

File Name: OES\_SEPT3\_ISH2\_PT2.mp4

File Length: 02:16:11

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:15 - 00:00:36:24

Okay. So now 20 to 5 and it's time to resume. Um, so I think we can move on now to, uh, Roman for just to try and get an understanding of the assessment effects on residential receptors and whether interested parties agree with the assessment and the conclusions reached. So I've come to interested parties in the first instance. So whether anyone wishes to contribute in

00:00:38:22 - 00:00:39:21

at this stage.

00:00:44:15 - 00:00:46:29

Mr. Brown yeah. Oliver Brown for the.

00:00:47:01 - 00:01:21:29

Uh, the host authorities. Thank you. Yeah. This is another item that we've we've had meetings and discussions about with the applicant. Uh, I think I think we're getting there with it. Um, obviously at the Last um, hearing, we discussed, um, the the lack of support of the evidence base in terms of the, the survey that had been carried out and the assessment on receptors, residential receptors. Subsequently, the applicant has provided information which is provided in appendix F, um of of the um summary text at deadline one.

00:01:22:01 - 00:01:55:15

And this actually provided a really useful figures which lays out the location of the, um, the properties that have been surveyed and also includes a description of the, the, the view, uh, towards the development. And it also includes goods offsets and then subsequently, uh, the latest update of the Elvia a deadline to there's been three paragraphs added, um clarifying that that the author judge that that no properties would reach the residential visual amenity threshold.

00:01:56:00 - 00:02:37:10

Um, I think in principle we agree with this. However, where I think we're just lacking a little bit of information or maybe just need a bit more signposting. Is that within the additional paragraphs that's been added to the Elvia estates that, um, an Vaa would be provided if major effects were identified for residential receptors in year 15 assessment within the Elvia, and that no such effects have been identified. That's fine, but I'm just struggling to sort of locate that assessment of of of those visual receptors for us to then say, yeah, that, that that's an acceptable statement essentially.

00:02:39:13 - 00:02:41:24

Okay. Thank you, Mr. White.

00:02:44:13 - 00:03:06:28

Hi. Thank you. Um, I'm sorry, I was a minute late joining back in. Um, I'm guessing we're still on, um, landscape and visual amenity. Possible item five. No, it's its item for the impact on residential receptors. Okay, I'll wait to. Sorry about that. I'll wait to speak on five. Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

00:03:09:21 - 00:03:35:01

So just taking that point further then, um, because it is a point that we covered in the previous hearings. And one of the things that we had asked for, which I still don't think we have, is the identified residential properties within the adjacent. Have I missed that or has that full list been provided now?

00:03:40:01 - 00:04:02:09

Sam Griffiths uh, for the applicant, the, um, plan that Mr. Brown has just referred to, which was appendix F of the written summary, um, that identified all of those residential dwellings, um, circled in two different colors to indicate those that we had and had not visited. So that was the plan that was intended to provide you with those locations of each dwelling.

00:04:03:29 - 00:04:15:12

Is that right? One zero 77 and zero 78, which then has the subsequent plan identifying the various viewpoints from individual properties.

00:04:16:13 - 00:04:28:09

You've described the plan I was thinking of. I would just check that number for you, but I'll confirm that it is maybe what you just said, says rep 1-077.

00:04:29:00 - 00:04:37:27

Yeah. And then it followed on to 78 with the following on sheets. Correct? Yeah. Okay. Well, um, so.

00:04:41:03 - 00:05:00:14

That part of me I think is still unclear about whether we've got the full list of all the properties. So for example, and also whether they're correctly named. So, for example, Vicarage Farm on Far Hill Lane, you make no reference to Vicarage Farm cottage.

00:05:03:07 - 00:05:19:08

I'm assuming that's two separate properties, and it may be that you've assessed them in a similar way because they're next door to each other. Um, but you'll be able to clarify that for me. Um, you make reference, um,

00:05:20:25 - 00:05:26:08

to a farm west of Main Street, and I just wanted clarification, whether that's North Farm.

00:05:30:01 - 00:06:09:07

Okay. And then Station Cottage again, I think is two properties on the Ordnance Survey numbers one and two. And again, that's what the book of reference confirms. And Station Cottage Ledbury East would appear to be station House in the book of reference. So again it's consistency of information that I would want to have. Um, and then we have a further property, which I don't think gets

referenced at all, and I don't know its name as a consequence, but, um, property to the west of Barn Cottage.

00:06:09:26 - 00:06:58:22

It's on sheet 15 of, uh, your plans that you included within rep 178, because it's sheet 15. Um, so it's just getting clarity that we do have all of the individual receptors properly identified. Um, and then following on from that and Mister Brown's point as well, in understanding the assessment that you've made for the, the, uh, respective receptors, because as you were pointing out to us at the ACI, there are Then certain separation distances or different approaches to screening in response to the relevant context.

00:06:59:08 - 00:07:01:22

It isn't clear to me yet.

00:07:04:04 - 00:07:47:06

How you've ended up with the approach to the separation distances and the different approaches to planting or not, and why you have done it in some places, not others. So if I give an example at, um, the site visit, which was the third site we visited, which is more farm. Um, we've obviously got separation distances to the northeast of 289m and at the edge of the, uh, the area where there's not going to be solar farms, you're showing not just hedge planting, but woodland planting to help mitigate the arrangement there.

00:07:47:08 - 00:08:08:24

But then that's not followed through in other directions or at other locations. So it's trying to understand the why. Um, and obviously I've just that's just one example, but you've obviously got 25 to 30 different properties. Uh, is it.

00:08:10:12 - 00:08:28:26

Uh, I think I understand, but I do need to be clear on it. The assessment that you originally undertook effectively put them all together. I think rather than going through them one by one. And so you've grouped them as one overall receptor.

00:08:31:03 - 00:08:54:10

And so I'm just wondering whether that is common practice for solar farms. Um, and whether as a consequence you miss detail, which means that, Uh, either the harm isn't fully identified or the mitigation to deal with that isn't fully identified.

00:08:55:06 - 00:09:28:01

Thank you. Sir. Uh, Sam Griffiths for the applicant, I think we don't want to conflate two separate but related issues. Um, the first of which is the assessment of impact visually on residential receptors. And you're quite right that for that assessment, the houses were grouped into those that were typically close to each other. And then for each of those receptor groups, a viewpoint was identified to represent them for the purposes of assessment.

00:09:28:03 - 00:10:00:22

And that is a common practice. Um, and for reference, the Elvia included 63 viewpoints. And I've got a number here, um, that 28 are representative of residential receptors. And then to work out quite where they are at a table 11.9 of the Ovia, which is the latest reference rep to 026, um, lists out the receptor groups and the locations of those receptors and the corresponding viewpoint to help the reader understand where those impacts and those groups are.

00:10:02:02 - 00:10:35:09

Um, just just a reference. If we were to then pursue the, uh, the thoughts along how residential receptors are assessed. Um, and Mr. Brown touched on this earlier. Um, we agreed a residential visual amenity threshold, um, pre examination, pre submission. Um, in our discussions with, uh, the host authorities, whereby if there were major adverse impacts at year 15, then it be right to then go and assess each individual property and have an individual assessment uh as part of the wider Elvia.

00:10:36:12 - 00:11:09:00

Um, again, Mr. Brown touched on this and it has been subject to our discussions recently. No such impacts were identified and therefore the need for Navarre has not been triggered in this instance. So that's where the assessment would need to consider each individual property and name them. Um, taking the the other but related matter of the design. That is more what is detailed in the supplementary information that was provided at the deadline that we're talking about in front of us.

00:11:09:09 - 00:11:42:22

Um, and this is where you're quite right, sir, where there are properties adjacent to each other. The design response is going to typically be the same, because those baseline views are the same as to why in some instances there's hedgerows, sometimes hedgerows with trees, sometimes no hedgerows. What we've tried to do is very much tailor that design response to the existing character, and of those views based on that site work, rather having a blanket approach. It's also worth noting that the illustrative master plan, which we've been referring to mostly for an example.

00:11:42:24 - 00:12:12:09

On the company site, inspection is just that. It's an interpretation of what could be brought forward by the works plans, and therefore there is no reason why. If through detailed design, it was identified that a hedgerow in a certain location would be beneficial? There is certainly flexibility to do that within those works plants. The illustrative masterplan demonstrates how it could be brought forwards. Um, if that can be extended if needed through detailed design, which of course would be discharged by requirement.

00:12:17:28 - 00:12:36:12

So in terms of the response to what Mr. Brown was saying about understanding the threshold and whether it's been met or not, is is that, uh, again, something that you're discussing as part of the statement of common ground to, uh, move matters forward or.

00:12:38:18 - 00:13:10:03

Sam Griffiths, On behalf of the applicant, it is. I think Mr. Brown can correct me if there's any misunderstanding, but I think the threshold is indeed agreed. And we've had that in writing many months ago now. The final test, which I think is reflected in your question on the agenda, actually is, um, do the host authorities agree with the findings of the assessment? Um, if they do, then we I think

we'd all confirm the threshold has not been reached. Um, and that is the subject of our detailed discussions that are currently being undertaken to inform the SOG.

00:13:12:19 - 00:13:13:15

Thank you.

00:13:15:04 - 00:13:20:11

Do the councils have anything further to add in light of what Mr. Griffiths has said?

00:13:23:11 - 00:13:58:03

Oliver Brown for the host authorities just just quickly. Yeah. So I think just just to to summarize that. Yeah. What we're looking for and I think to drive home a point, but it comes back to that receptor versus viewpoint assessment. Then what we'd be looking for is just that information extracting in a simple table. Just going through each of those identified residential properties. So we know what that the applicant's assessment is for each of. For each of those doesn't need to be full detailed assessment. So then we can just judge that we're happy with the the consideration and the judgment of the effects from each of those properties.

00:13:58:06 - 00:14:05:07

And I think it would just it would, it would provide that additional level of information that would assist in these plans.

00:14:07:07 - 00:14:11:05

Okay. And that's something you're going to be able to provide.

00:14:11:07 - 00:14:17:12

Yeah. And for clarity, I think that's presenting what's there in that format. That's yeah. We can request that.

00:14:17:16 - 00:14:24:27

Yeah. Okay. So if I put that as an action point from today and then we'll get to see that as well. Yeah. Thank you.

00:14:40:27 - 00:15:12:21

Okay, so if I move on then to item five, um, extend to mitigation offered and how this is secured within the draft Tompkins Order Development consent order, and whether the interested parties agree that this provides a sustainable solution. Um, so if I can come to the councils in the first instance and seek their views on whether their content with the mitigation that's being provided and how that is then secured.

00:15:22:09 - 00:15:37:12

Sorry. Oliver Brown, for the host authorities. So you're looking for basically, um, our input and on the indicative, um, landscape layout essentially that it's providing something that we think is suitable for this. This scheme.

