

Hearing Transcript

Project:	One Earth Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 6
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: 00:53:39

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:19:06 - 00:00:22:08

Now 25. If we can resume, please.

00:00:35:06 - 00:00:42:13

Thank you. Um, I think there's just one final closing point on the socioeconomic section. It's really just for us to,

00:00:44:06 - 00:01:20:11

uh, I think try and make clear that what would be helpful is if you can provide a table that lists the current jobs that are operating from the site, and then your assessment of the supporting jobs that are supporting those businesses. And then a direct comparison with the proposed scheme so that we can see clearly the one versus the other. I think that would help assist us, uh, quite a lot in, in understanding how you've got to or, you know, where you've got to in terms of the figures.

00:01:21:15 - 00:01:55:21

Would you agree with that? I think that's fine. I will just look at the screens to check that, uh, the person would be doing that is happy. Yes. Got a thumbs up. So, um, before I commit someone doing something. So that is fine. And just one final point. Social. Economic for me is, um, I appreciate this isn't a planning balance point, but, um, just there is a community benefit fund being proposed by the applicant. I appreciate that's not a, uh, you can't take that into account in your planning balance, but just so public aware, there is discussions ongoing about a community benefit fund.

00:01:57:23 - 00:01:58:16

Okay.

00:02:02:10 - 00:02:36:07

I'll reserve a written question on that, I think. Uh, I had it in mind anyway, because, um, but it's helpful to know that that that's that's there. Um, I said before the break that we would consider, uh, doing the human health aspects in writing, but I'm advised that, uh, the applicant does have their team representative here. So I think bearing in mind you've been sat here a long time. It would be quite miserable of us not to utilize that. So, um, when you're ready, we'll we'll commence with a few questions.

00:02:36:09 - 00:02:36:24

Thank you.

00:02:37:13 - 00:02:51:18

Thanks. I do appreciate that, given. I appreciate open floor hearings. People have mentioned human health, so we thought I was, um, we have, um, it's Katy Field here. It would be useful to cover it off.

00:02:54:09 - 00:03:04:13

Thank you. So if you could start by, um, just explaining your methodology of assessing the likely effects on mental health in particular. Thank you.

00:03:05:14 - 00:03:37:08

Thank you. Could you feel for the applicant? So all development has the potential for adverse effects for some particular individuals. In accordance with eye EMA guidance, the assessment took a population health approach for each determinant of health. The likely significant effects, and those are both adverse and beneficial, were considered on the populations that occur within the study areas where effects may be only relevant to a few individuals. A population effect health effect would not occur.

00:03:38:11 - 00:03:55:05

The role of EMA and significance conclusions is not to set a threshold of not no harm from development, but to show where, at a population level, the harm would weigh strongly in the balance, alongside the development of benefits for health and other the outcomes.

00:03:56:18 - 00:04:29:11

The significance of an effect is an evidence based professional judgment, informed by the sensitivity of a human health receptor at magnitude of impact specific magnitude. This again reflects human guidance. Sensitivity of human health receptors includes general populations and potentially vulnerable subpopulations. The assessment covered both groups. The assessment took into account the qualitative rather than quantitative, sensitivity of relevant populations and subpopulations, and their ability to respond to change.

00:04:30:09 - 00:05:01:12

The magnitude of impact considered the scale of the exposure of the population to an impact. Whether the impact was a one off or continuous. The likely nature of the human health impact, the permanence of the change, and the proportion of the relevant study area population that would be affected. The wider determinants of health considered by the assessment were. Physical health. Community, identity, culture, resilience and influence, employment and income for vulnerable groups.

00:05:01:16 - 00:05:11:13

Climate change mitigation and adaptation. Emff wider societal infrastructure and resource. And finally, health and social care services during the construction phase.

00:05:14:24 - 00:05:34:13

Thank you. So you mentioned, um, impacts at a population level. Has um, any assessment been undertaken on impacts on residents of individual properties or small business clusters that, um, that are, that are affected by the development?

00:05:36:24 - 00:06:09:12

And Katy, Phil for the applicant. So in terms of individuals, um, we're aware that during and sort of pre-construction, there's likely to be worry and anxiety associated with sort of a loss of control over living environment particularly relevant to individuals, and this can often be exacerbated by the sort of consultation activities. Public engagement process itself. There could be worry about how the

proposed development to be introduced in the area, and how that could affect the physical landscape of communities.

00:06:10:01 - 00:06:22:15

So we explored the kind of impacts on mental health through the assessment of impacts and community identity, culture, resilience and influence. So I can continue if that be helpful.

00:06:25:04 - 00:06:34:03

Please do so. But can I just understand in terms of the study area that you've selected, how how far is that gone?

