of the approach you've taken to the below ground heritage. And I think really the, uh, the concern that's been identified in the relevant representations from, I think both of the county councils is whether sufficient work has been undertaken to understand the

archaeological significance of the remains that are there, or even those that aren't known to be there at the current time.

00:31:32:15 - 00:31:47:17

So it's just understanding the approach that's been taken, whether that approach is sufficiently robust and whether you're continuing to do further work. And if so, what's the time frame of that? Thank you.

00:31:48:04 - 00:32:26:02

Thank you sir. Mr. Coleman, for the applicant. And thank you for the clarification. I'm going to invite our archaeologist to respond. I just would like at the outset, just to make very clear that we've carefully and diligently considered our approach to archaeological investigations in the context of needing to ensure compliance with the EIA regulations, in order that you and the Secretary of State have sufficient environmental information before you to take an informed approach on the likely significant effects of the scheme. We've also had regard to the requirements of the NPS policies, again, to ensure that you have adequate information in front of you to be satisfied as to the compliance with those policies.

00:32:26:11 - 00:32:56:14

So Mr. Ricky will explain shortly. We've also taken a proportionate approach, as advocated by N3 to ten 115, focused on likely areas of ground disturbance and areas of archaeological potential. And the proportionate approach reflects that. On the one hand, we need to ensure we've been able to identify the likely significant effects for the reasons I've mentioned, but it also recognises that the archaeological investigations in the form of trial trenching are intrusive surveys, which themselves have impacts on archaeology.

00:32:56:16 - 00:33:45:20

So that has informed the proportionate approach. And That's, um, that's the reason that. Well, one of the reasons that informs that. But, um, before I hand over to Mr. Ricky, just as a reminder, the EIA requirement is that the US must include information reasonably required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects, taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment. And again, Mr. Behe will shortly explain how we've done this. And I think the key parts of in terms of the MPs as it's covered by both Ian one, but more specifically Ian three, which relates obviously directly, um, to solar farm and SERPs, paragraphs 210 one one 3 to 1 one six in particular, which include that we're a site on which development is proposed, includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interests.

00:33:45:22 - 00:34:22:01

The applicant should submit an appropriate death based assessment and, when necessary, a field evaluation. In some instances, field surveys may include investigative work to assess the impacts of any ground disturbance. The extent of investigative work should be proportionate to the sensitivity of an extent of proposed ground disturbance in the associated study area. Um, so I think it was just helpful to set that context before I hand over to Mr. Ricky, which I'll do. So now. Um, his name is Mr. Stefanovic. He's a senior project manager at our senior projects, and he's going to talk you through the approach also with regard to the relevant professional standards and guidance as well.

00:34:22:03 - 00:34:24:00

That's been taken into account in the assessment.

00:34:24:17 - 00:34:25:07

Thank you.

00:34:26:04 - 00:34:51:12

Uh, we have Stefano Ricci for the applicants. So to expand what already been quite clearly stated, uh, our approach is our is the applicant's position that our approach is in full compliance with the EIA regulations, the NPF, the NPS and the professional standards guidance including but not limited to the uh Chartered Institute, Archaeologists Code of Conduct, and the standard for Archaeological Evaluation.

00:34:52:14 - 00:34:53:04

Uh.

00:34:53:21 - 00:35:32:19

It's all of these has been achieved trying to also to uphold these underlying concepts in the archaeological research of avoiding a disproportionate and unjustifiable harm to the environment. And this point is clearly articulated in paragraphs in paragraphs 5.9. 28, 32 and 33 of the N1, and in paragraphs 215 and 2016 and the NPF in. In essence, our intention is to strike the right balance between collecting enough data to robustly inform this chapter and the draft DCO application without inflicting unnecessary and disproportionate harm to the archaeological assets.

00:35:35:10 - 00:35:53:17

In in accordance with paragraphs 5.9. 11 of the N1 and paragraphs 207 of the NPF, our data collection exercise begun with an appropriate discrete assessment followed by a field evaluation which is perceived as standard for critical evaluation, included both intrusive and non-intrusive methodologies.

00:35:55:10 - 00:36:26:11

The auditors who are sorry auditors for the non-intrusive methodology, are provided in section 9.3.5 of the British Heritage chapter. Application number app 038. I'll be happy to go through them here, but they are quite well summarised in the chapter. But what I would like to put the emphasis on is that all the all the non-intrusive work has been done, has been developed in agreement with the key stakeholders and took into consideration the scoping opinion.

00:36:27:03 - 00:36:39:02

It has been acknowledged by the stakeholders in the relevant representations, and it's fully it fully complies with the CFR Standard and Guidance for Historic Environmental Assessment.

00:36:41:03 - 00:37:25:18

For all our non-intrusive work that needs assessment, geophysical survey inform this chapter and this application and identified 29 discrete locations with potential for buried archaeological remains. None of these locations have been already been evaluated via archaeological trial trenching, and as already mentioned, the are in line with the proportionality requirement expressed in the CFA guidance and in paragraph 207 of the NPF. Uh. To design this phase, this first phase of archaeological evaluation, we

adopted a tiered system to define both the scope of the evaluation, the areas to be evaluated, and to make these interventions as proportionate as possible to the expected asset significance.

00:37:25:20 - 00:38:00:21

And, uh, to provide sufficient information, uh, on the on the potential impacts arising for the proposed development. Uh, this approach is that it is detailed in the AP 038, paragraphs 9.35, 9.3.3 5 to 3 six, and included a 3.3% trail trenching areas. Uh Where the options for the substations and best, and for the other parameters for the DCO were being evaluated at 3%.

00:38:00:23 - 00:38:36:19

Trenching, which was a sensitive area that has been identified in, uh, consultation with the with the advisory teams and at 2% trenching in selected areas identified during that space assessment and the physical survey, and as a best practice. The evaluation included targeted trenching, both of the potential archaeology detected during the geophysical survey, but also in blank areas where no archaeology was expected. This enabled a very robust cross-referencing between the intrusive and non-intrusive evaluation techniques.

00:38:38:13 - 00:39:00:11

The outcome of this work produced a very strong, robust and proportionate data set, and what we noticed it was a very strong correlation between intrusive and intrusive assessment, and this gave us a very high confidence in our geophysical results and non-intrusive results compared to where the trail trenching and intrusive trail trenching was carried out.

00:39:02:08 - 00:39:30:03

This this integrated approach between intrusive and interesting work is something that's been applied successfully on other SEOs, including Springwell and Long Field in Essex, where, uh, a proportionate approach between these two different types of evaluation, uh, allowed us to minimise the any sort of impact on archaeological resources while providing enough information to inform the DCO,

00:39:31:21 - 00:39:43:04

uh, to, um also to expand on this, this approach is also, uh, is being seen and considered as best practice in other counties, for instance, in East Yorkshire.

00:39:45:08 - 00:40:16:07

Uh, what? To answer to the second point of, uh, your questions. Uh, uh, we are proposing further additional trail trenching, uh, to be carried out as a pre commencement and which is which design is currently under consultation, under, uh, consultation with local planning authorities and Historic England. This, uh, additional phase of trenching will be formalized in our existing scheme and investigation and will basically serve two purposes.

00:40:16:09 - 00:40:51:03

The first one would be to investigate the remaining 21 areas of archaeological potential that haven't been investigated. Just as for now and, uh, to in line with the end three paragraphs, two point 10.115 to investigate the areas where our impacts arising for the construction activities of the proposed development are expected. This will be, uh, undertaken in advance of construction to ensure the

impacts of any previously and any unidentified Identified. Archaeology. Archaeological assets are appropriately understood and offset accordingly.

00:40:52:16 - 00:41:11:13

Uh, this this this stage approach, uh, ensures to the to the DCO and to the archaeological input flexibility and responsiveness and uh, will be expanded and will provide more details on this while the, uh, proposed development design will progress.

00:41:14:00 - 00:41:46:03

And this sums up our approach to the archaeological, uh, data collection so far. What all of these will be informing is a proportionate and targeted mitigation strategy that will be implemented in, uh, for all the areas where buried heritage assets are affected, wherever fully or partially by the proposed development and as as as discussed in the chapter uh app 038, this strategy will consider the natural extent and sensitivity of the of the heritage assets.

00:41:46:08 - 00:42:00:17

The magnitude of the impact arising from the proposed development and the uh, in terms of deciding what specific methodology would be implemented. Uh, there will be consideration over the practicability and the suitability of said mitigations.

00:42:02:11 - 00:42:34:21

Um, so to conclude and wrap this up. The archaeological strategy implemented for the one DCO, including and including its latest iteration of the um outline WSI, which is under work at the moment, uh, is prioritizing a proportionate but robust evaluation, ensuring the impact of intrusive archaeological evaluation does not exceed the impact arising from the development itself. And it also provides a flexible and adaptive framework, a requirement that is expressly recognised in L1.

00:42:35:14 - 00:43:16:11

Uh, acknowledging that certain details of the proposed development will not be available until later in the process. And, um. Quoting directly paragraph 2.10 .115 of the N5. The extent of investigation work should be proportionate to the sensitivity and extent of proposed ground disturbances in the associated study area, because at the moment we don't have details of where these ground disturbances will be happening. We are proposing an approach where we will be evaluating these areas once we know what sort of impact will be affecting these areas.

00:43:35:03 - 00:43:40:14

Thank you. I then can come to the county councils and start with Lincolnshire first.

00:43:41:03 - 00:44:20:11

Thank you, Sir Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. So obviously we we don't agree that what's been done is sufficient. And, um, but we welcome the applicant's commitment to, uh, investigate the remaining 21 of 29 areas where the desk based assessment showed that there was a significant potential for below ground archaeology. I think those figures speak for themselves that you don't at present have a sufficiently clear picture as to what might be there, because you know that there are 21 areas of significant potential that have not yet been explored.