00:15:37:25 - 00:16:23:19

Well, we all understand that. It's currently the details. Scheme will need to be submitted in due course. And that would ultimately need to be approved by the relevant authorities. But it's really whether you agree that the mitigation that we have illustrated to date is going to give the capacity to facilitate the mitigation that is required and seen to be agreed, and and that the DCO, our draft DCO, secures that mitigation to ensure its would ultimately be provided to facilitate the mitigation that's needed.

00:16:24:25 - 00:16:55:05

Okay. Thank you for the clarification. Um, so yeah, so this this is another one that we've had some discussions with the applicant on. Um, I'll start with just the, um, the Olymp and the the updates that have been provided for that. I think generally we're happy with most of those updates. Uh, it now states that, um, detailed planting plans will be provided as part of the, um, the final, uh, lamp, which is a really important point. So that's picked up on that.

00:16:55:07 - 00:17:27:23

Obviously, this is, um, links back to to the DCO, um, requirement. Apologize. They believe it's eight. I'll have to check that, um, in terms of maintenance of the planting and ecological features, again, additional paragraphs being added, which clarifies that all existing proposed habitats with managed and maintained for the operational duration of the scheme, which again, is something that we were looking for. Um, the surveying has also been added into there. And then the final point we had on that was in regards to plant replacement.

00:17:27:25 - 00:18:01:14

So the um, five year replacement, which is essentially the typical establishment period, has been added to to to the Olymp, which was we have asked for. I think the only thing that we would like to see and we can discuss this, um, a specific, um, meeting with the applicant is just in terms of if there is in the future, a catastrophic loss of planting, which can happen. Obviously, the mitigation planting, um, is reducing, um, a lot of residual effects from year one to year 15.

00:18:01:18 - 00:18:31:20

So I think it's just important that, um, if an unforeseen, um, event or something has happened that the mitigation planting potentially could be replaced as well due to that event. It's something we discussed on, on on previous schemes in terms of the, um, the master plan, I think that, you know, it provides scope, um, to develop a more detailed planting, uh, design at any detailed design stage.

00:18:31:25 - 00:18:49:19

Um, and again, I believe that that is also tied into that being discussed and approved with, um, not just the, um, the authorities, but also a steering group I believe is mentioned with the oil lamp, which would be set up, which would include, uh, ecologists as well as the authorities as well.

00:18:52:09 - 00:18:52:27

Okay.

00:18:56:09 - 00:19:05:12

Mr. Clarkson, I think you were going to contribute before Mr. Brown came in. So is there anything further you'd wish to add? Uh, yes.

00:19:05:14 - 00:19:36:04

Thank you, sir. Um, yeah. I mean, we are in correspondence with with the applicant. Uh, but there's one particular point which we ask is a priority from from the applicant, really. And just to bring to the attention of the examination is, um, it's a mitigation point being used, as I understand it, but for the glint and glare aspects of the development. But this is temporary fencing being proposed around the perimeter of the site, particularly along the A11. 33.

00:19:36:06 - 00:20:12:15

Um. We understand that's temporary. Um, I think document as 037 shows the fencing at figure 11.13 four a viewpoint four, which shows a significant fencing. We understand this is going to be potentially up to four meters high. Uh, it's not shown at year 15. So we do acknowledge it's temporary. Nonetheless, this just seems somewhat quite substantial. Uh, and therefore we do have some concerns about the, the visual impact of what is supposedly mitigation, really.

00:20:12:17 - 00:20:20:25

So we are having ongoing discussion with the applicant. We have we are taking and throwing on this. But it's it is something just, just just to bring to your your attention. Really, sir?

00:20:23:16 - 00:20:31:11

Okay. Um, are you able to bring up that visualization just so that I can, uh, have it before me.

00:20:43:11 - 00:20:46:11

So, yes, we're just we're just finding that and putting it on the screen.

00:20:46:29 - 00:20:55:28

Okay. Thank you. But whilst that's being found, are there are any other parties wishing to make any further points on on the elements, Mr. White?

00:20:58:17 - 00:21:28:21

Hi. Yes. Thank you. Um, it's a very specific and hopefully easy question for the applicant to answer. Um, there's a particular area which is, uh, west of, uh, North Clifton, and it's the, uh, public right of way down to the river down Trent Lane, uh, which is right on the edge of the, uh, of the development area. Um, we've mentioned before, and I think it's been brought up that there is a public right of way.

00:21:28:23 - 00:22:05:12

It's a footpath and a road that goes down to the river, which is used constantly, and one that the development zone they've crossed over the road, uh, instead of keeping it on to the, uh, their side of the road, if you like. Um, we wanted to make sure that, uh, that was not going to be part of a permanent sort of lockout area or something. Um, and linked to that, that Trent Lane, uh, down to the river, uh, we want it's going to be used for mitigation.

00:22:05:14 - 00:22:36:10

Everything sort of north of that lane will be a large mitigation. I understand they're running the cables that go into the river. We wanted to make sure that that's not going to be fenced off. It's a major, uh, access route for, uh, used by dog walkers, cyclist fisherman. And also there's, uh, grazing down there

for horses and things. Um, and we have seen it mentioned that it would have to be closed off at some point.

00:22:36:17 - 00:22:59:04

Uh, and we're, we're concerned that about that which may come in the next point, but we want to make sure that they're not going to fence that area off, uh, for whatever reason, since it's mitigation. And once the cables are in the ground and under the river, there wouldn't be a need to fence that off. That would be a major issue. Uh, from from the local population, the local community point of view.

00:23:02:01 - 00:23:03:18

Okay. Thank you, Mr. White.

00:23:06:09 - 00:23:41:12

So just going to the visualization that, um, West Lindsey District Council have referred us to, um, have noted this before, but, um, it's not giving us an indication of and I'm not sure whether we have a plan that shows us what length of fence is this likely to be? Do we know? Because if it's just a very short section, the effect is obviously a far less consequence. But if it's across the whole frontage on the A11 33 and four metres high, then it will be an extremely substantial

00:23:42:28 - 00:23:44:07

thing to think about.

00:23:45:00 - 00:24:16:22

Thank you, Sir. Sam Griffiths for the applicant. Um, there are a series of shorter sections, um, and the key piece to look, um, I'm reading now from the Olymp, which points us to the glint and glare assessment. Um, and the glint and glare assessment identifies, um, a series of screens and where they are required spatially on a plan as Obi-Wan to Abbate and those locations as identified within the Olymp.

00:24:16:24 - 00:24:41:17

The outline landscape and ecological Management plan Are those where it was found? Um, we needed to provide screening for means of safety from the road, and that is why they are there for a temporary duration whilst the vegetation matures. Um, so the short answer is yes. And the glinton glare assessment is a place to see the extent of those temporary opaque screens.

00:24:45:10 - 00:25:07:07

Okay. And the longevity will be reliant upon the planting and how quickly it grows. And so we won't know for how long it's likely to be there, because it will be dependent on the growth rates and the establishment of those planting screens.

00:25:08:19 - 00:25:45:00

Sam Griffiths for the applicant. Um, that is correct. And the assumption in the Ovia is at 15 years and 15 years, is used as an industry standard, as a conservative benchmark because, um, whilst it should be, uh, the vegetation should be effective earlier, if anything. Um, we need to make sure it's sufficiently not only tall, but also, uh, dense, bushy for, for shorthand, um, to make sure that it provides that effective screening in all conditions. Um, so that's why, as referenced by West Lindsey



there, um, it's not there in the year 15 assessment because we can have reasonable confidence it would not be required at that stage.

00:25:45:02 - 00:25:53:06

So the same rules, so to speak, have been applied for, um, uh, the Elvia as to the Clinton glare screening.

00:25:56:02 - 00:26:00:25

And is it correct to assume that it may be up to four meters high?

00:26:02:02 - 00:26:32:26

That is, uh, what is secured within the Olymp, which would be subject to that final requirement. The reason being, again, um, the maximum panel height being three and a half. I think in this location. Um, of course, I don't think there is a matter along the road, which should be acknowledged as important and as such is up to four metres high. Um, of course, there is also something by nature being within the Olymp that would be reviewed at detailed design. And that final height, uh, confirmed it could be lower, but it could not on that basis be higher.

00:26:35:25 - 00:26:38:15

Which is why that's what's been assessed within the Elvia.

00:26:41:18 - 00:27:05:21

Um, would the location of the fence also be potentially adjusted so that it's actually rather than what appears to be the back edge of road verge within the site behind the current planting, which obviously is has gaps within it so that, um, the effect could be reduced further.

00:27:06:17 - 00:27:30:18

Thank you sir. Sam Griffiths for the applicant. Yes. There's flexibility for that to occur. Um, there are some instances along the A1 A123, where there is good existing screening and therefore no need for a fence. There are some instances where it's fragmented and it could, in that instance, be set back. Um, that certainly could occur. The point of this photo montage is to share a reasonable worst case. And this is exactly that a reasonable worst case.

00:27:31:26 - 00:27:41:11

But it's only showing us one corner. It's not showing us the extent of the fence that there might be. So

00:27:42:27 - 00:27:54:03

I think it would be helpful to have some sort of broader visualization so that we can understand the extent of the fence and

00:27:55:24 - 00:28:00:13

how much of the frontage of the 1133 is going to be

00:28:02:03 - 00:28:22:07

potentially affected for up to 15 years, and so that we can understand that fully. It may be that what, um, over one to over eight shows is that. But but if not, um, could I request that have that? Or by all means, show it. Now, if that's easy to to locate.

00:28:22:09 - 00:28:42:10

Thank you. So it may be that, um, we could make sure in our written summaries we link to that document, I think it probably will provide it. It provides a line showing the extent and the corresponding length in meters along the extent of that, that road carriageway. Um, so I suspect it does provide what's required, but we can make sure that it's linked within our written summaries. Um, after the hearing.

00:28:42:22 - 00:28:46:21

Thank you. So any follow up then from West Lindsey.

00:28:48:01 - 00:29:20:22

Cycle Service Clarkson West Lindsey we would welcome that. It's it's one of the things we've been struggling to fully understand the full extent of this. And you know the visualization takes a snapshot. But you know our understanding on Obi-Wan Obi five is is predominantly running the the extent of the A 1133 I don't know it's possible to to bring that up on the screen. It's our understanding it would be for meters. And our concern is also a the visual impact on that, but also the ability to to control that through the DCO or through the lamp.

00:29:20:28 - 00:29:29:07

Basically, if it is to be removed in 15 years, how that's secured and guaranteed, really. So these are some of the things we were concerned with, sir.

00:29:30:26 - 00:29:32:04

Okay. Thank you.

00:29:55:03 - 00:30:31:14

Thank you for patience. Um, just a clarification. Um, which is actually within the Olympics, the following paragraph 1.3.4, um, which, um, I'll not take up too much of our time, but I will read this out because it's pertinent to this issue, which explains that the Clinton assessment has been based on the illustrative master plan and has taken an overly precautionary approach, assuming no existing planting is in place. So at detailed design, the Clinton assessment will indeed be rerun, and therefore the need for, and therefore the extent of this screening will be confirmed at that stage.