00:06:36:11 - 00:06:55:06

Thank you Katie Phil for that. So the study area mirrors the same study area used by the UN socio economic chapter. So there's the continuity between the two in terms of populations. There's a local impact area which is for lower areas and then a wider sort of geographical area.

00:06:56:22 - 00:07:12:06

So was there something in terms of the very local community that are living in or nearby to the proposed development, or is it just been following those travel times in line with the socio economic assessment?

00:07:14:01 - 00:07:32:18

So in terms of that, we had a look at the data that's available for mental health. Unfortunately, there's not a substantial amount of data on local health at a local population level. So we did it in terms of the LSO level, which is around sort of 3000 households per LSO.

00:07:36:19 - 00:07:52:19

So if that's the level at which you've got information, we're not going to have information to assess a far more localised Area and the area specific to the proposed development, I'm assuming.

00:07:55:00 - 00:08:07:07

So this was done in line with Iowa guidance, which does take that population level into account. So rather than on a case by case basis, it's done at a population level.

00:08:11:01 - 00:08:11:20

Mr. bass

00:08:13:16 - 00:08:15:19

Simon district council.

00:08:15:22 - 00:09:04:00

Um, sir, I'm probably straying out of my area expertise again, but nonetheless, um, a practical suggestion in in other assessment topics, there is more primary data that is collected. We've already heard one example today in terms of agricultural workers. Um, to draw another analogy, if, uh, different contexts, but a housing needs survey. So there's a means to which you can collect, excuse me data anonymously and then utilize that more primary data. And I wonder whether there's an ability to

collect that data and to give a better picture of, uh, mental health, um, in the local community, because this is something that we've had a lot of direct communications on, as well as relevant representations being made.

00:09:04:04 - 00:09:05:15

So just a suggestion.

00:09:06:01 - 00:09:08:03

So would you give us on path the applicant

00:09:09:17 - 00:09:47:22

on the applicant. I think the comparison there of data collected for other topics versus mental health is extremely different. Um, we can't just do surveys of people's private, uh, health impacts. Uh, and that's something you can't do. Um, hence, Miss Katy. I'll bring her in a minute. Will confirm that the assessment that's been done, uh, accords with, um, uh, relevant guidance. I'll stop there because I'm straying into your field. But please, um, carry on that point, because that's the important point here is how has this assessment been done? Has it been done in accordance with the relevant guidance.

00:09:54:02 - 00:10:19:21

Thank you, Katy Fields, on behalf of the applicant. So the data that we did use was the Office of Health Inequalities and Disparities, Public Mental Health Dashboard and Data, which was the best and most robust data set that we could find at that stage. I understand that we may have been in some earlier negotiations and conversations on obtaining mental health data from local authorities. I don't believe that that ever got anywhere.

00:10:26:01 - 00:10:26:19

Thank you.

00:10:36:06 - 00:10:49:00

I've noted in table 16.11 within chapter 11 doesn't mental health doesn't feature in that particular table. Is there a reason for that?

00:10:56:04 - 00:11:23:21

And I will locate the table. But my understanding is that mental health isn't one of the prescribed wider determinants of health, as in the EMA guidance. So therefore it was not considered as an actual receptor itself in in terms of how we explored impacts of mental health. That was through the um, I'll get the correct title for unite. It was community. I am today culture, resilience and influence.

00:11:30:03 - 00:11:31:05

Thank you. That's helpful.

00:11:45:16 - 00:12:28:00

I think I've only got one final question. I understand that your, uh, you've undertaken this following, uh, sort of best practice in terms of following the aim of guidance. But you'll be aware that there's been a significant number of relevant representations identifying concerns about effects on health and particularly mental health, both in terms of the, uh, proposed development, the anxiety over the

proposed environment, and then subsequently, the possible consequential effects on people's, um, value of their homes.

00:12:28:10 - 00:12:31:18

Um, and the concerns about that. So I, um.

00:12:33:20 - 00:12:44:22

I would just ask that when you do your response to the relevant representations that we can understand how best, uh.

00:12:48:11 - 00:12:59:01

That's to be dealt with, if you like. So, um, because I don't think we should underplay it, but equally, we need to make sure that we're not, uh.

00:13:01:15 - 00:13:06:18

Falling into a trap of, um, not following best practice.

00:13:09:15 - 00:13:44:13

Path. I mean, first of all, we're not underplaying it. I mean, this is it is a topic that, um, uh, uh, you know, we take very seriously. And, um, my point was that the approach that the consultant team have done follows, um, the right guidance. And I would say that the project includes quite a significant amount of embedded mitigation, which will contribute to mitigating adverse mental health that may be caused by a project like this.

00:13:45:02 - 00:14:16:11

It's obviously not unique to a to this project. It's, um, mental health could be, um, adverse impacts on mental health can arise on any project. Uh, indeed, no matter what size. Um, and the idea guidance does recognize that, um, as part of a primary mitigation measure is meaningful engagement. Uh, both before and of course, continuation. That is why we have, uh, in the application and secured in the application.