00:44:20:14 - 00:44:51:08

Nevertheless, they will be, and we welcome that. Uh, our remaining concerns relate to the timing of the results of those trial trenching and, um, sort of when the work product from that will be given to us and, um, what will happen thereafter and the timescales for doing so, that is all, as I understand it, the subject of ongoing discussions between, um, the two archaeologists that sit to my right, um, and archaeologists sitting across the table. And it's a work in progress at the moment.

00:44:51:10 - 00:45:19:14

So I think you've probably got enough to understand that there is a debate about this that we don't agree sort of fundamentally, as to whether there's enough information before the examining authority. We think there may be a way through that to provide you with with more information, but the precise mechanism and timings for doing so are not yet agreed. Um, I'm just so conscious that I've got two archaeologists sitting to my right, so I'll just, um, pass it to to one or both of them.

00:45:27:10 - 00:45:37:00

Uh, hello, sirs, I'm John Allen, I'm an archaeologist, and I work for Lincolnshire County Council. Um, very, very briefly.

00:45:37:11 - 00:45:38:01

Uh.

00:45:38:18 - 00:46:12:01

We're not in the right place, but I think we're getting to the right place. Um, we're missing a lot of archaeological information, and we're missing a lot of the design impacts. And that's something that obviously would have a major impact in terms of informing our understanding of just what's going to be happening where. So we're needing to because we're where we are, we will be needing to accommodate the fact that we don't know quite a lot of things for quite a lot of this team.

00:46:12:20 - 00:46:52:06

Um, so we are working towards finding an accord with things like, um, the outline written scheme of investigation, and we would be looking to have that covered in our requirement to be able to allow that to be accommodated. Um, there were just a few points that I wanted to raise, and then I'll pass you on to Mr. Adams, if that's all right. Um, I'll pass you back as you as as it should be done. My apologies. Um, there was a reference to, um, the guidance, uh, which talked about N1 and N3.

00:46:52:14 - 00:47:25:09

Uh, N3 actually has in footnote 94, um, the results of predetermination of archaeological evaluation inform the design of the scheme and related archaeological planning conditions. And N1 uh section 5.9.12, the applicant should ensure that the extent of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of any heritage assets affected can be adequately understood from the application and supporting documents. Um, while this.

00:47:27:14 - 00:48:04:10

Is the case on this scheme, for example, for uh, I believe it was nine out of the 29 identified areas of archaeological significance have been, uh, evaluated by trenching. There's also 20 known sites that have been identified so far that that have not been subject to that. But again, this is one of the subjects

that we agree on. We're just, uh, having more of a discussion around, uh, timing and, and, and things like that, but certainly, um, just one point that I wanted to raise as an example.

00:48:05:23 - 00:48:06:13

Um.

00:48:09:11 - 00:48:24:13

There was a statement, uh, by their expert witness, which was that the non-intrusive and the intrusive evaluation were getting similar results. Um, actually, in section 9.7.2.

00:48:26:20 - 00:48:34:16

And I'm going to have to, uh, scroll out to give you the name of that document. I do apologize, and I'm just concentrating on the quote at the moment. Um,

00:48:36:14 - 00:49:18:05

387 trenches, uh, were designed to investigate areas where neither the DBA nor the geophysical survey suggested the presence of archaeology of these trenches. 94 recorded archaeological features not previously identified. Um, which is something that I'll be quoting in other schemes, to be honest, because that's quite a nice ratio of giving you an example of just how useful trenching is in terms of getting an understanding of the fact that you won't get an understanding of the archaeology across the site, across the specific impact areas, until you actually do an adequate job of doing things.

00:49:18:07 - 00:49:28:11

So our discussions really now centre around the timing. Um, but I would say that while, um, we are.

00:49:31:01 - 00:49:40:19

In disagreement about how much evaluation needed to be undertaken at which phase of the process.

00:49:42:19 - 00:50:20:19

My understanding is that for us, the management of risk would be more effective if there were to be a more evaluation earlier rather than later. But we also appreciate the various aspects that there are around. Um, doing things like intrusive evaluation. Um, I'd like to quite address that point of how doing trenching has an impact on archaeology. Yes, it does, but not doing trenching also has a massive impact on archaeology in that if these significant areas are not identified, uh, then they are destroyed without recording.

00:50:21:21 - 00:50:22:20

Thank you very much.

00:50:26:01 - 00:51:01:05

Good afternoon, Sir Matthew Adams. I'm the senior planning archaeologist for Nottinghamshire County Council. My colleagues summed it up. Um. Um. Very well. Um, the only thing. There's only a couple of things I'd add to it. Um, the Rochdale envelope has is front and centre of the applicant's application. I would, um, just point you to advice note number nine. Um, 5.2, which does say that the implementation of Rochdale envelope assessment approach should only be used where it is necessary and should not be treated as a blanket opportunity to allow for insufficient detail in the assessment.

00:51:01:08 - 00:51:33:10

Um, which I think is key here. Um, yeah, I, I think I think we're at a place where we will be able to get to an agreement on the approach. Um, our major differences are about when that should occur. It's my feeling that as the longer you leave these assessments, the greater the risk to the development, especially to delivery. Um, finding archaeological remains during construction is the worst time to find it, both for the um, scheme and for the archaeology.

00:51:33:14 - 00:51:53:12

So undertaking these assessments, um, as early as possible, um, is really, really key to a successful outcome for both for both parties, not just not just the archaeology. So, um, I'd just add that to the comment comments from my colleague, which I think covers pretty much everything else very well.

00:51:55:22 - 00:51:56:12

Thank you.

00:51:57:16 - 00:52:09:11

I, um, just then invite Historic England to see if you have anything further to add. Uh, following having heard from both the applicant and, uh, both county representatives.

00:52:10:17 - 00:52:47:19

Yeah. Haley James, inspector of ancient monuments, on behalf of Historic England. Um, so I'm not going to reiterate anything that my colleagues in local authority have said. I think they've summarized that quite well. Um, there was a there's a few localized areas of potential archaeology that we're particularly interested in. Um, as the government's advisers and all things, um, historic environment, particularly in relation to designated heritage assets. So the first thing that we would like to mention is, um, the area of proposed panels that's very close to the winter, more scheduled ancient monument.

00:52:48:06 - 00:53:22:01

Um, we have had a conversation with the applicant about this very recently. Um, so we're slightly concerned about that twofold. Um, one, in terms of the direct impact on any potential archaeology in that area, which would need to be characterized sufficiently, uh, via via trial trenching, because though not within the scheduled area itself, um, as per footnote 75 of the NPF, Non-designated archaeology can indeed contribute to the significance of a naturally considered ancient monument.

00:53:22:12 - 00:53:53:01

in terms of understanding the socio economic way in which a settlement like winter more functioned historically. So we would like to see that those archaeological remains characterized sufficiently to see whether actually they do indeed contribute to the significance of the designated asset. So that's the first one. And then, uh, someone else previously mentioned about the archaeological potential along the Lincolnshire Ridge.

00:53:53:10 - 00:54:35:16

Now there is also the, um, second scheduled monument that is very close to the order limits. And that's the Roman vaccination fort. Um, we're very aware that in terms of the topography and the way in which associated archaeology could be present with the scheduled monument of the Roman

vaccination fort that could potentially carry on along the Lincolnshire ridge. rich. Um. And similar to what I was saying about the winter more scheduled monument that would, in terms of its landscape contacts, contribute to the overall significance of that significance of that nationally significant scheduled ancient monument.

00:54:36:12 - 00:54:56:05

Finally, in terms of the archaeological potential, um, to the south of the Roman Ancient monument. We are slightly concerned about the approach around, um, archaeological potential around the reservoir and would like to see that, um, considered. Um,

00:54:57:22 - 00:55:34:24

furthermore, um, we just it's not quite about the buried archaeological remains, but it is in relation to the scheduled monument, which has a buried element, the um, observation post atop the Roman vaccination portion of the ancient monument. We are slightly concerned still about impact to the design views from that Shadow Nation monument. We are in conversation with the applicant about that currently, and we're hoping that we can, um, get to a point of agreement just in relation to possibly pulling back the panel slightly from one to more.

00:55:35:11 - 00:55:56:18

We're very recently had a conversation about that. Um, so hopefully we can get to a point of agreement trenching, um, along the Lincolnshire ridge down by the reservoir. And also the design views from, uh, the observation post. There are kind of three main points of concern without reiterating what my local authority colleagues have said.

00:55:59:11 - 00:56:00:12

Thank you very much.

00:56:00:23 - 00:56:01:15

You're welcome.

00:56:02:21 - 00:56:07:15

Can I then revert back to the applicant to see if there's any further response you'd wish to make?

00:56:19:01 - 00:56:41:22

Thank you, sir. I think for the most part, as the other parties have indicated, we are having very proactive discussions with with all parties and I thank them for acknowledging that. And I'm aware that that's ongoing and that all parties are working quite hard. And that's why we thank the historic England and the counties for their engagement in that respect. There are a couple of, um, specific points that I believe, um, my colleagues to my left are going to respond to.

00:56:42:10 - 00:56:43:00

Um.

00:56:43:08 - 00:56:46:05

Um, with Miss Georgia Foy first. Thanks.

00:56:47:03 - 00:57:43:02

Thank you, Miss Point, part of the applicant, um, in relation to the comment on the designed view from the Royal Observation Corps post in inside the room of Explanation Fort Scott monument. Um, we have been in discussion with Historic England. Um, as was pointed out. Um, and I wanted to refer to, um, our, uh, to s chapter ten on cultural heritage. Um, Reference app 039 and the specific document reference I'll make sure is in the the response where we have assessed the setting of the the port and including the view from the Roman, uh, from the Royal Observation Corps post, which is that figure 10.7, um, which is a document reference app, 055 which was requested by Historic England um during discussions.