00:30:31:16 - 00:30:37:26

So it's it's worth everybody being clear and I should have read this out earlier. This is an overly precautionary approach.

00:30:39:23 - 00:31:06:03

But equally, as you made clear, it is to ensure highway safety indeed, which is of paramount importance. And but nevertheless, we want to try and make sure that the visual effect for potentially quite a long period of time is appropriately addressed. So it's getting that balance right, isn't it? And having the sufficient certainty that we've achieved that. Thank you.

00:31:09:04 - 00:31:09:24

Yes.

00:31:11:24 - 00:31:15:09

This is a slightly different point, but also to do with.

00:31:15:11 - 00:31:15:26

Security.

00:31:15:28 - 00:31:26:02

Mitigation. Can I just ask you to introduce yourself? Sorry. Yes. John Barker, on behalf of West Lindsey District Council. Um, the, uh, the plans, uh, that.

00:31:26:04 - 00:32:00:21

Show the heights of, um, development, um, have a 13.5m, um, height for quite a large area, uh, around 20 hectares within the, uh, the West Lindsey area that's identified for the base and the substation. Um, and whilst we've had discussions through the, through the, the CCG about, um, about that and the it, we've had information that 13.5m is not the height across the whole site.

00:32:01:06 - 00:32:28:10

Um, the, uh, as it stands, the 13.5m could be anywhere on that site. So, uh, what, uh, West Lindsey District Council would request is that the applicant provides some parameter plans to narrow that 13.5m height within that area down, um, to specific locations, rather than being across the whole site. Uh, that's currently identified for that height.

00:32:30:23 - 00:32:38:02

Okay. Thank you. Um, see whether the applicant is willing to respond positively to that.

00:32:39:02 - 00:33:12:11

Thank you. Sir. Sam Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant, um, as I just what's been explained is, is correct. But just to reiterate, the extent of the height parameter plan is reflective of the of the work's areas. Um, the outline design parameters, um, which is the latest version rep 2022 control the extent to which, um, the footprint of the substation could extend to, and therefore ultimately control the extent of the area that could extend up to 13.5m high.

00:33:12:23 - 00:33:49:13

And the reason that that flexibility to site that footprint anywhere within that hyperparameter area has been sought is because it would depend on the final arrangement of the substation. Um, the best work area to and also the solar array within those locations. Um, all of that would be very much subject to detailed design. Um, and therefore the ES has been, uh, based on that flexibility and therefore considered, um, what we could say is a overly cautious, again, with, uh, unrealistic worst case where the whole area could extend up to 13.5m to allow that flexibility.

00:33:49:15 - 00:34:00:24

So that has been accounted for in the visual assessment. Um, but I would say it's important to retain the flexibility to show, um, it could go anywhere before detailed design has been undertaken.

00:34:02:07 - 00:34:50:11

To give West Lindsey reassurance. You also have and I think you've agreed that a limitation that, um, controls the extent of the substation within that overall larger space. So it's just being able to spell out that clarity and making sure that the different documents are aligned so that hopefully West Lindsey would be reassured that whilst these has assumed the worst case scenario for the full extent, the actual reality is that the 13.5m and I think it's the height rather than anything else, which seems to be the the greater concern, um, would only be for a proportion of that site.

00:34:50:13 - 00:34:54:16

And, and that document that you refer to specifies that.

00:34:56:19 - 00:34:59:25

Yeah. So that's a, that's a fair summary. Um,

00:35:01:16 - 00:35:04:12

so if there's a if there's a request there.

00:35:05:15 - 00:35:35:25

No, I don't think there is. I mean I think it will be confirmation in your written summary that what you've said is that reading the two together gives the reassurance. I think that whilst the ES does the worst case scenario, you actually have a further limitation within the documentation that is secured. That actually means that you wouldn't have the entirety of the site filled to 13.5m high.

00:35:36:00 - 00:35:42:19

The substation is limited, I don't know off the top of my head what the square meter bridge is, but to whatever it is.

00:35:43:01 - 00:35:45:04

Very well put. Say yes. Correct.

00:35:45:22 - 00:35:49:03

Does that give you the reassurance yours. You're seeking?

00:35:49:25 - 00:36:28:14

John Barker on behalf of West Lindsey District Council? Um, I think it's more the point that, uh, that 13.5m high element would be better, would be better placed on some areas of that 20 hectare site than others. And due to topography, um. Uh, distance from the, uh, distance from the A123, um, proximity to the, uh, the existing, uh, Anglian Water, um, water treatment works and uh, giving a an indication of where that's likely to be would be, uh, would be appreciated.

00:36:31:11 - 00:36:40:13

And this links into the your local impact report and your concerns about the overall location of the best, um,

00:36:42:00 - 00:36:46:05

concern about its prominence and whether it's in the right location at all.

00:36:48:00 - 00:36:58:18

Uh, yes, sir John Barker on behalf of Westland. And it's more the, uh, as I understand it, the, the, the substation that's going to be the higher element and it's the location of About.

00:37:00:24 - 00:37:09:09

Okay, I've come back to the applicant. See if there's anything further that could be said or. Or whether you wish to say anything further.

00:37:10:26 - 00:37:48:02

Sam Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant at the with respect to the siting of the substation and in this instance, the best because they are on more or less the same land and that is detailed within several documents, not least the design approach document, as to why that specific site has been selected. Um, and as for the conversation then regarding the detailed location of the substation within that uh, works area, I would say that's precisely a matter that would be discussed under the discharge of requirement five, which is detailed design within the draft DCO.

00:37:48:07 - 00:37:55:21

Um, so it's absolutely an important conversation to have, but I would suggest that is for that stage of the project rather than pre determination.

00:37:57:07 - 00:38:24:13

Okay. And I think also I mean, West Lindsey, if you can give an indication during this examination, if you think there's a particular area that is of preference, again, that might be helpful for us to understand. But I also understand where the applicant is coming from in their current, uh, situation with regard to the the progress in terms of design. But, um.

00:38:27:01 - 00:38:42:15

I think the only follow up question I would have for you is if you genuinely consider the substations in the wrong place. Do you have an alternative location that you would think would be preferable, and if so, where and why?

00:38:51:27 - 00:38:56:28

The district council will take that away and respond in writing on Okay.

00:38:57:00 - 00:38:57:24

Thank you.

00:39:01:03 - 00:39:04:27

So, does anyone else have any points? Mr. Fox?

00:39:16:22 - 00:39:18:21

Your microphone, Mr. Fox.

00:39:18:26 - 00:39:28:20

By the 811133. So it's probably going to go the whole length of the order limits within the A13, 3 to 4 meter.

00:39:30:12 - 00:39:50:22

I think what's been said is that the current assessment on a worst case scenario is assuming that there is no hedgerows or planting along the 1133 frontage at all. And if there was none, then that would be your conclusion to. But obviously that isn't that is far.

00:39:50:24 - 00:39:54:14

More devastating than solar panels in the first instance.

00:39:54:28 - 00:39:55:15

Okay.

00:39:55:27 - 00:40:24:13

Okay. Um, the second point is this is a question, actually. The, um, what happens if this moves on to the design stage? And, um, the councils don't agree. Is it just denied? Does that mean they can stop it? Stop anything on the design that anything that's to be agreed by the local councils that further down the design stage, if they say no, that they can stop something, can they?

00:40:25:13 - 00:40:44:28

Effectively they can refuse. But then there's a process for, for review, stroke appeal. So, uh, it's not entirely aligned with a Town and Country Planning Act process, but, um, it's probably the simplest way of explaining it. Okay.

00:40:45:03 - 00:40:52:05

Are you going back to to David's? Um. I'll say surname. David White's whites point.

00:40:53:22 - 00:40:54:07

Sorry.

00:40:54:09 - 00:41:03:23

What are you into? We interrupt at this point with the question from David White, didn't we? Also on the trend line in.

00:41:04:02 - 00:41:05:06

Yes, you're quite right.

00:41:05:08 - 00:41:07:24

Can I put a point in there? Where are you going to go back to David first.

00:41:07:26 - 00:41:20:29

Well, Mr. White's got his hand up, so, um, I'll come back to him in the first instance and see if he has anything further to add or whether it's the same point, and then I'll revert back to Mr. Griffiths. So, Mr. White.

00:41:21:18 - 00:41:22:03

Thank you.

00:41:22:05 - 00:41:22:20

Very.

00:41:22:22 - 00:41:23:07

Much.

00:41:23:09 - 00:41:23:26

And thank you, Stephen.

00:41:23:28 - 00:41:25:16

Um, yeah.

00:41:26:00 - 00:41:48:11

It was a really important point. So I can repeat the question again, if that helps. Uh, I also have an additional question about these two images here. Well, I think ask the question about these images, but I think the applicant will have your previous point already. So, uh, if, if you can make that point. Thank you.

00:41:51:28 - 00:42:09:26

So, hey, are you waiting for me or I am? Yes, I am sorry, Mr. White. Yeah. Oh, uh, do you want me to, uh, re, uh, repeat the question or talk about these images? Uh, just talk about these images. Thank you. Okay. Uh, right. Thank you very much. Um, looking at these.

00:42:09:28 - 00:42:10:13

Images.

00:42:10:15 - 00:42:11:00

Again.

00:42:11:02 - 00:42:11:20

As you quite.

00:42:11:22 - 00:42:15:00

Rightly pointed out, one, uh, it's difficult to see the full.

00:42:15:02 - 00:42:15:17

Scale.

00:42:15:19 - 00:42:17:14

Because it's clipped off.

00:42:17:16 - 00:42:19:26

Which is, uh, quite strange.

00:42:20:08 - 00:42:22:03

Uh, so it's very difficult to.

00:42:22:06 - 00:42:23:10

Really sort of.

00:42:23:14 - 00:42:27:16

Uh, look at how big this would be. But also if you look at this.

00:42:27:18 - 00:42:28:06

Photograph in.

00:42:28:08 - 00:42:29:03

Particular.

00:42:29:14 - 00:42:30:08

Um, it.

00:42:30:10 - 00:42:31:08

Looks like it's been taken.

00:42:31:10 - 00:42:31:25

From.

00:42:31:27 - 00:42:32:12

Higher level.

00:42:32:14 - 00:42:32:29

Which I guess.

00:42:33:01 - 00:42:33:16

Is.

00:42:33:18 - 00:42:34:03

Uh.

00:42:34:05 - 00:42:37:08

How these photographs are done. And I'm looking at the.



00:42:37:10 - 00:42:37:25

Fencing.

00:42:37:27 - 00:42:39:03

Here, for instance.

00:42:39:05 - 00:42:39:21

Um, it.

00:42:39:23 - 00:42:41:15

Looks like standard stock fencing, which.

00:42:41:17 - 00:42:42:02

Probably goes.

00:42:42:04 - 00:42:43:11

To about a meter or something.