00:14:17:01 - 00:14:59:00

Um, uh, community liaison officer that will carry on should this scheme get consent. So there was a point of contact for people to raise complaints or ask questions often for that person to notify the community of when things may happen. And that is why you've got, um, the control documents, such as the Kemp camp that controls construction activity, that that document secures the community. And also, I might add, the CNP to control traffic, um, the public rights of way management plan that secures what the diversions and the time period for those rights of way, the new permissive paths, um, to create the new, um, new walking areas.

00:14:59:04 - 00:15:12:03

All of those collectively together provide, uh, mitigation. Um, as far as a scheme like this can, uh, on, um, on mental health and that needs to be looked at in the round.

00:15:19:15 - 00:15:30:03

So can I just check there's anyone else in the room or virtually we wish to say anything further on this. Got a hand up at the back. So just wait for the microphone to be brought to you.

00:15:34:01 - 00:15:38:10

President of North Clifton. Just like to bring to attention.

00:15:38:13 - 00:15:40:24

Just pause for a moment. I can't hear you at the front.

00:15:41:21 - 00:15:42:19

At the fox.

00:15:43:08 - 00:15:43:23

Thank you.

00:15:44:00 - 00:16:16:09

I'll shout this then. Then. Sorry, it sounds like I'm shouting at you. Heather Fox, resident of North Clifton. Um, can I just ask to remind the applicants that on the very last sit down meeting with them, we had a local GP who had done an assessment on health, mental, especially as she had a, uh, special interest in that so that they are aware of the depth of feeling, even though they didn't come round to individual houses to ask.

00:16:16:14 - 00:16:39:07

And I don't suppose any of the consultation meetings did they say to individuals, how do you feel about the whole project? What can we do? They are aware of the strength of feeling because at the last sat down meeting in the Coronation Hall, it was put and subsequently put in writing, so they are in receipt of it. Thank you.

00:16:41:09 - 00:16:42:02

Thank you.

00:16:45:23 - 00:16:51:07

Would you give us some part of that? Because we are responding to the relevant reps and that will be submitted at deadline one.

00:16:51:17 - 00:16:52:21

Okay. Thank you.

00:16:59:06 - 00:17:03:10

Okay. Um, we'll move on then I think, um.

00:17:05:20 - 00:17:40:17

We've just got cumulative effects and we've touched on this already, uh, earlier on this afternoon. Um, particularly on the traffic, uh, and the, uh, landscape elements. Um, but also, I think we've also had confirmation with regard to working with other developers on, uh, their schemes and preparing a

document to, to deal with that. So really, it's just a more broad understanding of the approach that's been taken on cumulative effects.

00:17:41:08 - 00:18:16:06

Um, and I suppose the one particular point, um, I think it was Bassetlaw District Council in their relevant representation, have referenced that the a number of the application references referred to, I think they've said weren't correct. So that would be worth just revisiting, uh, as part of your submissions at deadline one. But if I can just understand the more the broader approach that you've taken on cumulative assessment.

00:18:16:08 - 00:18:16:23

Thank you.

00:18:17:09 - 00:18:23:07

Thank you sir. I'm going to introduce Mr. Guido Pizarro, technical director at Logica. Thank you.

00:18:24:18 - 00:18:56:09

Thank you. Uh, Guido Pelissero for the applicant. Um, as you mentioned, we are aware of some of the comments that you've made, and we will be kind of taking that away and providing those written responses in terms of the general approach. Um, the Inter project effects assessment, which is what we are referring to, is described in chapter 18. Uh, cumulative effects of the ES. And that's our app 047. We have followed Pins advice on the cumulative effects assessment.

00:18:57:02 - 00:19:13:07

And that involves a four stage process. So establishing the long list of other existing and approved developments a listing, a short list of existing and other approved developments, information gathering and then doing the assessment itself.

00:19:15:19 - 00:19:33:20

The long list of developments was established using the following criteria, which was having planning permission or development consent but not yet built. Having a planning application or DCC application submitted, but a decision not yet made. And our major projects are likely to do. Existing policy.

00:19:35:09 - 00:19:53:00

We looked at a ten kilometres zone of the proposed development, and that is broad enough area to capture potential significant cumulative effects from other projects. And that's kind of been used on other consented solar developments. It's pretty standard for the EIA kind of approach undertaken.

00:19:54:16 - 00:20:07:06

The long list of other developments was agreed with all the councils, and we kind of got that agreement by the 14th of January of this year. And that's just to allow us to have the time to undertake that assessment once we kind of got that approval from the councils.

00:20:09:03 - 00:20:21:00

The long list of developments is detailed in the appendix, which is app 146. And then those locations, the schemes are visualized in the figures in app series seven nine.