00:57:43:04 - 00:58:21:08

And we do not believe that it is a design viewpoint, and we have set out our reasoning why there. I won't go into detail of that now. Um, but I would direct you to look at that if you, if you could, and we can put some more on that in the written responses. Um, and I would also, uh, add on ten more as well. We are engaging in discussions on the setting of that in terms of the, the relationship of with the panels to the south. And I'll also direct you to the point in our, uh, yes, chapter app 039, where we have assessed that as well, because there are a number of considerations in terms of views and other items that we think are relevant to that discussion.

00:58:21:17 - 00:58:22:07

Thank you.

00:58:23:02 - 00:58:49:04

Thank you. Whilst we're talking about views, is it likely that it would be helpful to us as the examining authority to see these views? And, uh, I just ask whether it would be worth considering as part of the itinerary for the site inspection. Um, so I'll leave that with you to to consider.

00:58:49:07 - 00:58:53:03

Yes, we can confirm that at deadline one when we submit the, um, proposed itinerary.

00:58:57:20 - 00:58:59:20

For the applicant. Just sorry.

00:59:00:19 - 00:59:06:14

I think I just saw confirmation that, um, that view is part of the what we're going to propose, so.

00:59:06:16 - 00:59:07:06

Yes.

00:59:09:08 - 00:59:43:14

For the applicant. Uh, just a couple of comments regarding the, uh, the comments that we received, uh, from Miss James. So the, um, we already trenched the vast majority of the area around the Roman fort. That was one of the areas that we decided to prioritize in terms of like evaluation, because we wanted to de-risk any sort of association with the with Roma Fort and even the area south of water as well has been trenched. And we will be looking in trenching depending on what will be the final design.

00:59:44:05 - 01:00:11:19

The, uh, south of the Roman fort. Even if the vast majority of that land has already been excluded by the order limits. That was the first point. And yeah, 33 is what Miss Foley said about tomorrow. We will be, uh, carrying out trial trenching around in the archaeological potential archaeological archaeology found in the area. And we will be able to inform the final design and the mitigation required accordingly.

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

Um.

01:00:15:07 - 01:00:21:15

A couple I just a quick clarification, not not even clarification a bit. Um, explanation regarding the.

01:00:21:23 - 01:00:22:13

Uh.

01:00:22:15 - 01:00:56:23

Correlation between trial trenching results and Gypsy survey. It's true that 86 of the 94 trenches that were targeting, uh, bank areas found archaeology. But the vast majority of them, I think 95% of them were in Raglan. And Raglan was an area where the, uh, the potential for that specific part of land was already identified by the space assessment. So it's true that every single archaeological assessment or investigation has limits. But when you start to, like, put them together, the results of them together, they can easily fill the gaps of each other.

01:00:57:07 - 01:01:07:14

So while the BGP survey failed to represent the entire density of archaeology at Ragna, the district assessment proved that.

01:01:09:07 - 01:01:49:01

and the entire spirit of our approach to the engine is to avoid any unjustifiable harm to the archaeological resources which its archaeology has. Like a very unique challenge, which is find the balance between providing information and also inflicting harm to the archaeological resources while collecting this information. And the envelope that we are using guarantees that flexibility, that we can postpone a assessment or investigation of specific areas, waiting for a better understanding of what will be the design for that specific areas.

01:01:50:13 - 01:01:56:24

So it's not not doing trenching, it's just justifying the trial trenching based on the detailed design of the project.

01:02:02:11 - 01:02:20:02

Okay, I think I've heard from both parties I understand the distinction between you and I look forward to hearing more on your ongoing engagement with each other. Hopefully it will lead to a constructive conclusion, but we'll see how things progress.

01:02:20:04 - 01:02:22:04

So I just.

01:02:22:06 - 01:02:48:09

Give you a document reference. Stephanie Hall, County council. Um, Miss Allen, when she was speaking, gave you a reference to paragraph 9.7.2 of something TBC. Um, that document is um, chapter nine, Buried Heritage, uh, of the environmental statement. Uh reference app zero 38. And the section given was 9.7.2.

01:02:48:11 - 01:02:50:17

Thank you. Thank you.

01:02:54:22 - 01:02:57:10

Okay, so then, um.

01:02:59:21 - 01:03:03:03

We go on then I suppose it's back now to the.

01:03:11:10 - 01:03:15:16

Mr. Haley. I'm sorry I didn't see your hand up on line. Is it Mr. Haley?

01:03:16:10 - 01:03:19:02

It's Mrs. Haley, but it's absolutely fine.

01:03:19:22 - 01:03:20:21

My apologies.

01:03:22:01 - 01:03:29:07

It's up to you. Fine. Haley James. Um, Inspector Benton monuments on behalf of Historic England. Um, we thought.

01:03:29:09 - 01:03:29:24

It's.

01:03:30:01 - 01:03:35:02

Absolutely fine. Um, we'd just like to take the opportunity just to highlight that, um,

01:03:36:20 - 01:04:08:11

while, uh, Mr. Ritchie was saying, um, about some of the elements of design are not quite fixed at the moment, we absolutely would like to highlight the importance of the maintenance of flexibility in the final design and the ability to actually reflect the, um, the archaeological remains that are encountered as a result of this future child trenching, because without that maintenance of flexibility in the design. Obviously, the appropriate mitigation cannot be carried out.

01:04:09:03 - 01:04:39:17

Um, we'd like to particularly highlight that in relation to areas that have been, um, allocated for biodiversity net gain, because at the moment it's quite unclear, um, what exactly some of the areas of biodiversity net gain are going to be, whether that be kind of shallow scrapes for wildflower, um, trees, etc., so that the archaeological impact of different types of um bag proposals could have quite different, um, impacts on archaeological remains.

01:04:39:19 - 01:04:47:02

So we just would like to finally, before we move on from heritage, just highlight the importance of maintaining that flexibility within the final design.

01:04:50:00 - 01:04:51:23

Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

01:04:52:01 - 01:04:52:19

Thank you.

01:05:11:13 - 01:05:34:21

Thank you for that. I think, uh, to accommodate, uh, our traveler, we can just then quickly touch on the cumulative transport, uh, element. So, um, do we have any sweet, uh, seat swapping or is it everyone in place?

01:05:38:12 - 01:05:39:02

Uh.

01:05:40:01 - 01:05:40:17

Thank you.

01:05:41:21 - 01:06:00:10

So, really, it's understanding the approach you've taken with regard to the cumulative effect on traffic and transport during construction. Uh, both. And then subsequent operation and then decommissioning. If you can give us some clarification on that please.

01:06:04:07 - 01:06:41:06

Thank you sir. Gordon Buchan, on behalf of the applicant and on behalf of my wife, thank you for supporting this, as I will be murdered when I get home. So we're going on holiday tomorrow. Um, the, um, cumulative, um, construction traffic phase was undertaken in the transport assessment, but unfortunately, it appears to have been guillotined off in the final production. And, um, we will amend this deadline. One. So the full detail will be in the transport report. And for some technical reason, I don't understand myself, but it is unfortunately, it didn't make it through into the publication, but it has been undertaken.

01:06:41:18 - 01:07:14:21

Um, a review of committed developments located in proximity of the proposed development was undertaken, uh, using the long list of applications as detailed in um chapter 18 of the EIA report. That's App. Uh, Dash 047. Um. A sifting review of the long list applications was undertaken, and, um,

this will be present in appendix D of the revised transport assessment, which we will provide to you, um, urgently.

01:07:15:11 - 01:08:02:19

The sifting review only considered, uh, developments that may be concurrent with the construction phase of the proposed development and considered the following elements. The status of the application. For example, applications that are in pre-application or screening stage or that have been refused have been excluded. If an application is a significant trip generator, if a neighbouring application is likely to occur during the construction phase of the proposed development, uh, if it will lead to um vehicle movements travelling on the proposed development areas, um development study area, road network, and if the um, proposed development, uh, traffic generation information is publicly available.

01:08:03:10 - 01:08:35:24

The Sifting Review has considered all of those criteria, and there will be a color coding, um, in the revised transport assessment for ease of reference. But um, eight applications met all those criteria. And I can provide you, sir, with a list in writing rather than read through all the application notes. But it does include gate, Burton Energy Park and West Bird and Solar projects, as well as a host of other projects nearby. Um, to review the potential impact.

01:08:36:01 - 01:09:06:03

The cumulative development traffic is included to the 2007 traffic flows. Um, and an impact review for the peak of development traffic was, uh, undertaken. Um, the traffic impact of the proposed, um spring. Sorry, wrong project or the proposed One Earth project is, um. Uh, slightly less in terms of percentages, because obviously there are more vehicles moving on the network.

01:09:06:19 - 01:09:37:08

Um, and in some ways, the cumulative assessment itself is a slightly worse. Worst case scenario, because it would take all of the peaks of the surrounding projects together and assumes that they're concurrent at the same time, which for a variety of different reasons, is probably a highly, um, robust case. A road capacity review was undertaken to review any link capacity issues.

01:09:37:21 - 01:10:15:17

Um, and there were no, um, overcapacity issues. And uh, noted within the assessment. Um, so we will provide that information, sir, for your review and my, my apologies that that was not in the in the final production in terms of um, traffic management on common issues. Uh, the applicant has expressed a willingness to work with, uh, other developers, um, to see what common issues can be put together and to liaise with um, um, traffic management and other mitigation measures where appropriate.

01:10:16:14 - 01:10:57:11

Um, in terms of the operational traffic, the operational uh phase for the proposed development, um, generates very little traffic. Uh, during its normal operation. And we do not expect any significant cumulative issues to occur. Uh, and in terms of the decommissioning phase, um, again, it's very difficult to project forward that far in advance. Um, but prior to decommissioning, a revised transport assessment, um, would be undertaken with appropriate traffic management to cater for the base traffic levels there, and also other cumulative schemes that may be decommissioning at the at the same time.