00:42:43:13 - 00:42:44:06

Or maybe a meter.

00:42:44:08 - 00:42:45:02

And a half.

00:42:45:12 - 00:42:46:15

Um, and.

00:42:46:17 - 00:42:47:28

I, the solar farms.

00:42:48:00 - 00:42:51:16

That I I've visited uh, myself, has much.

00:42:51:18 - 00:42:54:09

Higher fencing and also.

00:42:54:22 - 00:42:55:07

Things like.

00:42:55:09 - 00:42:56:20

Barbed wire on top.

00:42:56:22 - 00:42:57:15

And sort of.

00:42:57:27 - 00:42:58:24

You know, fencing.

00:42:58:26 - 00:42:59:11

Turned in.

00:42:59:13 - 00:43:00:03

And things.

00:43:00:05 - 00:43:04:04

Uh, for security. Uh, and just to follow.

00:43:04:06 - 00:43:05:00

Up on that.

00:43:05:02 - 00:43:10:10

There's nothing that's the scale really. So it's very difficult to appreciate. But also.

00:43:10:12 - 00:43:12:09

If you look at the solar panels, the solar panels.

00:43:12:11 - 00:43:15:17

Don't look much higher than a couple of meters. Uh, and it's.

00:43:15:19 - 00:43:16:04

Quite.

00:43:16:06 - 00:43:18:08

Low to the ground, which is what we've seen on.

00:43:18:10 - 00:43:18:25

On.

00:43:18:27 - 00:43:20:21

Previous solar farms. But so this.

00:43:20:23 - 00:43:21:08

Particular.

00:43:21:10 - 00:43:36:06

Solar farm is much, much bigger. So I'm trying to judge here, uh, is that the size of the fencing or is the fencing going to be two meters with barbed wire and turned in on the top for security and with the panels? Is that a true representation of.

00:43:36:08 - 00:43:37:06

How how high.

00:43:37:08 - 00:43:38:24

The panels will be in that area?

00:43:40:23 - 00:43:52:21

Thank you, Mr. White. So I'll come back to Mr. Griffiths, um, and his team to respond to that point, but also if they can respond to the point you made on, uh, Trent Lane. Yeah.

00:43:56:09 - 00:43:57:25

Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant.

00:43:57:27 - 00:43:58:12

Um, I'll just.

00:43:58:14 - 00:44:06:22

Deal with Trent Lane first. Um, in that, uh, we're not we're not proposing to close, um.

00:44:07:04 - 00:44:40:06

Trent Lane. Uh, there will obviously need to be works to install the cable in the lane. Um, but there is no, uh, power sought to close that public footpath. Um, in terms of the, uh, fencing, uh, image on the screen, um, just to be clear, uh, the relevant parts of the A1. 133 um, uh, is OB zero five, OB zero six and OB seven on the plan that referred earlier that we referred to earlier, not OB1 three to OB uh, nine, I think it was.

00:44:40:08 - 00:44:54:10

It's OB 0506 and zero seven. That's the those are the relevant points to look at. Um, along the A100 three um, in terms of defence. I pass to Mr. Griffiths to explain further.

00:44:56:28 - 00:45:19:22

Sam Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. And um, with respect to the fence, the documents referred to as the outline design parameters, um, which confirmed that the, uh, the post and wire fence in this image, we're not talking about the opaque screens, we're talking about the post and wire fence would be up to two metres, um, and would be indeed that post and wire, no barbed wire or anything other such on top.

00:45:22:07 - 00:45:50:00

So thank you. Sorry, Mr. White, I think I think the other element was trying to understand the perspective and whether we could rely on that visualisation. And it's accurately showing the, the height of the fence at two metres and the height of the panels, which, um, are either going to be 3.5 or 3.8, depending on whether this is within the flood zone. So can you confirm that for us as well?

00:45:51:03 - 00:46:29:09

Thank you, sir. Sam Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes we can. Uh, the visualizations have been prepared in line with guidance, which is called and it can be provided visual representation of development proposals. And that's a technical guidance. Note zero 619 from the Landscape Institute.

Um, there have been based on surveyed photography. So it's not just a photograph. They have, uh, lidar data collected on site to make sure that they are aligned, um, such that the height of the camera is relative to the, um, the height of the surrounding features within the landscape so that we can be confident that these are accurately shown, um, at the correct heights.

00:46:29:11 - 00:46:57:03

For instance, fencing at two metres, uh, solar panels at 3.5 to 3.8, um, I other than that, probably not much detail I can go into now on that point. But we are confident and as Mr. Walker raised earlier on a question about the photo montages, we did refer back to the team who prepared them, who provided some further information to confirm their accuracy. So we've taken that one away and we've confirmed them to be indeed accurate.

00:46:58:05 - 00:47:01:08

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

00:47:03:18 - 00:47:05:13

Microphone. Mr. Fox, please.

00:47:05:23 - 00:47:11:18

The point about Trent Lane was the where you put the order limits. You're on the wrong side of the Trent lane.

00:47:13:25 - 00:47:14:23

And also.

00:47:15:09 - 00:47:17:05

Is there a plan to put a fence.

00:47:17:07 - 00:47:17:22

In down.

00:47:17:24 - 00:47:18:09

There.

00:47:19:07 - 00:47:19:25

On the, on.

00:47:19:27 - 00:47:34:24

The, on the order limits. It's it's it's a beautiful part of this area. People walk it every day and there are no fences. And we're worried that you're suddenly going to want to fence it off. For whatever reason. We couldn't, uh.

00:47:34:26 - 00:47:39:13

We we wouldn't understand why it was fenced off, because it's just underground cabling.

00:47:40:09 - 00:47:50:11

And the DCO does plan to manage that path all the way around where everybody walks regularly. And I would think 90% of the village do so.

00:47:51:27 - 00:47:58:08

No plans for a fence down there, but just waiting for the applicant to respond. Thank you.

00:47:58:11 - 00:48:02:20

Richard Gibson, part of the applicant. There are no plans for a fence down there.

00:48:03:15 - 00:48:37:06

Okay, perfect. Thank you. Um, sorry. Um, just a quick one five time, Mr. White. If it's genuinely quick. Okay, I understand, uh, going back to, uh, what's been said about these images, I think, uh, I hope some people might agree that, uh, this is where, uh, it's difficult to imagine the scale of it. If you look at the first solar panel or the closest to us, what the applicant is saying is that, uh, the top of that solar panel is level with guttering on a on the, on the first floor of a house.

00:48:37:11 - 00:49:04:09

Now Looking at that image that doesn't look like it's almost as tall as the first floor guttering on the house. Uh, so with, uh, I wonder if it's possible to provide, uh, some, uh, some additional sort of points for this image because it's really different. I find it very difficult to imagine a house being there, and that being up to the guttering, it looks about 6 or 7ft high. I hope people can agree to that.

00:49:07:16 - 00:49:48:14

Um, I understand the point you're making, but I think the applicant has confirmed that they have followed practice. They've verified the approach that the firm's taken, that's produced these, and they are confirming to us. And I'm sure we'll get this in writing as the post hearing submission, that they do accurately reflect the, um, scheme as it's obviously illustrative because the actual layout is not fully defined, but should give us all a proper understanding of the likely effect in this location.

00:49:48:28 - 00:50:03:09

Um, hang on, Mr. White. Um, what may be, I don't know whether it's helpful at all to try and super interpose something which has known dimensions on it. Um,

00:50:05:02 - 00:50:37:03

I understand the point you're making about trying to understand it, but beyond getting the clarity that it's an accurate image. Um, I'm not sure. Uh, so if I may, if you look at the, uh, again, I'm trying to sort of, uh, get trying to get this right, that this image would be correct if you look at the panel closest to us, and if you had a person standing up next to that pole that's holding the solar panel up there saying that a person would only come halfway up that pole.

00:50:37:18 - 00:50:39:19

I see, in fact, what they're saying, and

00:50:41:06 - 00:51:22:14

I don't think that's correct, because there is a distance that you have to take into account because the panels are further away from the fence. So I don't think it's as straightforward as saying I don't think that's interpretations. Right. Um. Uh, well, I'll let Mr. Griffiths respond for the applicant in a moment, but. Okay. Um, we also have Mr. Walker with his hand up as well. So I'd like to give him the opportunity to come in, uh, in the first instance, and then I'll come back to the applicant to try and, uh, see how they wish to respond to the concerns that you've identified, Mr.

00:51:22:16 - 00:51:24:10

White. So, Mr. Walker.

00:51:27:12 - 00:51:28:01

Thank you.

00:51:28:03 - 00:51:40:24

Uh, Craig Walker, resident of North Clifton. Uh, I appreciate the company, which is, uh, done. The 3D renderings have said that is correct, but, uh.

00:51:43:05 - 00:52:09:12

They're doing the 3D render. Unless the, uh, LiDAR scanned the entire area, including, uh, including all the tree, that vegetation. I, I fail to see how they can, uh, verify that data with any certainty. Uh, if I can place a physical object of 3.8m in that, uh,

00:52:11:06 - 00:52:39:16

scene and take a picture of it, and it's different. It's significantly different to the 3D model that totally disproves that. Their 3D models incorrect. Because there's there's there's no other scenario, uh, other than that which is pretty much what I demonstrated at the, uh, the viewings.

00:52:41:11 - 00:52:46:00

Uh, I'm baffled by the response. Uh,

00:52:47:22 - 00:53:12:15

yeah. That's it really? Um, I, uh, I don't understand, uh, how they've come. They can come back and say that that, uh, they've verified it it without, uh, Linus gang in the area or the buildings they're just using. Uh.

00:53:15:26 - 00:53:31:20

Basically, Google graffiti scanned 3D images of the area and, uh, riding it over the top of the over the top of that. Uh, and obviously it's not works. Hence why we have

00:53:33:20 - 00:53:48:03

a physical object. And as you saw yourself, that doesn't compare to the 3D render. Otherwise you wouldn't have a difference. Thank you.

00:53:49:10 - 00:53:56:00

Thank you, Mr. Walker. If I can come back to the applicant to see how they would wish to respond. Thank you.

00:53:57:02 - 00:54:32:25

Thank you sir. Sam Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, we haven't just taken Google Earth and overlaid what we think it would look like. And as Charles would have it, we have completed a leader scan of the locations, which is how we have ended up with, um, accurate photo montages. So I propose in our written summary that we provide a little bit more detail on the process that was undertaken to make sure these are verifiable views. And we would include a couple of images from 1 or 2 viewpoints that show this leader data, which Mr.

00:54:32:27 - 00:54:42:07

Walker was referring to, and I think that might provide a step by step summary of how these images were compiled and hopefully, therefore instill some more confidence in their reliability.

00:54:43:11 - 00:54:46:12

Thank you. I think that would be very helpful.

00:54:58:11 - 00:54:59:01

So.

00:55:01:07 - 00:55:21:15

Just to round off then on on the mitigation, obviously the broader question also made reference to access provision, hedgerow protection, cable routing and so on. Nobody's made any specific comments about any concerns on on those elements. So um.