00:20:24:04 - 00:20:55:05

As detailed in paragraph 18.3 .21 of the s chapter 18. 19. We actually took a bit of a conservative approach during the consultations that we had with the local authorities. There was concern, as we've kind of heard as well, about the number of CEOs coming forward in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. And so we actually extended our cumulative assessments to consider any Bess or solar farm schemes within Nottinghamshire or Lincolnshire beyond that initial 10 a.m.

00:20:55:09 - 00:21:00:23

spatial zones. And that's primarily to assess that impact upon BMV and also Elvia.

00:21:02:24 - 00:21:27:14

Um, the certainty of other developments was considered using tiers as defined within pin's advice and the potential zones of influence of the proposed developments. Construction, operation and decommissioning was considered by each environmental aspect, so they identified the zones of influence where there could be a likely impact. And those details came as to to get us to the shortlist, which is detailed in app one for six.

00:21:29:10 - 00:21:40:21

The next stage was to undertake a detailed assessment based on the overlap in temporal and scale and nature of developments likely to have a significant effect, and those cumulative schemes are detailed in the chapter.

00:21:42:20 - 00:22:13:10

Referring to some of the conversations we had last night as well, just to be aware that at paragraph 18.5 .18 of chapter 18, um, we do consider the, um, high Maanum substation expansion. We looked at data in the public domain, knowing that there is the potential for Tcpa to come forward. Um, there is a reference to where that information has come from. And then we've looked at the cumulative effects of that scheme with us.

00:22:25:23 - 00:22:40:12

So in terms of the broader, uh, solar schemes that you've included, is that just in SIPs or is that in SIPs and, uh, schemes that are coming forward through the, uh, Town and Country Planning Act?

00:22:47:24 - 00:23:03:11

I'll just have to check. Um, I know for the best, we looked at, um, Tcpa town and country planning applications as well. Um, off the top of my head, I'm not too sure about this solar. Um. It's something.

00:23:28:15 - 00:23:35:12

Yeah. Sorry. So we did look at the town planning solar farms, because that was also something that the local authorities asked us to look to at that time.

00:23:37:04 - 00:23:41:03

Okay. Thank you. So the the broad assessment then is.

00:23:43:23 - 00:23:51:21

Actually covered the whole of Nottinghamshire in Lincolnshire and then obviously it's focused down. Thank you. Yeah. Okay.

00:24:00:03 - 00:24:21:01

Then in sort of taking that forward in terms of identifying those effects, um, you're obviously doing ongoing work in talking to other projects and how you might plan to manage and mitigate, uh, over time, those projects. Um,

00:24:22:21 - 00:24:37:20

is that something we can just we need to sort of park until we see that, uh, further down the road. Or are you able to give us any form of understanding at the moment as to, uh, how that might work or what progress you've, you've made with it?

00:24:39:24 - 00:24:46:01

So I think that's something that will come back with, um, there will come part of the joint report and interrelationships to be submitted.

00:24:47:10 - 00:24:54:20

Okay. Thank you. Um, I'll then come to the local authorities, Lancashire County Council.

00:24:55:20 - 00:25:37:15

So thank you, Stephanie, for Lancashire County Council. Um, just obviously the point that I made earlier, just to flesh that out a little bit about the, um, potential relationship between the, um, appendix 18.2 and other parts of the environmental statement and these chapters, the way that we read 18.2, for example, in its treatment of Gate Burst and Energy Park, just to pick an example, is that, um, it essentially He is involved in the assessment at tier one. And then what the assessor does is ask themselves a question at stage one is whether whether that project is within the zone of influence, and if it is, then you for various different effects.

00:25:37:17 - 00:26:12:15

Then it progresses to stage two. And then there's another question about whether that has a significant effect. And then if there is, it progresses to stages three and four. There are obviously a number of points at which schemes could fall out of the assessment and where those lines are drawn and why it is important, and it is not something that we necessarily agree with. So there's a series of different zones of influence for, for different effects that are drawn. So for example, although Gate Burton Energy Park is in there at stage one, it is dropped out after stage two.

00:26:13:08 - 00:26:45:10

Um, and it only progresses to stage two for biodiversity because of the way in which the zones of influence for different types of effect are drawn and how tight those circles are. So, um, it's within the ten kilometer zone, which gets it into stage one. But that doesn't mean that the assessment is considered in detail whether there is whether there is significant, um, other cumulative effects in terms of landscape construction, traffic to, you know, et cetera, etc..

00:26:45:19 - 00:27:17:16

Um, because of the way in which the zones of influence have been drawn, it's been dropped out of the assessment for, for those reasons so that, uh, we are finding it quite difficult, I think, to interrogate, um, the methodology in terms of why those essentially concentric circles of zones of influence have been set as they are, and whether those circles have been too tightly drawn. And if they have been, the effect is that there are potentially cumulative effects that are not then assessed and taken into the later stages of the assessment.