01:10:58:05 - 01:11:35:05

We would note, however, the decommissioning phase would likely to result in fewer traffic movements as certain elements of infrastructure may be retained on site. And for example, uh, improvements to uh access junctions may be taken on um for the future agricultural uses on the site. Um, but we, we feel for the decommissioning phase that um, a future assessment and potentially decommissioning traffic management plan would be the most appropriate tool to cater for that for, um, those at that time.

01:11:38:15 - 01:12:17:23

Uh. Thank you. Just a couple of points. If it's, uh, a document that you have already and it's just somehow or other got lost in the wash, Um, is it going to be possible that you can provide that sooner rather than deadline one? Um, so that, uh, we can see that, but also, the council's might have the opportunity to include that within their local impact reports. I think if you if you even if you can only share it with the councils, uh, and it still needs to be submitted to us slightly afterwards, I think the council's would appreciate receiving it as soon as as possible.

01:12:18:11 - 01:12:24:08

Um, and that would be helpful if that's, uh, something that you can do. Um,

01:12:26:05 - 01:12:48:05

you reference the the applicant's willingness to commit to working with other, um, projects. One of the things that has been raised in relevant representations is that other schemes have prepared documents to that effect, and wonder if that's something that you're proposing to do, or would be willing to do.

01:12:50:01 - 01:12:56:12

With the applicant? Um, yes. I think you're referring to what other projects have as a interrelationships report, and we're preparing that for deadline one.

01:12:57:05 - 01:12:59:01

Super. That's very helpful. Thank you.

01:13:00:23 - 01:13:19:08

So, um, Gordon Buchan, for the applicant, in terms of the commitment to working with others, that commitment is already made in the, um, construction traffic management plan, uh, as it as it stands today. And yes, we will get the expedited version of the transport assessment issued as soon as possible.

01:13:20:05 - 01:13:20:20

Thank you.

01:13:31:21 - 01:13:33:06

Yeah. Lincolnshire county.

01:13:33:08 - 01:13:52:20

So thank you, Stephanie. Lancashire county council. So thank you. We obviously welcome, um, any early sight of the the missing parts of the cumulative transport assessment. Um, Uh, so we probably just for your notes, might not be able to feed that into the LR because I think it's it's already written and it's been published by our committee services. So it's.

01:13:52:22 - 01:13:53:12

Sort of.

01:13:53:16 - 01:14:51:20

It's already there. We might be able to all really update committee if we get it in time. But but the committee is on Monday, so um, so that would possibly be prohibited. Um, so that's just a timing point. But obviously we'll consider it as soon as we get it. And, um, we'll take it from there. Um, in terms of the cumulative assessment broadly in how this fits together, certainly we had, um, struggled to follow through quite the relationship between the projects and the assessments contained in appendix 18.2, um, which is app 146, which suggests that West Burton and Gate Burton would not progress to stages three and four of the um applicants cumulative assessment on the basis that they weren't considered to have relevant overlaps, and certainly the entries for those projects in that table suggest that there would be an unknown overlap in temporal scope.

01:14:52:01 - 01:15:32:13

Whereas when you get to the transport chapter, those are actually flagged as yes. You think there might be a construction, um, overlap in terms of periods. So there's just there's some consistency, um, difficulties between documents, between the cumulative assessment chapter 18 and its appendices. And then when you go into the the impact specific chapters of the environmental statement, which has made it quite difficult for us to read. Um, and certainly when we started with chapter 18 and found that, um, I think all of the concepts, uh, in this area are essentially scoped out of the later stages of the cumulative assessment.

01:15:32:23 - 01:16:03:04

Um, was a concern to us, particularly when it's noted, uh, in chapter 18 and appendix 18.2 that, um, the overlapping tempore will escape with West Burton was wasn't known at a point when West Burton has got consent. So it's, um, it's projected construction timescales. Um, should be as well known as any other project or better known because it's it's, uh, enshrines in that order. Um, ditto.

01:16:03:06 - 01:16:33:23

Gates Burton was listed as, as being unknown, but we do obviously have published timescales for for that project. So I'll just rather than read you out all of our little I say little, quite lengthy, detailed list of, um, concerns about how those documents fit together and what our broader point that we think some of these concepts might have fallen through the net or should have progressed to a later stage in a cumulative assessment than has actually occurred.

01:16:34:19 - 01:17:00:00

Um, or they're listed as not progressing in 18.2. It may be that when you sort of ferret through the topic specific, um, chapters of the year, they have been assessed. Um, we'll provide all of that in writing. And it might be that the applicant can respond either with substantive responses or just a

document reference for where in fact that is addressed. But probably and I've seen some nods from across the room. Let's do that in writing.

01:17:03:16 - 01:17:04:24

Very helpful. Thank you.

01:17:05:22 - 01:17:10:06

Could I just clarify? Sorry, was that part of the law or will that just be a separate, um, separate.

01:17:10:14 - 01:17:17:22

For Lancashire County Council. So we won't be able to do that as part of the law because of the timescales. And um, but we'll get that to you.

01:17:23:24 - 01:17:25:14

Okay. Nottinghamshire.

01:17:26:04 - 01:17:53:23

Yeah. Will Lawrence County Council just confirm agreement with Lincolnshire there? I don't think that the cumulative transport assessment is going to be able to form part of our representations in our local impact report, given the time frames and the need to secure an approval for what's already been drafted. However, obviously if it is received well, we'll review it as soon as we can. Uh, and I know there's a meeting scheduled anyway with our transport, uh, team, and perhaps it can form part of that discussion and subsequently the statement of common ground.

01:17:56:18 - 01:17:57:12

Thank you.

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

Uh.

01:18:05:08 - 01:18:11:04

Okay. I think we can release you to go for your train. So have a safe journey and have a good holiday.

01:18:32:16 - 01:18:42:14

Uh, I've just seen, uh, a message telling me that there's a hand up online. I can't see one. So it is. If somebody's wishing to say anything.

01:18:44:07 - 01:18:44:22

No.

01:18:45:04 - 01:18:49:02

No. Okay. Not obviously. Thank you.

01:18:54:12 - 01:19:05:16

Okay, then if we can move on to, um, agriculture, uh, soils and question about best and most versatile agricultural land.

01:19:13:04 - 01:19:13:19

They.

01:19:15:24 - 01:19:52:10

Just invite the applicant to explain, really the effects on soils and, uh, BMV and provide evidence on the management of soils throughout the lifetime of the project. Um, appreciate your scheme is now proposed for 60 years. So I'm looking to understand what evidence you have of how soil can be managed for 60 years, and whether there is anything to support doing that, such that the soil will still be in a suitable condition after such time.

01:19:54:05 - 01:19:59:19

Thank you sir. Mr.. For the applicant, I'm going to pass you over to Mr. Kirk Hill, Technical Director at Adas.

01:20:00:01 - 01:20:01:08

Thank you. Okay.

01:20:01:18 - 01:20:02:08

So

01:20:04:00 - 01:20:21:23

Kirk Hill from Adas, on behalf of the applicant, um, my colleague will, uh, give a bit of a brief about, uh, the survey background and the assessment process, and then I can continue about any soil management issues and restoration plans as required, depending on what's contentious and what questions they have.

01:20:25:16 - 01:20:26:15

Jay Ryan, on behalf.

01:20:26:17 - 01:21:12:02

Of the applicant. So soil is recognised in the UK policy as a fragile finite resource which needs to be protected. Some soils are more vulnerable than others, which outlines the requirement for an AOC survey. Agricultural land classification. A range of soil types of various quality and resilience have been identified at the site, with lighter soils being more resilient than heavier soils. In this particular case, which is often common, the lighter soils are recognised as BMV and higher quality land, but they are also the more resilient soils as they are lighter in texture and the heavier soils, the counterpart being more susceptible to damage.

01:21:12:11 - 01:21:14:19

And in this case the lower quality land.

01:21:16:09 - 01:21:27:07

The Soil Management Plan EP 182 outlines good practice, guide and mitigation efforts on the soil for the duration of the project.

01:21:29:09 - 01:21:47:14

And the AP 105 Agricultural Land Classification Report was stipulated by Natural England, and the Soil Management Plan was done in accordance with Defoe's Code of Conduct, which have both been approved by Natural England.

01:21:54:23 - 01:22:29:22

Um, I suppose depending on how much new media you cover. I mean, the biggest threat to soil damage is to, uh, soil structural damage through compaction, by trafficking of the land, by soil stripping it and moving the soil. And so, to answer your question straight away about will it still be, uh, manageable and good within 60 years? We know from years of experience and research that putting soil down to a long term grass lay improves soil health because you are physically, uh, working the soil less every time.

01:22:29:24 - 01:23:10:17

You know, even in agriculture terms, every time we cultivate the soils, there's a risk of doing damage to it. Which is why we sort of we should be doing as little cultivation as possible, depending on the need of the, of the farming that you're involved in. So there are risks inherent in agriculture, in managing soils. And those are similar on a construction site, although arguably tending on the level of the construction site. They could be, uh, severe or they could be less. And uh, for example, a, uh, cross-country pipeline would have more, um, invasive actions than a solar farm because you are doing more intrusive actions, more intensive, uh, machinery and heavy machinery, and you're digging far greater trenches and far greater risk of, of mixing soils than you would in a solar farm.

01:23:10:20 - 01:23:49:06

And, and so it's all a matter of scale of weight of the equipment, axle load of the equipment and the amount of soil movements and the length of time that they stay, uh, uncovered by crops. Because obviously a growing crop covers the land, protects it from erosion. Rainfall and everything else. And it also helps to to weather the soil to make it aerobic. And increase soil fauna and soil. Soil, soil, fauna and flora, which increases soil health. And those soil benefits, as well as the longer time it's in grass layer, you'll get greater grass species diversity, which will help invertebrates and everything else above ground as well.