00:55:24:07 - 00:55:25:07

Mr. Fox

00:55:27:07 - 00:55:28:23

Microphone, please.

00:55:29:13 - 00:55:38:04

I think we got an answer. The question of the order limits down Trent Lane, and whether or not and whether or not they're going to close the footpaths.

00:55:41:03 - 00:55:52:23

Or not. Sorry. Use the words correctly managed for us. And it's clearly it's in the DCO, DCO that you are going to do that or they're asking for permission to do that.

00:55:55:00 - 00:55:55:23

Okay.

00:55:57:17 - 00:56:04:03

Mr. Wyatt, you have your hand raised again and so do you, Mr. Walker. So if I come to Mr. Walker in the first instance.

00:56:05:25 - 00:56:46:20

Uh, yeah. Uh, uh, question to, uh, uh, Sam Griffiths, uh, the leader scanning. Is that just of the local, uh, the buildings in the local area? Because, uh, I'm not sure how the leader scans all the vegetation, which is, uh, in the 3D renders, because that's it's not the buildings which seem to be the problem. It is the vegetation which is in the back of the views which dancing, which don't seem to relate to, uh, the solar panels.

00:56:46:26 - 00:57:00:26

The solar panels, which are, uh, in the 3D renders, the, uh, the panels don't come anywhere near to the height of covering the, uh,

00:57:02:17 - 00:57:30:18

uh, vegetation in the distance where when you put an actual object of 3.8m in, in a field, it obscures it. That's where the difference comes. I can't I can't see how one of the disputing this when some, uh, Griffiths himself was there and saw it with his own eyes.

00:57:32:11 - 00:57:39:00

But this point seems a bit farcical that there's any pushback on this. I'm totally bewildered by it.

00:57:40:14 - 00:57:43:26

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Walker. Mr. white.

00:57:45:24 - 00:58:29:11

Yes. Thank you. I agree with Mr. Walker saying, um, the, uh, going back to Trent Lane. Uh, you mentioned about cables. I did want to ask one question. Um, the cable that goes underground under the Trent, that is downtrend line. Uh, in the area of mitigation, is there will there be any building, uh, sort of over that area, or is the, is the plan just to drop the cable in a trench up to that area and then just go under the Trent and everything would be then covered up and mitigation and things? Or would there be have to be like a brick station above where the where it goes underground or something?

00:58:32:06 - 00:59:05:29

And sorry, what you're looking at that um, going back to the fencing, thank you for the offer of, uh, of updating those images to try and make them clearer to us. It would be helpful if you could, uh, where those panels are, if you could please put something that we can relate to in scale, like a person or something, even if it just involves Photoshop or something. Just so we can see that, uh, it would be 3.8m a, uh, a person at a scale at the foot of, uh, the highest point of those solar panels.

00:59:06:01 - 00:59:06:23

Thank you.

00:59:08:20 - 00:59:09:27

Thank you, Mr. White.

00:59:14:15 - 00:59:25:26

I don't think any of the points that have been raised actually responded to the question I posed, which was about access, hedgerows and so on. So Mr. Betts.



00:59:29:25 - 00:59:31:04

Simon Betts, some health and.

00:59:31:06 - 00:59:38:04

You can chair district council. Um, sir, if I can just make a point in relation to trees, we have raised this in.

00:59:38:06 - 00:59:39:00

Our local impact.

00:59:39:02 - 00:59:40:21

Reports and also.

00:59:40:23 - 00:59:41:13

Local.

00:59:41:20 - 00:59:42:05

Other.

00:59:42:07 - 00:59:42:22

Written submissions.

00:59:42:24 - 00:59:49:01

But, um, to to make the point again, obviously this question is referring to tree.

00:59:49:03 - 00:59:49:28

Protection.

00:59:50:00 - 00:59:50:27

But our.

00:59:50:29 - 00:59:53:18

Point that we still maintain is that the understanding of impact.

00:59:53:20 - 00:59:55:02

On trees is.

00:59:55:04 - 00:59:55:19

Limited.

00:59:55:21 - 00:59:58:09

Given the stage one assessment that's been undertaken.

00:59:58:11 - 00:59:58:26

Which is.

00:59:58:28 - 01:00:00:02

A tree condition.

01:00:00:04 - 01:00:03:26

Survey in effect and therefore the the developed.

01:00:03:28 - 01:00:04:27

Understanding of.

01:00:04:29 - 01:00:06:27

Impact on trees is still not there from.

01:00:07:06 - 01:00:08:00

Our perspective.

01:00:08:02 - 01:00:09:03

So I just wanted to.

01:00:09:05 - 01:00:10:04

Make that point.

01:00:12:13 - 01:00:21:12

Okay. Thank you. So before I go back to the applicant for the final time, is um, okay. That's.

01:00:23:13 - 01:00:53:06

Mrs. Fox at the Fox residence, North Clifton. So just referring back to those images, which I feel were misleading, the perspective didn't seem quite right, but let's move on. As regard mitigation, if the idea of planting, hedging in order to grow for 15 years behind that hedge, behind, behind that four meter fence panel is any indication of the way the mitigation will go on? I'm concerned.

01:00:56:22 - 01:00:57:07

Okay.

01:00:58:02 - 01:00:58:19

Thank you.

01:01:02:27 - 01:01:47:06

So I'll just return to the applicant, see if there's any final points. Um, I understand what you're going to provide as a written submission with your leader information. And, um, hopefully that will help clarify matters. I think also, I would express a request for you to think about if there's something that you can help us with. Uh, showing the perspective. I don't think showing human being. That's because we all vary in size, but something that is, um, a recognized, you know, whether it's a measuring post,

you know, just which might help us and also help the public to, uh, as you say, have greater confidence in the, the imagery.

01:01:50:20 - 01:02:23:04

So that's understood. Sam Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, there's quite a few points there. Um, maybe not all of them require a response, but, um, um, Mr. Betts, when you consider we mentioned, um, an assessment on trees and, um, it was previously committed that, um, as part of detailed design, a detailed cultural impact assessment would be provided. Um, so far, the assessment has been made on on the high level information, but that will essentially come down to the detailed design.

01:02:23:11 - 01:02:35:14

Um, I mean, I have got things that I can point you to in terms of access provision and cable routing and those items on your agenda. But it may be that we're not delving into them now.

01:02:37:00 - 01:02:49:27

I think really what I was wanting to get, uh, clarity on from the interested parties because there were various issues raised in local impact reports and others that, uh.

01:02:53:27 - 01:03:29:28

They were confident from your responses at deadline two, that those issues had been responded to in a way that gave them the comfort that they were seeking in terms of tree protection, hedgerow protection. And I'm just thinking of simple things like knowing where your cable route will be so it doesn't go through root systems of either trees or hedgerows and locations of your access tracks so that they don't compress the soils and adversely affect hedgerows and trees equally.

01:03:30:00 - 01:03:55:18

Where you have your new access points that you're not creating visual displays which are excessive and result in further loss of hedges. It's those sorts of details which, um, I was I'm really seeking clarification from and how you're addressing that and responding to the points that generally the councils and other parties have raised on those specifics.

01:03:55:27 - 01:04:34:16

Thank you sir. And I think I could give you a relatively concise answer that covers most of these points. So, um, allow me to go into that. So um, and I will give you the shorter version. So please ask for further information if that would be useful. Um, so with respect to access provision, I think there's, there's two primary points there that we could look at one of which you've mentioned is the vehicular access points. Um, and um, as a matter of principle, throughout the design, um, we have always thought to site those existing access points where, where we can that hasn't always been achievable, and therefore we have sited them in locations where there is less vegetation.

01:04:34:21 - 01:05:10:16

But as you've just pointed out, we will always have associated visibility slates. Um, and that's something that the team looked at in some detail to try and avoid, um, mitigation elsewhere, to try and to avoid vegetation loss. The proposal is to actually coppice or lay the vegetation to a height of 0.9m, thereby facilitating the visibility to play without losing that vegetation. Of course, that will seem to be

subject to making sure that vegetation is appropriate for such management, but we think it is. Um, and important to your question is how is this secured? And that is firstly secured by the vegetation removal plan.

01:05:10:22 - 01:05:47:03

That's appendix C of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. For clarity, that's Rep 2056. You've mentioned also tree and hedgerow protection. Um and that is detail within the outline design parameters, um, which will of course inform the final detailed design and the most recent references rep to 022. To give you some examples. Um, works won't occur within five metres of hedgerows, ten metres of drainage ditches and watercourses and water bodies, 15m of trees, 25m of woodlands and so on.

01:05:47:06 - 01:06:26:25

Um, it does also, in the most recent update, clarify that no works would occur within the PPAs, that the route protection areas are veteran trees as well. Um, and all of this once again would be um, embedded in the final detailed design as discharge under requirement five of the draft DCO. Um, it's also worth noting here. Route protection. Um, in particular, um, the lamp also details in paragraph 5.3.6 that the route protection area for individual trees will be accounted for in the construction and habitat creation to ensure tree retention and to avoid damage, and also this will be in accordance with BS 5837 2021.

01:06:26:27 - 01:07:03:16

Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction and keeping moving through those points on cable routing. There's probably two pertinent issues here. One is the cables across, um, connecting solar field to solar field. Um, and there I'll point to, um, as a key security mechanism to construction environmental management plan, which is rep to 049. Um, and that explains that we have several embedded mitigation measures, um, the same offsets as required under the outline design principles are embedded there five meters from hedgerows, 25 from woodland, etc..

01:07:03:22 - 01:07:47:15

Um, but also it speaks to the micro siting of this infrastructure to say that it must be positioned as far from the stem of retained trees as possible, and or trenching outside of paths of retained trees. So we cannot take a trench through that existing route protection area. And again, that speaks to Mr. Betts on the cultural impact assessment earlier. Once we have that detailed alignment, we can detail that assessment. It goes on to state that trench crossings, such as horizontal directional drilling, will be utilized as required to mitigate impacts on tree belts or hedgerows, and that plan will be submitted for approval under requirement 13 of the draft DCO I mentioned.

01:07:47:17 - 01:08:19:04

There's two points there. The second one is the export cable route and the key document there is the outline export cable route construction method statement app zero sorry 185. And that explains that the working width will have to be reinstated to its original condition so backfilled with topsoil seeding when necessary, and replanting of areas if there was any vegetation lost as a result of installing that cable. And then finally and more concisely, um, also on the agenda was maintenance.

01:08:19:06 - 01:08:39:01

I think this is actually where we started with Mr. Brown a little while ago to explain that we've had quite a lot of discussions around the outline landscape and ecological management plan. Um, that I think is, is almost agreed and again, will be submitted and is thereby secure by requirement eight. That gives a bit of a rattle through and hopefully provide some clarity to some of your questions.