00:27:17:21 - 00:27:53:17

So for example, with in relation to gate person. It's only biodiversity that gets to stage two and we say, well, there may well be a cumulative assessment missed, particularly in relation to construction traffic because um, as I mentioned earlier, one of the entries in the table is that it says in the table in 18 put in appendix 18.2. When the assessor is asking themselves the question, is there an overlap in temporal scape? It says unknown, but that's not right. So there are a number of kind of problems we with with Bayesian methodology and the application of it in the table.

00:27:54:03 - 00:28:27:10

Um, so there's quite a bit of additional detail that we don't we're asking for in terms of assisting the reader in understanding the rationale for the methodology, and whether that methodology has then been correctly applied for each site. A pit gate, Burton as an example, but that that is copy and pasted across all of the of the other. um, inset projects in this part of of Lincolnshire. Um, but for different reasons. I said we'll set out all of our, um, points in writing.

00:28:27:12 - 00:28:58:00

But it's not it's not just a sort of labelling point. There's a real substance behind it. Because if if any of that is wrong, then there's a potential effect that just hasn't been assessed. Um, so that's that's my point on on tables. Um, so I'm not going to, to spend um, time on this at the examination, but we've got, um, points that will come out of our LA in relation to a cumulative effect on waste. Um, so that's just a headline that I appreciate.

00:28:58:02 - 00:29:36:11

Those sitting around the table probably can't address the substance of. But obviously Lincolnshire has a number of these projects, um, all of which will have a failure rate for panels during the lifetime, even if everything progresses nicely and if things don't progress nicely. And there are, ah. Um, you know, events such as storms that result in redundancies of panels that weren't anticipated. There'll be waste generated through the lifetime of the project. And then, because all of the construction periods are at a similar time frame, one can expect the decommissioning to equally be at a similar time frame at 60 years down the line.

00:29:36:13 - 00:30:06:17

So there's quite a significant effect for Lincolnshire in terms of managing its waste, uh, capacity and its local plan provision for allocating sites for those facilities, um, to be done in a, in a coordinated way. And we don't have uh assessments from the applicant in terms of the quantity. What we do have is, is a sort of bald commitment to, to recycling. But we we need to make provision for those recycling facilities and allocate them in a plan somewhere.

00:30:06:20 - 00:30:37:24

We need to know the quantity we're dealing with in order to, to make that provision. And these recycling facilities don't come out of nowhere that they need to be allocated. Um, we would just welcome the interrelationship report commitment that was on my ask list. So thank you for that. Um, and my final point so well, I'm talking is, is mineral safeguarding and then I'll, I'll shut up. Um, that that is um, we don't find that as a constraint, I think applied by the applicant.

00:30:38:01 - 00:31:14:08

We've got a minerals um, report, um, which quotes that we have a ten year land bank, which we don't. Um, but that's app 175. So they've looked at minerals, but they haven't treated safeguarding as a constraint or looked at that either in site selection or in terms of cumulative effects on or on safeguarded sites. And obviously, minerals planning over a seven year land bank horizon is is helpful to an extent, but in the context of a 60 year project, you know, sterilisation of minerals, um, for a 60 year time frame.

00:31:14:15 - 00:31:20:14

We just just needs to be taken into account both on a soulless effect and a cumulative one. Thank you.

00:31:23:17 - 00:31:27:18

Thank you. Do it. Yes. Yes, Lindsey.

00:31:29:01 - 00:31:29:20

Yes. Thank you sir.

00:31:29:22 - 00:31:34:23

Russell Clarkson from Westlands District Council. Yes. Cumulative impact is certainly.

00:31:35:00 - 00:31:37:09

Something at West Lindsey. We are concerned.

00:31:37:11 - 00:31:38:19

With, sir, and we will be.

00:31:38:21 - 00:31:39:11

Setting.

00:31:39:13 - 00:31:40:17

Out that local impact, those those.

00:31:40:19 - 00:31:41:10

Impacts that.

00:31:41:12 - 00:31:43:07

That that we are identifying.

00:31:44:00 - 00:31:44:23

Um, I think.

00:31:45:00 - 00:31:48:05

From my point of view, it's more of a request, really. And as we're going through.

00:31:48:07 - 00:31:49:24

This information and put it together, it's.

00:31:50:10 - 00:31:55:00

You know, recognised there is a distinct cumulative impact report. And when.

00:31:55:02 - 00:31:55:24

Looking at figures.

00:31:56:01 - 00:32:07:14

18.1 to 18.9, which does identify a number of projects, which includes nationally significant solar projects as well as others. Uh, and it's really a request in terms of the visual.

00:32:07:16 - 00:32:08:12

Representation.