01:23:50:01 - 01:24:23:17

Um, so the greatest risks are from sun movements and compaction, but there's also some risks of soil mixing as well. This occurs mainly on the solar farm, when you're stripping soils to put the access tracks down or compounds down, but also with the cables where you're excavating sub soils as well. And the soil management band does set down how we handle those. And the key thing is handling soils during a suitably dry enough conditions, because the analogy I'll use if you if you've got a bowl of dry flour and you hit it with a sledgehammer, you've still got flour that you could brush around and make you sneeze.

01:24:23:19 - 01:24:55:23

But if it's slightly moist, you know. Even my puny little thumbs will form an impenetrable pastry that the water can't get through. All the or the gravy or whatever can't get to. And soil's much the same. So that is absolutely key. Is some management plan and doing all the works during suitably dry moisture conditions, um, and avoiding soil mixing. So if we're stripping the top soils, they should be stored separately. And if we're excavating subsoil trenches, if we've got some sort of different quality as you go down through the soil profile, then they should be stored separately and not on top soils and avoid mixing.

01:24:56:04 - 01:25:26:24

And in the solar farm, particularly on on linear lengths, we are stripping the top soils and storing them linearly along the track so they aren't moved and uh, mixed with soils of other quality in other areas. And when the when the track is removed, they can just be scraped back off in situ. So if the soils are stored close to their point of origin, there'll be less contamination with poor quality soils, and they'll go back in the same place. And they should be go back in the same order. So the lower subsurface to go back in a cable trench first, followed by upper sub soils and then your top soils on top. So there's there's no mixing.

01:25:27:17 - 01:26:05:16

Um, and I say all that is set down in the, in the, in the soil management plan, which has been accepted by, by Natural England. I think they asked one question or two question was it on the soil management plan which we we can address. There was a question about, uh, topsoil storage. Uh, and they said it needs to specify that topsoil stored for longer than six months or overwinter, uh, should be put down to grass. And it actually already does say anything over six months should be put down to grass. But we can add the clause about anything still stored over winter to be put down to grass as well, so we can make that adjustment to the outline plan and that will be covered.

01:26:05:17 - 01:26:35:19

The only other question they asked was about, uh, concrete shoes on some of the panels. And as I said, the concrete shoes are designed for, um, potentially areas of archaeological significance to, to have less ground and excavations. So they'd sit on the surface. So actually they're less intrusive than the piles potentially as well in any case. So they should be fine. But we can clarify that again in outline soil placement. And so those are the only two questions, as far as I was aware, that Natural England asked to remedy that.

01:26:36:10 - 01:26:50:17

Um, and I think I've possibly already covered the point about six years of management. And the grassland is extensive farming rather than intensive farming, uh, and less groundworks. And yes, soil health will improve during that that period of management.

01:26:51:20 - 01:27:25:24

But can I just clarify that where you stripped the soil for the various components across the site? Um, what's the depth or do you know the depth of soil that you'll be stripping and then the quantum of soil that will then be stored? And is that then going to be how high is it likely to be? Are you going to have a series of, uh, ridges along? You know what I mean? How is it going to work in practice. And would that have any material effect on the quality of the soil as a consequence over time? Uh.

01:27:26:16 - 01:27:59:03

Not really. So we do know the depth that we'll be stripping out, because we've got a soil survey that tells us that. But there is still variability within that. So typically I think it's about 200 is the common topsoil depth across the site. But there will be variety within that as well. And so you have to strip to the color change. So the topsoil will have more organic matter in it because it's whether, you know, fecal matter and plants have deposited time and built up that that key layer, which is really important for nutrients and initial plant growth. So that will be stripped separately, pulled alongside. And it's not a great depth and not a great width.

01:27:59:05 - 01:28:30:05

So you'll end up with quite small heaps alongside the track, ideally on the up side next to the hedge or and gaps within them, which would be detailed in the surface water management plan. To avoid diverting surface water along a given route and concentrating flows to a given point. So that's the that's the key risk really of any bunds is diverting surface water, but it should be stored in a discreet bun, so it's clearly visible and they're not lost to to be in statement. It shouldn't be spread thinly and scattered around. It should be alongside the track.

01:28:31:19 - 01:28:35:01

So do you have any indication of the height that these are likely to be?

01:28:35:18 - 01:29:06:21

Uh, pretty small, I suppose. The answer we shouldn't do it. Uh, depending on when it's dripped normally, you know, we'd say no higher than than two metres. But in essence, in this track it's going to be much smaller than that. You know, it might only be about half a metre high in some of these aspects, in some of the local, um, uh, structures, it might be a little bit higher than a half meter and put in a more discreet heap, but depending on the soil type, it would be, uh, no more than two meters or no more than five meters in the code of practice.

01:29:08:00 - 01:29:11:22

Yeah, yeah, but it depends on soil type and conditions when it's stripped.

01:29:14:05 - 01:29:46:24

I appreciate some more clarification. It's perhaps best to be done in writing because. Yeah. Um. Also, the greater the height, the greater the compaction. But also what, depending on the quantity and the length of these runs of soil. What's that doing for? For drainage, but also the landscape. Is it doing anything, uh, how much of it is there, you know, what's the length of run that we're talking about? Is this for every single track that you're creating? Um, you know, just a bit more detail in terms of the.

01:29:49:06 - 01:29:52:09

Extent of effect that that may arise. Yeah.

01:29:52:11 - 01:30:22:10

That's okay. I mean for obviously some of the also some of the applicant the, the, the length of the heap will be the same length as the access tracks along the route, and obviously the temporary ones. That will only be for a very short period of time. But the, the, um, the longer term tracks that stay in existence for the it will be there for the whole length of the time, unless there's a particular need to

move it to a different area. For example, if it was in a floodplain, we wouldn't want topsoil stored in a floodplain.

01:30:23:06 - 01:30:26:06

So that could be addressed based on, you know, in writing afterwards.

01:30:26:20 - 01:30:41:07

Okay. Thank you sir. If there's a plan you can refer me to for the permanent accesses or tracks, then that would again be helpful to understand where your soil is going to be stored adjacent to those tracks.

01:30:46:22 - 01:30:48:17

Because yes, that'd be fine.

01:30:49:05 - 01:30:49:21

Thank you.

01:30:50:11 - 01:31:01:05

Sorry. Just to add, Jay Ryan, on behalf of the applicant. Topsoil restored, no taller than two meters high, and any stripping of subsoil will be stored. No, no taller than three meters high.

01:31:04:03 - 01:31:05:18

No taller than three meters.

01:31:05:23 - 01:31:08:17

Yes. For subsoil and then two meters for topsoil.

01:31:10:16 - 01:31:42:15

Uh, if you're having. It's not right to call it a structure, but a landform that is three meters high. I think we should see some detail of that. It's relatively flat landscape, and if you're going to be adding three meter landforms within your scheme, I think we should see where they are proposed to be, the extent of them to understand the consequential effects, if any.

01:31:43:01 - 01:31:48:05

So I think that's something we you should assist us with.

01:31:50:03 - 01:31:50:18

Yeah.

01:31:53:05 - 01:32:00:16

Yes. We can make sure that when we provide that confirmation at deadline one and then any any other additional points, as you've mentioned in terms of impact will pick that up.

01:32:01:03 - 01:32:01:18

Thank you.

01:32:04:23 - 01:32:08:12

I open that up to the room then in terms of any concerns. Mr..

01:32:10:16 - 01:32:15:23

Uh, Simon Newton District Council. Um, I'm just going to pass.

01:32:16:00 - 01:32:17:13

This issue over to a colleague.

01:32:17:15 - 01:32:18:05

Online.

01:32:18:07 - 01:32:18:22

Who hopefully he's.

01:32:18:24 - 01:32:19:14

Still there.

01:32:19:16 - 01:32:20:06

Have.

01:32:20:08 - 01:32:20:23

Been.

01:32:21:00 - 01:32:21:15

Patiently.

01:32:21:17 - 01:32:22:07

Waiting.

01:32:22:09 - 01:32:34:12

Um, just to check in and see if there anything, uh, anything that we would like to add at this stage. So Sam Franklin should be, should be online. So hopefully I'll let him declare himself and see if there's anything to add.

01:32:36:12 - 01:32:46:22

Okay. Mr. Franklin, can you wish to introduce yourself? Yep. Sam Franklin. Uh, on behalf of, uh, Newark and Sherwood and, uh, Lincolnshire.

01:32:47:18 - 01:32:48:08

Uh.

01:32:48:21 - 01:32:57:15

Thank you, sir. I, I think, um, Jay Ryan actually, um, clarified that it was a three metre high rather than a five metre high.

01:32:58:09 - 01:33:33:12

Um, uh, bund, which which I'm pleased about because I was concerned when I thought I heard five metres and I was going to seek clarification on that. Um, in terms of soil storage and not from a landscape perspective. The other issue, unrelated to that, that I have some concerns about, is that a lot of the soils on this site are fairly heavy clay based soils, and they will have an artificial agricultural drainage, probably plastic or clay pipe.

01:33:34:01 - 01:33:48:11

And I think we need some reassurance that that drainage won't be damaged by the insertion of, um, the supporting um, legs for the, for the, um, panels. Uh.

01:33:52:11 - 01:33:57:10

Okay. Thank you. Come to the applicant to respond. Okay.

01:33:57:22 - 01:34:31:07

On behalf of the applicant, um. Ah, we certainly can't, uh, guarantee that the drains won't be damaged by the panels because it's just we don't know where all the existing drains are. Some of them could be, you know, a couple of hundred years old. All we can say is that they will be repaired and there will be a remedial drainage plan, depending on the level of damage that occurs in the field, and that might occur during construction phase, operational phase, and certainly at decommissioning phase when it's returned to good agriculture practice. Yeah, but you're right is absolutely crucial.