01:08:39:14 - 01:09:17:21

And Sir Richard Gibson, applicant, if I can come to Trent Lane and answer that. Um, so Trent Lane is identified on the streets rights of way and access plans. The public right of way is marked between pro W12, slash zero three and Pro 1210. Um, as I said earlier that during construction of installation, installing the cable. There will need to be some form of management of the lane. For safety reasons, that is, that power is requested in the draft development consent order in schedule six, part four.

01:09:18:07 - 01:10:02:04

Um, uh, those rights of way references are just given. You are identified that power is only being sought during construction of the authorized development. It's made explicitly clear in that schedule it's only for construction post construction. In operation phase, there is no power being asked for, um, for any form of management or closure or other form over those public over, uh, Trans Lane. Uh, and so where the residents will be able to walk, as they do now in terms of any built form, um, there will only be there need to be some form of jointing bay for the cable, but that will be covered with a like a manhole cover effectively on the ground.

01:10:02:06 - 01:10:14:09

So there won't be any, um, structure above ground. It would be some form of manhole cover to enter into the jointing bay. So hopefully that clarifies trend link.

01:10:15:16 - 01:10:16:10

Thank you.

01:10:23:19 - 01:10:45:24

Okay, I think that takes us then really on to water. So I'm going to move on to agriculture. And I think if you still have points to make on Trent Lane, I would ask you to put them in writing. I think, you know, we're now getting to nearly 6:00 and we need to try and get through the agricultural section if we can. Um, I hope that's okay.

01:10:47:28 - 01:11:28:09

Well, if you can set out any further concerns in writing. Um, get those in by deadline three, which is the 16th of September, and then hopefully the applicant will be able to give further The clarification to any further outstanding concerns that you have. Thank you. So, um, item five then agricultural land and best and most versatile agriculture and agricultural land. We've got A.S. chapter eight which is a PPO three seven, the Agricultural Land Classification Report, which is a PB 105 and then the appendix 18.3 revision two.

01:11:28:19 - 01:12:10:04

Rep 2041. Now we are just trying to seek a further understanding of the extent of loss of BMV from the proposed development and the quantity that could be regarded as permanently lost. Now, the applicant provided a response to the, uh, local impacts reports, and it was an item raised by

Lincolnshire County Council. 1511 uh, on page 138, I think of the applicant's response identified 120 20 hectares permanently removed from Earth for ecological enhancement, and 534.67 hectares temporarily lost.

01:12:10:15 - 01:12:18:14

Um. Do the councils have any concerns about the accuracy of those figures or the interpretation of that?

01:12:36:02 - 01:13:02:16

West Lindsey District Council. Um, I think from the council's point of view, it's difficult to quantify how much within each council area of each of the classifications there is, uh, because it's it's given as a given, as a single figure across the project. Uh, I haven't found it anywhere else divided by, um, local authority area. Um, it may be in there, and I've just not found it.

01:13:04:17 - 01:13:21:05

And that's important to you for your understanding of the the loss. Uh. Uh, John Barker with the district council. Yeah. In terms of the loss within the West Lindsey area and the Lincolnshire area, because the coincidence.

01:13:23:18 - 01:13:31:15

In, in, um, to go back to the cumulative effect issue, uh, with the other uh.

01:13:32:02 - 01:13:33:12

Uh, incidents.

01:13:33:22 - 01:13:52:14

Within West Lindsey to take it also taken at best and most versatile and adding this to the to the already taken best from I suppose to land would be uh would be would be able to then total up what the what the the loss in West Lindsey is.

01:13:56:02 - 01:13:57:18

Okay. Um.

01:14:00:12 - 01:14:08:14

And to the other councils have a similar concern that they would wish to have that sort of detail. Mr. Betts. Simon Betts.

01:14:08:16 - 01:14:10:00

And you can share a district council.

01:14:10:02 - 01:14:12:10

Um, yes. We don't we don't dispute.

01:14:12:12 - 01:14:12:28

That.

01:14:13:00 - 01:14:14:08

Loss figure as presented.

01:14:14:10 - 01:14:15:15

Within s, but we would.

01:14:15:17 - 01:14:16:08

Share a similar.

01:14:16:10 - 01:14:21:10

Concern in terms of the breakdown district level for our authority because as.

01:14:21:12 - 01:14:21:27

Has already.

01:14:21:29 - 01:14:23:06

Been pointed out, it's.

01:14:23:08 - 01:14:23:23

The.

01:14:23:25 - 01:14:29:15

Assessment produces a scheme wide figure and therefore the understanding on.

01:14:29:17 - 01:14:30:15

A district.

01:14:30:17 - 01:14:38:21

Basis for each authority. And then working out from that local area is is more limited on that basis.

That's what I was going to add. Thank you.

01:14:39:16 - 01:14:45:03

Under Lincolnshire County, you have a similar concern that you'd be wanting a county breakdown.

01:14:46:20 - 01:14:59:01

Alison Richards for Lancashire County Council. Yes, it would be very useful. We know there's 207 hectares within Lincolnshire, but we don't know what will be permanently lost in that area. We're very helpful.

01:14:59:07 - 01:15:08:15

Thank you. Thank you. So is that something that's readily provided for, uh, the councils and for the examination?

01:15:11:17 - 01:15:13:05

Of the applicant? Um.

01:15:13:07 - 01:15:22:11

Thank you. Yes, sir. For the cumulative assessment. We have done a breakdown between counties. Um, but I'm told that we could provide that district level breakdown at deadline three.

01:15:23:07 - 01:15:33:03

Okay. I think that would be helpful for each of the councils. Uh, understanding the broader picture and relative to them. Thank you.

01:15:38:12 - 01:16:09:23

Um, I think the other thing that I've noted in your response, the applicant's response to our written question, 13 .0.1, you provided the cumulative figures and now included those in appendix Point three to include Meridian Solar and Leader Solar being added, which I think were points that Lincolnshire County had, um, identified as missing. Do we now have an agreed full list of schemes that, uh, should be included?

01:16:16:03 - 01:16:50:24

For Lancashire County Council and with regard to BMV, it was appendix 18.3. Um and the BMV has been assessed on county wide basis. Um and one of the items missing is Lincolnshire Reservoir. That's not in the list. And obviously we have other incidents, um, across mostly transmission schemes across the county which have, um, significant converter stations. So we would, um, appreciate those being included as well.

01:16:50:27 - 01:16:51:17

please.

01:16:53:29 - 01:17:06:23

Okay. Um, we've obviously got part of the agenda for tomorrow to look at the cumulative assessment, but, um, if we can note that for the moment, um,

01:17:08:19 - 01:17:14:21

do any of the other councils have any other sites that they are concerned are not included?

01:17:17:24 - 01:17:20:13

Mr.. Betts, Simon Betts.

01:17:20:15 - 01:17:21:15

Morgan Stewart um.

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

It's a related.

01:17:22:21 - 01:17:24:19

Point, and perhaps that moves.



01:17:24:21 - 01:17:25:07

Into the next.

01:17:25:09 - 01:17:25:24

Part of.

01:17:25:26 - 01:17:26:18

The question.

01:17:26:20 - 01:17:29:23

But to continue from the point.

01:17:29:25 - 01:17:32:18

I was making before about local impacts, because.

01:17:32:20 - 01:17:33:21

The question.

01:17:33:23 - 01:17:34:08

Refers.

01:17:34:10 - 01:17:35:23

To local impacts.

01:17:35:25 - 01:17:36:25

How the.

01:17:36:27 - 01:17:37:13

Cumulative.

01:17:37:15 - 01:17:41:10

Assessment has been presented so far and BMV by the applicant.

01:17:41:16 - 01:17:42:10

Is it a.

01:17:42:12 - 01:17:48:00

Very sort of, um, macro level? So it's very high level. It looks at a county.

01:17:48:05 - 01:17:48:20

Level.

01:17:48:22 - 01:17:59:11

Figures for Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. It then looks at that as a percentage, as a proportion that would be lost within that wider context. I think what.

01:17:59:13 - 01:17:59:28

We.

01:18:00:00 - 01:18:39:23

Are seeking is a better understanding of the assessment of those other individual schemes. So the data is available for those other schemes within the different districts of the different authorities. So I think, um, we haven't quite got that developed understanding again. The question refers to local level. We've talked already about a breakdown per authority, but it's also thinking about okay for or for each of the districts taking those other schemes and other, uh, town country planning schemes that have been consented locally.

01:18:40:02 - 01:19:00:25

Um, what does that look like look like? Is a BMC BMV figure rather than just presenting it as a a percentage. Proportion of the the entire BMV land that's within those two county areas. So I think that's that's where there's gaps at the moment leading into perhaps the next part of the point.

01:19:05:09 - 01:19:12:21

Okay. Um, I'll just come then to the applicant to see how you wish to respond to that comment.

01:19:12:23 - 01:19:47:05

The applicant. Um, I think if I right that the actual practice in terms of the approach on cumulative for ALC has sort of evolved, um, to be at that county or regional level, um, which wouldn't strictly be required normally with cumulative assessment, but in terms of solar and in response to local authorities across several intercepts, it has sort of become more of the approach. Um, I will take that point away, though, to see if we can, as part of that district level. Um, looking at the breakdown there, we can give a bit more clarity on that point. Um, so I could I just just going back to the point around seeking clarity on the permanent loss.

01:19:47:07 - 01:19:50:07

There was just one point I wanted to make. If that's okay.

01:19:50:09 - 01:19:51:01

By all means, yeah.

01:19:51:03 - 01:20:24:26

Um, so you referenced the, um, one, two, three hectares, which we've identified as being permanently removed for ecological enhancement areas. Um, that's I think it's important to just point out that's very much an overly precautionary, um, approach because that combines both, um, areas that would definitely be retained and would be permanent loss, such as hedgerow and woodlands and trees, which are very much areas around sort of edges of fields and things. And that amounts to about 11 hectares, 11.6 hectares in total.

01:20:25:05 - 01:20:57:03

Um, the additional that takes you up to the one, two, three hectares is things like, um, wildflower meadows, which is mitigation land that we've included, usually for um heritage or visual mitigation. So providing offsets, which we've then also, um, taken the opportunity to enhance ecologically um, by having wildflower meadows so that land would be handed back to landowners and would very easily would be ready to be farmed, basically. So for the purposes of an overly, um, conservative assessment, we've assumed that that is permanently lost.

01:20:57:05 - 01:21:28:18

But I think a more realistic approach is that we very much the 11 hectares or the 11.6, um, is very much, um, the permanent loss. And really those other areas, such as wildflower meadows, would be handed back to the landowner and they could quite easily, um, just start farming that again. The other point to note, and we will provide a plan for this, which we're sort of preparing at the moment for deadline three, which will identify where the 11.6 hectares is. And I think it's quite a useful plan because it does show you how it's along the edges of fields.

01:21:28:20 - 01:21:52:00

It's not whole fields that are permanently not what we assume not to go back into agricultural use. Um, we haven't done the overlay with BMV at the moment. So in that figure, I'm assuming it's all B&B B., but it may well be less than that. But in terms of maximum of that sort of established planting woodlands, trees, hedgerows, it's 11.6 hectares.