00:32:08:14 - 00:32:11:03

Of that. We have little yellow numbered figures.

00:32:11:05 - 00:32:12:00

Across all.

00:32:12:02 - 00:32:16:16

Over Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. These solar projects, in terms of the order.

00:32:16:18 - 00:32:17:08

Limits.

00:32:17:10 - 00:32:18:00

Of them, this.

00:32:18:02 - 00:32:20:04

Is the fifth one we now have within our.

00:32:20:06 - 00:32:37:10

District, much further beyond going into Nottinghamshire and and other aspects of Lincolnshire. The smallest of those gate, Burton, is 824 hectares in terms of its order limits. Cottam 1451. And it's 13km across.

00:32:37:12 - 00:32:38:02

It's a series.

00:32:38:04 - 00:32:40:07

Of sites I think.

00:32:40:09 - 00:32:42:04

Would be helpful to the examination.

00:32:42:06 - 00:33:13:06

To yourselves in terms of and to all those looking at if we can have representation which demonstrates this site in the context of order limits from all the others, because at the minute we simply have little numbers, which I feel under represents that. And I think this is relevant in terms of recognising overlaying that in terms of things such as landscape, character. I think in terms of as it is currently over BMV drawings, and I think it would therefore really assist the the examination.

00:33:13:08 - 00:33:24:18

So if the if the applicant was able to provide something of that nature really, which shows all of them in respect of their order limits and not simply a number, um, some of its requests anyway, thank you sir.

00:33:25:10 - 00:33:42:17

Are you looking for an Ordnance Survey base in effect, which shows the relative, um, solar farms, uh, either as permitted or in the pipeline for Nottingham and Lincolnshire, for the for the whole of both counties.

00:33:44:17 - 00:33:46:13

I, I think in terms of.

00:33:46:15 - 00:33:47:05

That.

00:33:47:07 - 00:33:47:22

I.

00:33:47:24 - 00:33:48:14

Think.

00:33:48:16 - 00:33:50:04

It would certainly help in terms of the, the three.

00:33:50:06 - 00:33:51:03

Districts.

00:33:51:06 - 00:33:52:11

Uh, I'm a county.

00:33:52:13 - 00:33:53:04

Councillor.

00:33:53:06 - 00:34:31:17

Uh, county council friends may, may, you know, find that helpful. But I think it would help, sir, to, to have that context because at the moment we haven't got anything which visually shows the impact of how this relates to those. I would certainly ask for within our district. I think it would certainly help to have great North Road projects in there and steeple. It may be helpful to go beyond that, sir, so I think that'd be useful. And again, showing those older limits, I think an OS based mount would be helpful. I think it would be helpful to have an overlay of, uh, BMV land, which is something the applicant has provided in terms of the numbers, um, potentially with other baselines as well, such as flood risk.

00:34:31:19 - 00:34:39:15

It would be helpful to have that sort of comparators, how they sit in that geographic landscape compared to, compared to this particular site. So thank.

00:34:39:17 - 00:34:40:07

You.

00:34:41:05 - 00:34:42:06

Okay. Mr..

00:34:44:21 - 00:35:19:21

Simon bets new district council. Um, Sarah I'll keep it brief. Um, because my colleagues have already, um, made a lot of points that I agree with. But just to echo that cumulative impact is a concern. Uh, significant concerns. And you can share with district council as well. Uh, we have five major projects, four of which are in CIPs at the moment. One Electricity acts. Um, just in our district alone. So I think the fact that the level of engagement, um, earlier in the process, we haven't had the opportunity to interrogate and understand the methodology.

00:35:19:23 - 00:35:42:23

I think that has already been made. But I think that's where we need to try and get to, and that will be helpful. I also concur in terms of the visualization of these are the schemes and how they're representing. I think that's very useful for the public to understand as well. So, um, yes, we'll be also making more detailed comments on this issue in terms of local impact reports as well. Thanks.

00:35:45:03 - 00:35:52:09

Thank you. Um, is that something that the applicant is going to be able to provide for us.

00:35:53:10 - 00:36:21:06

With the applicant? Yes, I think I understand the plan. Um, probably as included in the interrelationships report for some other schemes, um, in, in this district. So, yes, we're aware of that. And I think that's where we'll sit in the relationships report. So we can do that. I think Miss Hall mentioned her comments will be in writing, which, um, in more detail, which we can definitely

respond to. I think there was 1 or 2 points on the cumulative as Mr. Pelissero was just address. Um, yeah. Thank you.

00:36:24:18 - 00:36:58:11

I read up that. Sorry for the applicant. Just wanted to kind of clarify that you mentioned about the zone of influence and kind of how that has been established. We do detail those zones of influence. And table 8.2 of chapter 18. It's very clearly set out about what that spatial zone influence is and that rationale. So it's for each of the environmental aspects and has details about where it's come from in terms of guidance or approach. So we do have that information in terms of other points.