01:34:31:12 - 01:34:32:02

Yeah.

01:34:32:04 - 01:34:44:04

Jay Ryan, on behalf of the applicant, I just want to clarify that that is paragraph 5.3.26 within the Soil Management Plan document reference AP 182.

01:35:05:04 - 01:35:08:20

Are there any other issues that you sought clarification on, Mr. Franklin?

01:35:12:23 - 01:35:27:00

Sam. Franklin. Uh, no, sir, not not at this stage, I think. Um, there's going to be some, uh, additional information provided, I think, with regard to safeguards, which I shall, um, be looking forward to.

01:35:27:08 - 01:35:27:23

Uh.

01:35:28:01 - 01:35:30:19

But I think at this stage I have enough information.

01:35:30:21 - 01:35:33:12

Thank you. Thank you.

01:35:41:02 - 01:36:02:24

If I can then come back to that. We, in terms of, uh, best and most versatile agricultural land, I think the proportion across the site is either 53 or 56%. If my memory serves me right. Um, if that figure is correct. Um, can you just address,

01:36:06:02 - 01:36:07:12

The national policy

01:36:09:03 - 01:36:10:20

element with regard to

01:36:12:13 - 01:36:17:17

protecting best and most versatile, and avoiding the use of best and most versatile.

01:36:23:02 - 01:36:29:19

I'm going to pass you over to Mrs. Sarah Price from DWD, from the, um, who's our, um, director at DWD. Thanks.

01:36:32:24 - 01:36:33:14

Thank you.

01:36:33:16 - 01:36:34:06

Sarah.

01:36:34:08 - 01:36:34:23

Price, for the applicant.

01:36:35:06 - 01:36:36:05

Um, so.

01:36:36:24 - 01:36:37:14

The site.

01:36:37:16 - 01:36:39:19

Selection report, which I was.

01:36:39:21 - 01:36:40:11

Referring.

01:36:40:13 - 01:36:41:08

To yesterday, which.

01:36:41:10 - 01:36:42:00

Is a.

01:36:42:02 - 01:36:42:17

Appendix.

01:36:42:19 - 01:36:43:09

One of.

01:36:43:11 - 01:36:44:01

The planning.

01:36:44:03 - 01:36:44:18

Statement.

01:36:44:20 - 01:36:46:06

App 168.

01:36:46:13 - 01:36:47:03

Um, sets.

01:36:47:05 - 01:37:41:01

Out how the applicant took account of best and most versatile agricultural land when considering the site that it was going to take forward for development. That set out in paragraphs 3.3. 4 to 3 .3. 11 of the site selection report. When the applicant was initially identifying the site, they took account of publicly accessible data published by Defra and Natural England, and that approach has been established as a reasonable starting point for the other solar insects determined to date, and at that level, the site was identified as almost entirely grade three and with some small elements of grade four and with much larger areas of grade two.

01:37:41:12 - 01:38:14:13

Um agricultural land located towards the western and southern extents of the ten kilometre search area, and says, I'm conscious that we're still to get back to you on the appropriateness of that search area. But at that level, um, the applicant was seeking to avoid those large swathes of grade two land. Um, to the to the western south. There are pockets of grade four land throughout the ten km study area, and although these are predominantly coinciding with other protected ecological features.

01:38:14:15 - 01:39:15:08

So see for instance. And so the applicant considered that those sites wouldn't be appropriate sites for a potential solar farm. Um, in terms of how the applicant has considered best and most versatile agricultural land throughout the order limits and the land available to it. Um, there's some information on that set out in the design approach document that's EP 171, and that has some, uh, consideration on page 64 about how the sighting of solar panels within the order limits sought to reduce the use of BMV, and what that shows is at various stages through the scheme development, and that land was removed as being potentially suitable for solar and proposed for solar panels, and that was also best and most versatile land.

01:39:15:16 - 01:39:45:03

So at the early stage of development, following initial consultation, 34 hectares of BMV was removed from the area proposed for solar panels and the statutory consultation, 65 hectares was removed. So in total, the applicant was previously proposing 99 hectares of best and most versatile land that was subsequently removed as the design developed.

01:39:50:06 - 01:39:50:21

Thank you.

01:39:56:24 - 01:39:57:23

Yes, Mr. Boss.

01:40:00:02 - 01:40:31:02

Simon Betts. Excuse me. Simon Betts, Newark and Sherwood district council. Um, just just some brief comments. It won't be a surprise because it's a matter of record in our relevant representations. We are concerned about the loss of BMV land, um, the proportions involved. And I suppose the added to it added to that it's the degree of permanence. So as I alluded to before, this is a longer than average operational period for a solar farm.

01:40:31:04 - 01:40:51:00

And therefore at what point, I suppose, do you go beyond temporary and you become, in effect, permanent? Um, so again, this is nothing significantly new, won't be a surprise to the applicant and will provide further details of this in our local impact report as well. But I just wanted to, uh, set out our position on that.

01:40:51:02 - 01:40:51:17

Thank you.

01:40:53:06 - 01:40:53:21

Thank you.

01:40:55:04 - 01:40:55:22

Yeah, Lincolnshire.

01:40:55:24 - 01:41:37:12

County, says Stephanie Hall, County Council. So in a similar vein to it, and you can share with district council. I think you've probably got the sense from our relevant rep and it will be repeated, um, in our Lear, that we have significant concerns about the extent of agricultural land loss rather than a harm to soils point. It's a land use change point. So BMV tends to be twofold. Effects are loss of, um, agricultural land usage and um, impacts on food security throughout the lifetime of the project as one type of harm and another type of harm being whether there's any permanent effect on soil quality.

01:41:37:17 - 01:42:09:11

I think we're relatively sanguine about the latter, given the, um, soil management plan, the ability to deal with those things by way of conditional requirements is relatively well established. And any, um, harms would be, um, B minor in terms of their perm. If there's any permanent harm, they'll be limited

to, um, creating concrete bases for anything that needs to be flat. But that'd be a minor area overall. And the larger harm is in relation to the, um, cumulative effects from from loss of land use.

01:42:09:24 - 01:42:49:17

And, um, we obviously want to just consider, uh, in and we'll probably address this in writing, um, about, uh, the degree to which the applicant is, is considered, uh, policy tests, both in the 2015 written ministerial statement and the 2024 written ministerial statement, the latter of which, um, refers to clustering in Lincolnshire when it talks about clustering in Lincolnshire. This is the cluster it is talking about. Um, so when government has had a think about, um, use of BMV land, it has its eye very firmly fixed on, um, this area of Lincolnshire as being an area of geographical clustering.

01:42:49:19 - 01:42:59:00

So we consider that, um, the cumulative effects over the use of agricultural land are significant and a material concern for us.

01:43:00:20 - 01:43:01:12

Thank you.

01:43:02:20 - 01:43:09:00

Okay, so before I return to the applicant, is anyone else got any further points or concerns they would wish to raise?

01:43:12:08 - 01:43:16:00

Okay then. Is there anything further you would wish to say in response.

01:43:16:12 - 01:43:53:21

To the applicant? Just briefly, I will respond in a bit more detail in writing. But firstly, um, the the other schemes reference Cottam, Gate, Burton and West Burton. Firstly, just to note those are all 60 year consents. Those decisions also confirm that the effects with respect to agricultural land and BMV are appropriate long term, but treated as temporary and reversible. And I'll pull out the references for that. Um, I've got the one. There's one from Cottam, at least in front of me, but I'm fairly confident they all confirmed at that point, so we'll put that in writing with the references. Um, in terms of just any permanent, Imminent, um, loss of, um, best ability to use, best and most versatile.

01:43:53:23 - 01:44:37:19

And in our assessment, we've assumed that established habitats will remain in place when we decommission. And that's the only permanent harm. There's no permanent harm through concrete. I think there may be an area in our, um, cumulative effects, uh, chapter in that respect, um, which we will, um, correct at deadline one. Um, the other point to note is that all these decisions as well to date have considered the cumulative effect, in particular in Lincolnshire. Um, the schemes I've mentioned, and also Harrington Fen is another example where, um, the cumulative effect has been considered possibly overestimated in the case of one Earth, given those schemes have come earlier and made various assumptions around our the amount of BMV, but that has been, um, already considered as part of those other schemes.

01:44:37:21 - 01:45:11:00

So again, we'll pull out, um, references to assist with that. Um, we can address the points about the written ministerial statements in writing, but I think, um, the first point on the 2015 one is obviously due to the age of that and the, um, confirmation of um, policy. Since that point is has limited weight, albeit we comply with it. Um, the 2024 one, um, basically is referred to in, I think almost every sector of state decision to date is essentially just emphasizing aspects that are already in, in three. Um, and again, we can respond to that in more detail in writing.

01:45:11:02 - 01:45:18:23

But the cumulative point we've obviously assessed, I've addressed as well. So um, that I think covers the points generally. But as I said, I'll put some more detail in writing.

01:45:20:13 - 01:45:21:04

Thank you.

01:45:29:01 - 01:45:44:23

So I think that now moves us on to, uh, socioeconomics. And so if I turn to my colleague and I'm sure he'll when he's ready, he will begin. He's just concluding on some action points, I think.

01:46:05:10 - 01:46:06:01

Okay, so.

01:46:06:03 - 01:46:07:10

Can we start.

01:46:07:22 - 01:46:08:12

Um.

01:46:08:20 - 01:46:18:10

Just by having a bit of an explanation about the methodology for this, uh, determining the socio economic impacts, please.