01:21:52:27 - 01:21:55:02

Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

01:22:00:00 - 01:22:32:19

So in trying to understand the council's positions, um, I can understand to an extent why you're after information at a local level. But this is an insight for a national scheme which is to be assessed in the first inst against national policy. So are there particular elements of national policy that, again, you can point us to that? Uh, would, uh, help, um, on this matter?

01:22:37:27 - 01:22:38:26

Simon Betts you.

01:22:38:28 - 01:22:41:17

Can share with District council, um, perhaps in.

01:22:41:19 - 01:22:42:04

The.

01:22:42:06 - 01:22:51:15

First instance, if I refer to MPs one paragraph 5.11.34, um, which says the Secretary of State should ensure that applicants do not cite.

01:22:51:17 - 01:22:52:02

The.

01:22:52:04 - 01:23:14:21

Scheme on the best and most versatile agricultural land without justification, where schemes are to be searched on best and most versatile agricultural land, the Secretary of State should take into account the economic and other benefits that land where development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary. Areas of poor quality land should be referred to those of a higher quality. So that's just one one initial reference.

01:23:15:10 - 01:23:19:17

I understand that, but what I'm trying to understand is, um.

01:23:22:06 - 01:24:03:05

There's no reference to a distinction between a district level and a county level. It's a national project that crosses boundaries. And so, uh, the applicant, uh, has done the assessment on on that basis, I think, and you're asking for more information, to have an understanding of the consequential effects at district and county level. So is there something specific in national policy that we should be looking at to, to help us understand that approach? Or is it, um, just to help you more broadly, um, at district and county level?

01:24:04:14 - 01:24:05:00

Some of.

01:24:05:02 - 01:24:05:17

It's.

01:24:05:19 - 01:24:06:04

New.

01:24:06:06 - 01:24:06:21

Consumer.

01:24:06:23 - 01:24:40:23

District council. Um, well, Sarah, I was following through on the logic of your question that did refer to local. So I was assuming there was an issue there that was wanting to be explored. Um, I suppose it comes down to the, the, the extent to which the approach to cumulative assessment has been agreed. And I think that's been limited, which is what I've certainly referred to in the previous, uh, hearings have taken place. We've had a sort of long list of schemes, and it's it's not necessarily the, number of schemes to be considered.

01:24:40:25 - 01:25:21:17

Uh but it's it's the approach to to to cumulative assessment for this and other topic areas. So that's really what we're driving at. But then that's that cumulative assessment I suppose if you, if you drill down to to the more micro level of each of the host authorities, um, for this scheme alone, and then you start to link this scheme with some of those other schemes and break down, um, that information further. I think that's, that's pointing to a wider picture and an understanding of what, what is the scale of BMV loss cumulatively that is occurring with Nsic projects.

01:25:21:19 - 01:25:46:13

So that's you know, that's where we're driving at. By all means, we can we can sort of take away the policy points and refer to anything specific that we think is relevant for the examining authority. But that's that's the point that we're seeking to get further information and clarification on. And as I said, I think the data is available and accessible. Um, so I see no reason why it couldn't be considered further.

01:25:47:18 - 01:25:50:04

No. That's helpful clarification. Thank you.

01:25:53:21 - 01:25:59:01

So I'll just come back to the applicant, see if there's anything further they would wish to say in response.

01:26:00:01 - 01:26:30:05

Miss Coleman, if the applicant. Um, no, I would agree with your question, sir. Um, the saying that there's no reason why it can't be done doesn't necessarily provide justification for why that level of information is needed. It's it's an effect that, um, as I've said, as I said previously, has the approach has evolved to do that at a county or regional level. Um, I suppose reflecting that it's not really, you know, when you're looking at like the zone of influence for different effects, it's not really a specific, um, county or district.

01:26:30:07 - 01:27:00:05

Um, in fact, it is on that slightly larger, larger scale, which is why we've taken the approach we've done, which is. Which is quite well established and actually brings in a lot more solar and snips than a more localised approach. So it would be helpful if, if, um, Mr. Betts can just point out sort of the, um, the policy that he's referencing as you've asked. Um, so that we can just understand what it is that, um, the information is needed for, and then we can make sure that if we are able to provide that, it's as tailored as possible for what the purpose is.

01:27:01:11 - 01:27:22:29

Okay. Thank you. Well, I think you're both going to provide us with responses and hopefully in conjunction with the ongoing discussions on statements of common ground, those elements can be brought together to give all parties greater clarity. So hopefully that will be the way it progresses. Um.

01:27:27:04 - 01:27:47:06

So if that goes on to the second point, um, just seeking views then on the parties, on the suitability of the search undertaking consideration of alternatives in seeking to minimize the loss of of BMV. Again, I'll come to the councils in the first instance to see, uh, if there's any points that you would wish to raise in that respect.

01:27:54:13 - 01:28:19:15

Alison Richards, uh, for Lancashire County Council. Um, looking at, um, the data provided it, um, and the, uh, alternatives chapter, it appears that these Midlands distribution network area was favoured due to irradiance and topography. Um, and that Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire both have large areas of undeveloped land and.

01:28:21:18 - 01:28:38:12

What we were concerned about is that talking about, as you said, about this is a national project. Why was it focused on East Midlands and Nottinghamshire. So the East Midlands, without discounting areas of lower value of land elsewhere.

01:28:41:25 - 01:28:45:13

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Betts.

01:28:47:05 - 01:29:18:14

Simon Betts, Newark and Sherwood District Council. Um, what I would like to say is that the alternatives consideration from my perspective, focuses more on the constraints and the issues considered. It doesn't necessarily provide information on alternative, uh, sites or areas from a spatial perspective that have been considered and discounted. So from our point of view, it is it is lacking in that regard.

01:29:23:09 - 01:29:31:03

So is there something specific that you would want the applicant to do to help assist in Clarifying that position.

01:29:38:13 - 01:30:15:17

Simon Betts, Newark and Sherwood District Council. Well, I suppose ultimately we're talking about a high level loss of BMV land. So if if the applicant was able to present areas of land, um, that have been considered previously, and there may be other reasons that, uh, alternative sites have been ruled out. Um, I suppose what we're getting at is are there any other areas that are at lower, lower value, um, agricultural land that could have accommodated the scheme, um, rather than the scheme that we've ended up with.

01:30:15:19 - 01:30:49:28

So I think there's there's a, there's a lack of information about what those areas or um, sites are. At the moment, I think we've got an approach to the applicant explaining how they've considered it and the areas and the issues they've taken into account in formulating a scheme in an area that as part of that screening exercise. Where are the other areas of lands that have been considered and discounted that may have been resulted in a lower amount of BMV loss?

01:30:51:18 - 01:30:55:00

Okay. Thank you. Then come to Mr. Griffiths.

01:30:56:02 - 01:31:02:13

Mr. Coleman. Thank you. I'm going to introduce Mrs. Sarah Price from DWP to to respond to the question.

01:31:04:26 - 01:31:50:04

Thank you, Sarah Price on behalf of the applicant. Um, thank you for the questions raised. Um, I'll, I'll come on to the applicant's approach. And obviously in previous issues, issue specific hearings. Um, and the obviously written summary following that, we have set out the applicant's overall site

selection process,. the first thing I would do just before turning to the points raised is. Is just to draw attention to MPs on three again, and what that says about site selection and agricultural land and paragraph 2.1.29, which makes it clear there that, um, land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of a site location.

01:31:50:06 - 01:32:13:12

But applicants should, where possible, utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Um and the where the proposed use of such land has been shown to be necessary. That poorer quality land should be preferred to the higher quality land. And that's the approach that the applicant has followed. Um,

01:32:15:02 - 01:32:53:19

going to the how the the applicant has considered, um, lower quality agricultural land within the study area. Um, and sort of first coming back to the principles of site selection and the, um, the grid connection, um, needs to be a starting point. And that's been established as an appropriate starting point by, um, all of the solar nips determined to date. So hymenium is our starting point, and that that is why we haven't considered a sort of further national basis in terms of looking at the site.

01:32:53:21 - 01:33:26:16

And the applicant initially looked ten kilometres from, um, the grid connection. And through the further information that's been presented at deadline to in relation to the, um, the sequential test, which I know will come on tomorrow for flood risk. We've also presented that information across a 15 kilometre, um, study area. So I thought it might be useful if it's helpful just to get one of the plans up from the sequential test assessment that shows, um, uh, agricultural land mapping as well.

01:33:26:18 - 01:33:31:11

And that's at rep 2080, which we'll just bring up on the screen.

01:33:32:28 - 01:33:34:24

I'm sorry, I didn't quite catch the ref.

01:33:34:26 - 01:33:37:24

Sorry. That's rep two zero 80.

01:33:38:02 - 01:33:38:23

Thank you.

01:33:39:23 - 01:34:37:09

So this plan is right at the end of that report. Um, and with reference to the sequential test for flood risk. But it does show, uh, the study area and the agricultural land grades as set out by a relatively high level. But the published available information from Defra and Natural England and what that shows across the ten kilometer and 15 kilometer distance from the point of connection, is that there is a very large amount of grade three, um, a significant chunk of grade two towards the west of the study area, which the applicant discounted through favouring the use of lower grade agricultural land, and then some swathe of grade four, broadly coinciding with ecological designations along the River Trent.

01:34:37:21 - 01:35:10:12

So this was set out in our um written summary for issue specific hearing one. Um, but those grade four areas were considered not appropriate for solar development because of those ecological designations. And also some of them coincided with proximity to villages, um, and heritage designations as well. Um, so the applicant sought to initially select a site which reduced the level of best and most versatile agricultural land.

01:35:10:20 - 01:35:43:11

And they then went to survey that land. And clearly, to go onto people's land to survey it, you need to have agreement from the landowners to do so. And so that can't be carried out across a sort of ten kilometres. 10km or 15km study area. And what they found was clearly that there was reasonably high levels of grade three across that grade three compared to grade three B, and those um figures are set out in the application documents. Um, there's sort of sorry, I'm a planner.

01:35:43:13 - 01:36:10:14

So I will say this is, um, not my professional area of expertise, and we have a soil specialist on the call as well. But, um, the advice that I was given from our professional team in relation to soils was that the soil characteristics of this area are such that if the site was located on another part of grade three, it would be likely that it would have similar levels of grade three A and three B, as we found in relation to the order limits.

01:36:12:15 - 01:36:13:05

Thank you sir.

01:36:14:09 - 01:36:15:10

Okay. Thank you.

01:36:26:17 - 01:36:33:16

Okay, um, I'll move on then to the next item on the agenda. Um,

01:36:35:09 - 01:36:59:18

just to seek a further explanation. Um, the evidence available to support management of soil health through the lifetime of the project and the obligations to secure returning the land to its current condition or or agricultural status, I suppose, and how those, um, obligations are secured through the draft DCO.