00:36:58:19 - 00:37:24:10

I you know, I am aware about the number of DCS, and that's why we did extend that search for Nottinghamshire. Lincolnshire. I'm not too sure other SEOs have done that recently. We felt it was very important and did do that and we we will respond in writing. I'm aware that looking at their their appendix, we can provide more detail on those how we kind of got to that shortlist.

00:37:27:18 - 00:37:29:09

Thank you. I think that'll be helpful.

00:38:17:19 - 00:38:29:08

Okay. Well, I think, um, that's our last question on cumulative effects. So I just and make sure that no one else in the room has anything further on that particular topic.

00:38:32:13 - 00:38:50:21

Very good. So that then leads us to really whether there is any matter sort of any other business to to cover this afternoon. So again, I would just look around the room to see if there is anybody who has anything that they would wish to raise whilst we're all together.

00:38:53:20 - 00:39:05:07

Oh, well, um, on that basis then, it looks that I can close this hearing. Thank everyone for their attendance and their contributions. Sorry, I'm getting it.

00:39:05:21 - 00:39:11:22

Which goes on. Um, would it be useful for me to run through the action? That's before you close, sir.

00:39:11:24 - 00:39:13:24

No. That's helpful. Reminder. Thank you.

00:39:30:23 - 00:39:36:09

We're just having a technical issue at the moment, so hopefully it'll sort itself out. Give me a moment.

00:40:55:14 - 00:40:59:21

Right. Hopefully, um, The technology will play.

00:41:01:10 - 00:41:36:09

Um, so from today then, uh, and effectively, this starts at number 24, following on from, uh, yesterday's applicant to provide clarity in respect of requirement 20 or the um, outline demolition uh management plan to account for scenario of the scheme stopping generating power before the 60 years and potentially needing to be decommissioned early 25. Review whether the time period in requirement 20 should be longer than ten weeks.

00:41:40:08 - 00:42:06:15

Uh 26. Provide evidence on risk to the environment that may be potentially caused by leaving cables in the ground as part of the decommissioning, um, including potential impacts on water, environment, drinking water, protected areas and soil. And that's obviously I think we have a duplication here. So, um, would be covered to an extent in the response to Mr. White's relevant presentation.

00:42:09:21 - 00:42:40:23

To provide a response in respect of a potential inverter fire. I think that was also something that we were looking to seek. Um, and also obviously include within the, uh, response in respect of, uh, concerns about the water protection area. And that's something that we also asked the Environment Agency to respond to in setting out, uh, their response to Mr.

00:42:41:00 - 00:42:45:16

White's relevant representation and the issues he's raised at the hearings.

00:42:51:20 - 00:43:01:17

And the figure that was referenced within paragraph 3.5 of ASU 51, in the discussions with the Environment Agency, if that can be provided.

00:43:03:23 - 00:43:10:22

Um, and then obviously to provide a response in respect of flood storage and any knock on effects.

00:43:19:06 - 00:43:34:20

The, uh, point that Mrs. Fox raised about the, uh, suitability of the design of the structures supporting the panels in the event of a flood event or a breach event to show their robustness in those scenarios.

00:43:36:18 - 00:44:09:24

And then a further response to consider the effect, make sure that the flood risk assessment has covered the implication of the Environment Agency gates, um, there closure during flood events and and how that um is It's clarified for us. And then there was a follow up point, I think, that Mr. White raised, um, with regard to any effect of of heave. So if we can just have a comment on that, it would be helpful.

00:44:13:01 - 00:44:23:12

Um, provide an illustrative plan of the Western bears, uh, to show relative ground levels, proposed ground levels to aid in understanding of the water and landscape effects.

00:44:28:21 - 00:44:46:20

As I said, for the Environment Agency to advise us on the Water Framework Directive and then the, uh, screening, uh, in including, uh, response to, uh, the issues that were raised in the relevant representation from, uh, Mr. White.

00:44:49:20 - 00:44:56:17

Applicant to provide clarification on the date when the screening for the Water Framework Directive was submitted.

00:45:02:16 - 00:45:14:08

I think we're expecting an updated, uh, construction traffic management plan to address the issues in respect of minor road network, including a plan identifying access points and barred routes,

00:45:16:05 - 00:45:25:01

and then a review of the plans that show the access points, uh, to ensure that they are consistent and coordinated across the documents.

00:45:27:20 - 00:45:47:11

And this is for the applicant and Nottinghamshire County to undertake discussions to consider those access points within the Nottinghamshire part of the, uh proposal and whether or not there is a need or otherwise for a road safety audit in respect of those access points.

00:45:50:07 - 00:46:00:06

To have again for the applicant to submit the joint landscape report referenced at other DCS. And I think cotton was the one that was mentioned.