01:46:19:19 - 01:46:46:23

Thank you so much. On behalf of the applicant. Yes. I'll be passing over to, um, Mr. David Tyre, who is a technical director at Logica, who is hearing virtually, uh, just appeared on the screen. Um, but just to confirm that the approach we've taken accords with paragraphs 5.13, point 2 to 5 point 13.7 of N1, and the overall approach is set out in chapter two, which Mr. Tyre will now go into. To answer your question.

01:46:49:03 - 01:46:51:15

Good afternoon everyone. Can you see and hear me? Okay.

01:46:53:04 - 01:46:54:00

Yes. Thank you.

01:46:54:12 - 01:47:26:21

And so I'll give you a run through of the overall approach. Um, first of all, we we, uh, summarized, um, socio economic conditions, uh, at different spatial scales. Um, first starting with what we call the local area, which is for lower level super output areas, which are the smallest areas for which socio economic data is available. Uh, there were four of those which we mapped onto the, um, the order limits that that area is, is about double or more the size of the order limits.

01:47:26:23 - 01:48:10:12

And that's important when you interpret some of the data. But but that's akin to the as close as we could get to the order limits. Uh, we also looked at, um, what we call the labour catchment area, which is where existing employees in the local area. Live, um, from census data. And then we looked at a lot of data on the three districts level. Um, that's Newark and Sherwood in West Lindsey, and compared that to regional and national data. Sorts of things we looked at were population characteristics, uh, age profiles reported health, uh, and particularly employment, um, labour market indicators, unemployment, claim account, unemployment.

01:48:11:02 - 01:48:42:18

Um, and we also looked at uh, existing uh, amenity and recreation and visitor attractions facilities in the, in the local area, um, things like um churches, campsites, holiday homes, etc.. Um, following that, the two principal effects we looked at were, um, as per your next questions, effects on employment. So that's the effects during construction operation and during decommissioning.

01:48:43:11 - 01:49:04:07

Um driven by this the scheme itself, um and also potential effects on existing employment within the order limits um primarily agricultural employment. And we did a survey of landowners to get a more accurate assessment of how those plots are being used currently and the employment, uh, sustained in them.

01:49:06:06 - 01:49:43:21

Um, and again, um, looking at the, the new jobs that construction and then uh, during operation, um, finally we looked at um, effects on tourism. So in a, in an economic context. So the visitor economy, for want of a better word, again in the local area and again, construction, operation, decommissioning. And we did this by looking at, again, existing facilities, um, i.e. campsites, holiday homes, Cross-referencing that with existing information on things like Airbnbs and, um.

01:49:43:23 - 01:50:17:17

Commercial B&B provision, um, comparing that with local employment data in relevant sectors, primarily accommodation and food services. Um, and also taking into account, uh, the proximity of the specific sites, holiday homes, etc., um, to the, uh, to the order limits and the nature of works that were proposed immediately adjacent or close to those sites, um, taking into account the um, amenity effects.

01:50:17:19 - 01:50:50:09

So noise, visual impact, traffic, um, and then also taking into account the potential for um, the additional employees to offset any harm, um, arising from the expenditure of those employees in the local area on things like food, fuel and potentially accommodation. Um, we also looked at

employment and and potential effects for the visitor economy as part of the wider cumulative assessment in chapter 18.

01:50:54:12 - 01:50:55:02

Okay.

01:50:55:04 - 01:50:57:06

Thank you. Um, I think.

01:51:00:01 - 01:51:06:17

I'm going to move on to tourist impact on tourism, unless anybody's got any comments on employment to come by.

01:51:08:12 - 01:51:41:05

Simon Betts, New York Consumer District Council. Um, just a brief comment. Uh, and recalling open floor hearing one when there was a member of the public which who is making a point about the extent to which the supply chain associated with agricultural activity had been considered within the assessment. I'm just wondering where there's an opportune moment to to look at that methodology in a little bit more detail. Um, I'm not a technical expert on this subject, but it did seem lighter.

01:51:41:14 - 01:51:57:19

Um, so sort of working down from displacement of that agricultural enterprise down into there was it was referenced to, um, transport providers, etc., as I recall. I just wonder whether it might be a, an opportunity potentially to talk about that.

01:51:58:14 - 01:52:00:24

Thank you. Yep. I'm happy for that to be answered.

01:52:02:13 - 01:52:03:18

Hand over to the applicant.

01:52:05:00 - 01:52:23:07

Thanks, David. For the applicant, I understand the point. I think it is included in the assessment. Um, in document app 046. Um, particularly if you bear with me a second, I'll just find the right table. Um.

01:52:30:06 - 01:53:07:07

In table, uh, Point 18 on page 39. So we we look at direct employment from the proposed development, which is 15 full time roles. We then assume a displacement. Um, and that's the result of our um, employment survey on existing occupants and tenants within the order limits. Um, and we assume and that in, uh, in aggregate is is a small number of permanent roles, but a larger number of temporary or seasonal roles.

01:53:07:15 - 01:53:39:10

So we convert that to full time equivalents. Um, and that's something like 7.75. We, we assume for the purposes of this assessment that they'll all be lost. I don't think that that actually is realistic, but but we it's an assumption for the, um, for the assessment, um, because we're aware that, some of the land

owners have have other plots and their scope potentially for activities to be consolidated on those plots.

01:53:39:20 - 01:54:10:08

Uh, particularly given the the support the scheme might have for diversification of income. I think it's also reasonable that some of these jobs might be reabsorbed into the labour market, um, in, in agriculture as well, but we don't assume any of that. But to answer your point, Mr. Betts, we we only apply the multiplier to the the delta, the net increase in employment. So we assume that that existing employment is lost as a worst case. We apply the multiplier to the delta.

01:54:10:10 - 01:54:28:23

So I think that that does respect the the the proper baseline. Um, with the other uh, caveats that, that these, these some of these jobs at least may be reabsorbed into other plots. And I hope that addresses the point.

01:54:31:00 - 01:55:07:12

I think the question is really not so much about the direct employment on the land, but the supply chain that's feeding into those agricultural businesses and how you've assessed the consequential effects of the land no longer being farmed. Um, and the reference that was being made was, as an example, the transport of produce to market the transport companies that currently employ those people. What's the consequential effects on those businesses and any businesses servicing those vehicles? Uh, and so on.

01:55:07:14 - 01:55:21:02

So it's the supply chain supporting the agricultural industry that is currently operating from the farmland that no longer would be in operational farming for the 60 year period.

01:55:24:05 - 01:56:08:12

Yeah. Sorry. David Tyrer for the for the applicant. I understand the point. I think you may want me to consider this in more detail, but the methodology only applies a multiplier effect to a net increase. So I think that the assessment does respect that risk, because we're only applying a multiplier to the 7.25 the addition. Um, again, I think the wider effects of of that, you would need to compare the kind of economic intensity of supply chains in agricultural versus supply chains in, in solar farms.

01:56:09:03 - 01:56:23:20

Um, so I think I've never seen that assessed in other approaches. And I think it's because we only apply a multiplier to what is a net increase. That that supply chain effect is actually taking into account.

01:56:27:03 - 01:57:05:18

I think it would be helpful if you can take it away and and consider it, and perhaps give us a written response so that we can understand as best we can, what the potential implications would be from the information you have on the supporting industries, and whether that would or could result in job losses. Uh, and then how that extrapolates across towards the future picture as to whether there would be an overall net gain in employment whilst the scheme is in operation.

01:57:05:20 - 01:57:20:12

We understand there will be a larger number of people during the construction period, but it's then, for the longer term, understanding the the balance of, uh, numbers of jobs lost versus gained relative to the baseline.

01:57:21:24 - 01:57:22:14

Yeah.

01:57:23:00 - 01:57:55:14

Thank you, David, for that. I'll certainly do that. But I think the assessment does actually do that. Um, and the the direct change is a net increase. So that's the primary thing. The multipliers are assumptions. But we we are assuming very conservatively that all employment is essentially lost. But the result of that if it occurs is a net increase on site. Uh, but I will I'll respond to that and then perhaps set out the uncertainties.

01:57:55:16 - 01:57:57:02

But I understand the point.

01:57:58:15 - 01:57:59:06

Thank you.

01:58:10:03 - 01:58:15:07

Moving on to tourism, the effects on tourism. Um.

01:58:20:21 - 01:58:23:21

I was just interested to know, um,

01:58:25:10 - 01:58:39:19

I think the impact I. I'm just trying to think about this question. Paragraph. Um, 17.6 .25 refers to a 2013 study,

01:58:41:10 - 01:58:45:24

um, of the impact of renewable energy farms on businesses to Cornwall.

01:58:48:00 - 01:58:48:15

Um,

01:58:50:07 - 01:58:57:18

just be interested to know a bit more about that study and how relatable those energy schemes in Cornwall are to the One Earth project.

01:59:01:10 - 01:59:17:14

Thank you. David Tyree, for the applicant. If acceptable, I'll take you through the approach to tourism to put that in context and then provide a bit more detail about the Cornwall study and what it enables us to infer and what it does, and if that would be useful.

01:59:20:10 - 01:59:21:07

Yes, please.

01:59:22:09 - 01:59:52:15

So firstly, I think with tourism, with the visitor economy, we recognise that this is to a degree subjective because it relates to individuals decisions and purchasing and nature of their visits. But we, we looked at um, existing accommodation and visitor attractions as I outlined, uh, near to the order limits. There are none inside it. It's all agricultural uses. Uh, we also looked at employment in potentially affected sectors locally.

01:59:52:17 - 02:00:31:19

So, um, accommodation and food services employ about 150 people in the local area. So that bigger site than the order limits. And that includes a number of villages outside the order limit. So it's quite substantially more than is likely to be employed in the order limits itself. Um, we looked at the, um, what works are proposed near to these attractions. Um, and we've got a quite a useful diagram in app 078, which highlights in blue that the various attractions or facilities, they're mostly um, uh, campsites and holiday parks.

02:00:32:07 - 02:01:15:23

Um, and you can cross-reference that with the illustrative master planning app 018, which gives an indication of. Of what what's proposed in the vicinity of those. Um, we also looked at, um, uh, the natural and proposed barriers and mitigation vegetation and green space, etc., that's going to be, um, part of the proposed development near those sites. We looked at, um, the the various assessments on amenity that we've been discussing for the last two days that that could drive those effects or what might materially affect someone's enjoyment of a visit or inclination to return.

02:01:16:00 - 02:01:48:13

Time and noise. Air quality, traffic, cultural heritage and not least landscape and visual impact and noted the various mitigation measures. Um, the site also is pretty big and those works are expected to move across the site. So very localized effects would be would be more temporary. Um, and then we we also recognize that there's a sizable increase in, in employees going physically being located on the site.

02:01:48:15 - 02:02:21:05

So between 554 and 750 employees on site. Um, which which I think on balance would, would mitigate any risk, um, that there would be expenditure from these, uh, employees, a proportion of which may be on accommodation, depending on, uh, from where the employees, uh, live and, and the ability of the labor market to accommodate the number. Um, and that would offset some, some adverse effects, we think.

02:02:22:09 - 02:03:02:00

Um, so the second point, um, was about the, uh, the evidence we looked at, uh, on from Cornwall. Um, and I, I accept that that's, that's not directly comparable. It's useful context we did look for. Um, a wider body of evidence to to, um, try and find some empirical data. There isn't a well, we could find

none. None from the UK. Anyway, the usefulness of the Cornwall study is that it's an empirical study of a thousand people, um, based at seven sites around Cornwall.

02:03:02:13 - 02:03:37:19

We can't necessarily infer that there's exactly the same intensity of solar farms, but we can infer the effect on sentiment, which I think is an important driver in visitor economy and visitor expenditure. And the, um, the study, um, looked at wind and solar but disaggregated the results between the two. And, and essentially I can provide some more data on this, but essentially found that, um, the majority weren't aware of it and didn't affect their decision to visit the, the area.

02:03:38:10 - 02:04:12:20

Um, a number of people had, uh, had negative views about the presence of solar and or wind. Uh, a larger number had positive views, but most of the people had no view. And then there was some supplementary questions on, um, the extent to which it might, uh, influence the visit. And, uh, there was a small net increase. So I think it was 6% to have a positive, 2% negative, and 94% said it didn't have any effect. And other factors like, like the weather and cost a greater factors.

02:04:12:24 - 02:04:32:03

I'll double check those specific data, but it was a net increase. Now we can't draw a direct line between that. But I think that that gives some empirical data that that there's a um, it's not it doesn't prevent a, um, a healthy tourism sector in the local area during operation.

02:04:35:15 - 02:04:57:04

Thank you. Um, just as a follow up on that, uh, what assessment is taking place, um, for the cumulative impact of the other end chips in the, in this locality on having the total impact on the tourism industry up here.

02:05:00:11 - 02:05:15:16

Thank you. David Tyree, for the applicant. Um, I think this this marries up with the previous question on cumulative effects. The the effects looked at the local area, i.e. the same geographical area as the assessment itself. Um,

02:05:17:07 - 02:05:50:18

so we did not look at the effect on, on tourism of, of insects. I would argue that adverse a potential adverse effect would be driven by, uh, landscape and visual impact. And I refer to my colleague's earlier statement on, on those, but I know that that's, um, been raised in by by colleagues. Um, I know in the relevant reps also that there was a discussion about the potential effect on, uh, sufficient supply of visitor accommodation for remaining tourists.

02:05:51:06 - 02:06:24:18

Um, and that wasn't something that we looked at. It wasn't something that we considered. Um, uh, I mean, because that that is a essentially a third order effect, which which depends on, Um. The cumulative demand for construction work one. Um. The likelihood of that labor coming from outside. What is a commutable distance to the likelihood of that labor, um, requiring accommodation? Three.

02:06:25:00 - 02:07:02:21

And the likelihood of that accommodation supply being so full that it essentially crowds out the, um, expenditure of other tourists. Um, if that would be something that you would like us to consider, we can, but we have not looked at that yet. Um, I have some information on existing labor supply that that I think gives some assurance that that's unlikely. Um, there is also some data on and some of the other applicants in the N6 you're talking about looked at the scope for construction workers to take up temporary private rented accommodation.

02:07:03:00 - 02:07:31:06

Um, in addition, And, um, I think a third possibility, hypothetically, is that they could take up demand in some of the local, um, holiday park, etc. accommodation. That's theoretical. But but then again, I think the potential exists for that to, to offset any effects. Um, so it wasn't assessed, but we can provide some more, uh, rationale on that if it would be useful.

02:07:33:05 - 02:07:55:03

Thank you. Yes, that would be useful. Um, if it could also make reference to something that we discussed earlier, which was that the staff, the construction staff travel plan, because that had a target, a modal shift target of 80%. So it would be interesting just to see how those two aspects tie up together.

02:08:00:02 - 02:08:03:07

That they'd be targeted. Absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. Thank you.

02:08:06:18 - 02:08:09:19

Any comments from in the room on tourism?

02:08:12:20 - 02:08:14:03

I know.

02:08:29:17 - 02:08:36:18

What benefits, um, if, if any, are available to residents affected by the proposed development?

02:08:44:14 - 02:09:15:05

Uh, so David Taylor for the applicant. Um, it's difficult to disaggregate the benefits to and the proportion of those that would directly or could directly be taken up by, by residents. But, um, uh, the employment during construction. Um 554. Full time jobs up to 750. Um, the data suggests there is some some capacity in the very local labor market.

02:09:15:07 - 02:09:52:03

Again, theoretically, for those jobs to be accommodated and the, um, the skills supply chain and employment plan, or the outline version, which is app 180, contains a number of actions to try and support that, um, outreach, advertising, etc.. Um, the, the um the second benefit I think is and for scale that that that employment increase at the very local area is quite significant. So uh, it would it would constitute an increase of about 140% in, in employment in that very local area.

02:09:52:18 - 02:10:23:01

Um, the jobs may be filled from, from a wider area, of course, but some will be filled locally. And again, I think there is opportunity to for that quantum of construction work to have wider spin off benefits from their expenditure on accommodation and on, you know, fuel subsidies, subsistence, um, etc. the indirect employment is probably along a wider area.

02:10:23:10 - 02:11:08:23

And because it's driven by the expenditure patterns of the employees and the supply chain of purchases for the for the project itself, um, operational employment within the order limits, um, the data we've got and we've spent a good amount of time trying to get a good handle on that baseline, suggests that there will be a net increase in, um, employment in, in absolute numbers of FTEs, um, from a majority of, um, part time and seasonal agricultural roles to full time roles at the operational stage of the development and the very local benefits.

02:11:09:04 - 02:11:52:00

There are various ecological enhancements that colleagues have mentioned today. Uh nine kilometers of species rich native hedgerow, six kilometres. Uh approximately 1240 hectares of species, rich grasslands, wildflower meadows, um and um 44.2 hectares of woodland and native tree belts. Also, the permissive path network, um, that my colleague mentioned earlier on, um, about two, 2.5km, uh, that leads south of the A57 to the Sustrans route at Ledbury Viaduct and then a further 3.6km on the west side of the River Trent.

02:11:55:16 - 02:11:56:07

Thank you.

02:11:57:07 - 02:12:47:14

Sir. Which proves I'm part of the applicant. And just to, um, a couple of points for me. Uh, obviously, the central benefit of the scheme, which, um, uh, is residents, but also the wider country is the contribution that it makes to the GHG emission reduction. And we shouldn't under estimate that. And, uh, the relevant chapter in the ES app hyphen zero 43, it concludes that as being a beneficial significance impact and just on the outline skills supply chain employment management plan that secured under requirement 17, um, that has a clear purpose to promote the delivery of economic benefits to people and businesses in the local area and the wider region, uh, particularly access to employment, upskilling and reskilling opportunities for people and enhancing business growth.

02:12:49:11 - 02:12:50:16

Thank you. That's helpful.

02:12:52:10 - 02:12:53:04

Mr. Betts.

02:12:54:23 - 02:13:32:02

Simon Betts, Newark and Sherwood District Council. Um, a a point about the outline, skills, supply chain, employment, whatever it is, it's a very long title that that plan, um, we'll just call it the outline plan, shall we? Um, I think we've, we as an authority, we've had very limited and early discussions on this. Um, except the plan is designed to form a mechanism, but as an authority, we're looking at

impacts and we're looking at benefits. So to start to understand how those benefits will be crystallised during the examination period will be helpful.

02:13:32:16 - 02:14:20:11

Um, within that document, I think it's table 4.1 refers to some key milestones and actions. So hopefully I'm pushing against an open door on this. But it does describe continuing to engage with local authorities, um a working group to be formed. So I think there's a, there's a parallel activity to be undertaken over over the coming period. Whilst noting there's lots of deadlines and things to be done during this period. So I suppose, um, with my authority hat on, it's just to sort of welcome, welcome those further discussions and, um, that we'd certainly like to take an active participation in that and see if we can just bring some of those elements a little bit further forward and a little bit more quickly, if possible.

02:14:20:13 - 02:14:21:03

Thank you.

02:14:25:11 - 02:14:26:17

Yeah, thank you for that.

02:14:53:19 - 02:15:26:20

I think, um, we're just going to 4:30, so it might be sensible just to have a ten minute break so everyone can, uh, refresh themselves accordingly. So if we can just come back at 22, I think also I'm considering that, um, it's probably as well for us to look at dealing with the human health aspects and we'll do that in writing. Um, so hopefully that will, uh, ease things uh, shortly.

02:15:26:22 - 02:15:31:20

But if we can just take a break now and then we'll come back at 22. Thank you.