00:46:02:14 - 00:46:26:16

And then in terms of the residential receptors provide the list of the 20 properties that is uh, either visited or not, as the case may be. And then a full list of the properties within the order limits. Again, with a spatial plan that identifies those spatially so that we can understand the, uh, how the assessment has been undertaken.

00:46:30:20 - 00:46:44:20

By the applicant, again, to provide examples of other solar schemes with similar separation distances from dwellings or rights of way. So again, we can understand the if there's a consistent approach being taken.

00:46:46:09 - 00:47:00:02

And then for, uh, Mr. Brown on behalf of four of the local authorities to provide the routes where landscape fatigue may exist due to cumulative solar schemes in the area.

00:47:03:04 - 00:47:14:17

An applicant to provide information or evidence for effect on the heritage asset, and particularly Link and Cathedral, and how that works its way through the heritage assessment.

00:47:16:06 - 00:47:25:04

And I think we've got this confirmed already for the ASI to include views of or from the relevant heritage sites.

00:47:28:05 - 00:47:41:14

Applicant to provide the updated cumulative traffic information with the council's um, ideally as soon as possible, because there's obviously a missing piece of information we all need.

00:47:43:02 - 00:47:44:16

And then, um.

00:47:47:24 - 00:47:58:09

I think Lincolnshire County Council, we're going to provide comments to the applicant on the cumulative traffic and the content in chapter 12 being different to chapter 18.

00:48:02:06 - 00:48:13:13

Um, again, applicant, provide clarity, clarification on the size, scale, frequency and locations of extent of soil scraping and then storage.

00:48:17:15 - 00:48:35:18

Applicant respond to the Lincolnshire County Council's concerns with regard to cumulative effects, loss of best and most versatile land and then the extent of loss of agricultural use and, um, dealing with the written ministerial statements.

00:48:38:18 - 00:48:49:05

Applicant on socioeconomics. To provide an explanation of effect on supply chain businesses and the consequences of Any job losses versus jobs gained.

00:48:53:00 - 00:48:59:15

And then a further explanation of the Cornwall study on tourism and effects on solar farms

00:49:01:13 - 00:49:14:01

getting near the end. Now you'll be pleased to hear. Um, and then, uh, again for the applicant, further information provided on the socioeconomics and tourism and travel plan target of 80%.

00:49:18:14 - 00:49:34:00

Then an update and correct cumulative effect chapter including review. The Bassetlaw District Council relevant representation that we do have a correct list of applications that should be included in the list of cumulative sites.

00:49:36:00 - 00:49:52:00

And then obviously a plan showing the consent in upcoming solar DCO schemes in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire with the order limits within. So is there any that I'm being told? There's one more. Okay. Can.

00:49:56:01 - 00:49:57:02

You explain? Um.

00:49:58:19 - 00:50:13:23

There was one further action point which was providing the extra information, extra information on the zone of influence to explain how that was taken, how that was, uh, the method for that.

00:50:33:08 - 00:50:40:09

Is that, uh, sufficiently clear that everyone understands Mr. Best.

00:50:42:04 - 00:50:49:20

So you can show it. I thought we had an action around clarifying the position on mental health.

00:50:55:08 - 00:51:02:11

You may well have done and we've missed it, but I'm just trying to think what it was that we were asking for. Can you assist me?

00:51:02:15 - 00:51:34:20

I think it was a explanation of I'm trying to remember it myself now, but I, I felt like, uh, whilst there was discussion on the methodology used, um, there was still a concern raised about how the localised impacts, potential impacts on mental health could be captured. And my recollection was there was a commitment for the applicant to come back and explain further.

00:51:38:19 - 00:52:00:13

Which group was the applicant? Uh, I don't recall that commitment from us. Um, I think we've explained the approach at this hearing, and we'll be responding to those residents who raised mental health, uh, in their relevant reps at deadline one. I propose we do that. And of course it examining authority thinks you need further information. You can raise a question.

00:52:10:24 - 00:52:41:20

I thank you, but I don't have a note to support that request. Um, but I'm sure that everyone here in the room has heard that discussion, and I'm sure that we are going to get a written summaries of of what's happened today, but also the response to the relevant representations, which are obviously going to be, uh, very important for our understanding of, uh, of this particular issue. And obviously, it's of great concern to a lot of people.

00:52:42:08 - 00:53:13:13

And so I'm sure that will aid us in understanding of our examination and how we move forward from here. So hopefully that's a, uh, sufficient list of action points to pursue. Uh, I'm sure some people are thinking it's far too many. Um, but there we are. Um, so with, uh, nothing further, I'll just check, make sure I'm not crossing, cutting across anyone. Okay.

00:53:13:15 - 00:53:19:17

So thank everyone for their time and their contributions today. And our forum will close the hearing. Thank you.