01:37:01:11 - 01:37:40:22

Um, now, Natural England in there, uh, up to 100 response and respect to soil health. Um, make reference to the British Society of Soil Science publication. Um, and note that that's something that is still under discussion between yourselves and Natural England, whether it should be referenced within the details that you're providing to us. Um, but equally and three I know makes reference, I think, to the Defra guidance, which is what you have sought to rely upon.

01:37:40:24 - 01:38:11:18

So what I really need clarification from you. Um, particularly if ultimately Natural England and yourselves don't get to an agreed position is what is the distinction between the two documents? And,



uh, why should we rely upon one rather than the other? Is there something extra being brought to the table that the document that Natural England refers to?

01:38:15:09 - 01:38:22:29

For the applicant. I have two of our experts from Ada's online. I think it will be Mr. Kirkhill who will respond on this one.

01:38:24:17 - 01:38:26:23

Yes, looks like it. Thanks, Mr. Hill.

01:38:27:14 - 01:38:31:18

Okay, back to my camera. Yeah. Kirkhill for the respondent. Um, I'm.

01:38:31:20 - 01:38:34:06

I'm not sure which, uh, top of my head, what document.

01:38:34:09 - 01:38:34:24

I.

01:38:35:00 - 01:38:35:24

Have referred.

01:38:35:26 - 01:38:36:11

To.

01:38:36:13 - 01:38:37:03

But.

01:38:37:05 - 01:38:39:08

If they referred to a BSc.

01:38:39:10 - 01:38:39:25

Document.

01:38:39:27 - 01:38:40:18

I imagine that.

01:38:40:20 - 01:38:42:23

BSc document then just.

01:38:42:25 - 01:38:44:17

Refers to the Defra document.

01:38:44:19 - 01:38:46:26

But if someone could form forward me.

01:38:46:28 - 01:38:47:13

That.

01:38:47:15 - 01:38:48:27

That reference, I can certainly check.

01:38:48:29 - 01:38:49:14

That.

01:38:49:16 - 01:38:51:21

Out. But the, the standards that are.

01:38:51:23 - 01:38:52:08

Quoted.

01:38:52:10 - 01:38:52:25

Are like.

01:38:52:27 - 01:38:53:12

B sort of.

01:38:53:14 - 01:38:54:02

Well-established.

01:38:54:04 - 01:38:57:18

Standards that have been existing in various um.

01:38:57:20 - 01:38:58:08

Best practice.

01:38:58:10 - 01:38:59:01

Guidelines.

01:38:59:03 - 01:38:59:18

Over.

01:38:59:20 - 01:39:47:07

The, over the decades. It's uh, I think rep one 107 and it was updated at rep two 100. And naturally they were making reference to, as I say, British Society soil science publication. Um, it may well be that, uh, a written response will be sufficient to explain. Yeah. You know, the the distinctions between them, uh, if there are distinctions. But it's really trying to understand whether in making reference to that document, additional protections would arise or different measures be undertaken to protect the soil that otherwise would not be, uh, undertaken.

01:39:47:09 - 01:40:10:01

So it's just, uh, that level of detail that we're, uh, after, uh, in understanding the distinction between what Natural England have said in their risk register and relative to what you've said in your agricultural land classification. And then the ES assessment on, uh, land and soils.

01:40:10:18 - 01:40:11:08

Yeah. Okay.

01:40:11:10 - 01:40:12:01

Cooker for the.

01:40:12:03 - 01:40:12:18

For.

01:40:12:20 - 01:40:13:05

The.

01:40:13:07 - 01:40:16:02

Applicant. Yeah, I'm sure we can address that in a written response.

01:40:16:17 - 01:40:17:12

Thank you.

01:40:20:23 - 01:41:04:24

Um, moving on. In terms of, um, the commitment to returning the land to the condition that it, uh, currently has, there's some slight discrepancies, I think, within the documentation that's been provided to us to date. So, um, chapter six of the. Yes, at para six 1015. Um, and it's now six 1017. In revision, two states at the point of decommissioning, the likely significant effect will be similar to construction, although will be less intrusive as cables, piles and other below ground infrastructure is proposed to remain in place.

01:41:04:27 - 01:41:42:06

Now, that seems to me to contradict what, um, We'd understood what was going to happen in respect of piles. Um, but, uh, it's hard to see how you'd be able to utilize the land for agriculture if all the piles were to remain. So I like clarity on on that, but also going further. Um, chapter eight Land and Soils talks about underground cables may remain in situ, which doesn't reference piles at all.

01:41:42:10 - 01:42:21:14

And chapter five, in the description of the proposed development says, uh, with regard to agriculture, it will limit the disturbance and impact of soil quality. And again, that's talking about the decommissioning element. So just making sure that the various documents come together, uh, consistently and then align with the outline decommissioning and environmental management plan. Um, because of revision three, make references again, something slightly different, because that now then says um at paragraph 2.2.2.

01:42:22:06 - 01:42:22:26

Um.

01:42:25:20 - 01:42:57:06

Buried on site, low voltage cables would be removed, buried into connecting cables. Medium voltage would either be removed or left in situ, providing the depth of installation was below 0.9m. Then goes on to say the majority of the site would be returned to the landowner after decommissioning, and will be available for its original use. So I think it would be helpful to get clarity, um, on various elements that but also consistency within that.

01:42:57:08 - 01:43:31:12

So is there a definition of low, medium and high voltage if that's going to be the distinction? Um, and what is the majority? Because 51% is the majority. And that's clearly not the intention. So would it be better if that document actually makes reference to an expected Hector to be returned, um, or a specified minimum? So I know there's quite a lot of elements to that, but can you assist.

01:43:31:26 - 01:43:50:25

For the applicant? Yes. The distinguishing point is the depth. So, um, everything up to 0.9m in depth would be removed at decommissioning the, um, cabling that is under that depth. And that's the depth that allows for continued agricultural use. And that's agreed by Natural England in their response. I think there was a question.

01:43:51:01 - 01:43:51:16

Um.

01:43:51:18 - 01:44:25:00

On that, that they've responded to a deadline to. So they've agreed that as well. Um, if there's inconsistency between our document will definitely look, look at that to make sure that they're aligned and that we're not there's no confusion in that respect. But um, that's definitely the position Um, I think in terms of the text you mentioned about the majority, I think it sounded as if perhaps the majority meant, um, land would be returned to agricultural use rather than be returned at all. Um, but again, we will look at we've got those references so we can make sure that all of those are clear and consistent.

01:44:25:03 - 01:44:31:00

Um, but yes, that's that's the very simple point. It's it's based on the, on the distance below ground.

01:44:31:18 - 01:44:44:04

So, so the reference to the different voltages within paragraph 2.2.2 of the outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan is potentially misleading is it's more to do with the depth.

01:44:45:22 - 01:44:57:16

Um, I think it's probably because the lower voltage ones would be more likely to be above the 0.9. But yes, it will make it clear that it's related to depth. Um, it's not related to voltage.

01:44:59:00 - 01:45:02:20

Okay. Thank you. And in terms of piles.

01:45:05:21 - 01:45:08:03

Yes, everything up to 0.9m.

01:45:14:21 - 01:45:18:15

We obviously don't have any details of the specific piles, but.

01:45:21:28 - 01:45:35:08

So the pile would be removed either in because it just comes out in one go, or you might be leaving elements of powers if they are below 0.9. Is that is that correct?

01:45:35:16 - 01:45:50:23

Ah, so I'm going to quickly stray outside my legal expertise here. So I think what we'll do is we've got the various references you've given us. We'll take it away in writing and make sure that it's consistent across both the references and all our other documents, so that we're very clear, so that there's a clear understanding of what's proposed.

01:45:51:18 - 01:46:07:06

I think what I'm getting to is trying to get a commitment within your documentation, and whether it's the DCO or Are supporting as to the status and the quality of the land. Uh.

01:46:09:16 - 01:46:23:29

Effectively meeting the current status and condition, or better. Um, and that the works that you undertake will facilitate that and then commit to it happening.

01:46:25:12 - 01:46:58:08

Thank you. So, Miss Coleman, for the applicant. So our outline sole management plan. And Mr. Hill might talk through some of this detail and sets out the actual, um, measures or actions that would be taken upon decommissioning to ensure that the current condition is returned. There's also a section in section ten of the um outlined soil management plan in terms of monitoring and aftercare, which sets out procedures that would make sure that, um, that those, um, that quality of that land and those grades and soil properties had been restored to the same status as prior to the scheme.

01:46:58:10 - 01:47:05:00

So if it's helpful for Mr. Hill to talk through some more detail of how that's achieved, than he can certainly do that, if that would be helpful.

01:47:05:06 - 01:47:40:10

I think it would be, but perhaps, uh, um, greatest need, if you like, is that the decommissioning plan, the soil management plan, align with each other because ultimately they need to be enforceable. And if one contradicts the other, it seems to me that the authority could be left in limbo. Um, with you saying, well, I don't have to do it because I've said here, I don't have to do it. So I need to be making sure that they are aligned so that they do achieve what you're saying they will achieve.

01:47:41:15 - 01:47:47:19

Yes. That's understood. And we'll we'll definitely do that check and make any consequential amendments.

01:47:48:18 - 01:47:53:11

Thank you, Mr. White. I know you have your hand up, so I'll come to you.

01:47:56:07 - 01:48:45:03

Hi. Thank you very much. Um, we submitted a document about, uh, this area, about this point, nine meters in the cables that would be left in situ. Um, on the 21st of August. Um, forgive me for not knowing the answer to this, but, um, one, we weren't sure what happens to that document. Now, is it followed up on or is it, uh, is it part of what you will be looking at and not necessarily following up with us? Um, the other part of this, uh, was from what we understood, uh, and it was a little sort of, um, we weren't totally happy with the answer we were getting from the developers about, uh, low voltage, medium voltage, which was left in the ground.

01:48:45:05 - 01:49:19:07

From what we understood, the low voltage ones would be that would be the ones that are connecting or the solar panels up. And they would they would naturally be, uh, clipped under the solar panels. There'll be lots of those, of course. Um, but they will come up when the solar panels get removed. Uh, the cables that would be left in the ground at 0.9m. Ah, the the bulk of the cables, which could go over 1000km, um, maybe 1200 kilometers, based on, uh, similar solar farms.

01:49:19:12 - 01:49:50:27

Uh, which works out to nearly 8000 tons of plastics and metals that will be left in the ground. Um, and so we just wanted to point that out. Um, and wondering if this was going to be followed up. We submitted a 14 page document also explaining the scientific reports that are coming out. Um, are debunking this 0.9m. No effect on agricultural soil myths. And we wonder if that was if this was going to be followed up.

01:49:51:27 - 01:50:22:06

I think the submission you're talking to. But you can clarify me if I'm wrong because you're speaking from with several hats is the one that's come from South Clifton Parish Council. No, we did get involved in that. It was the one submitted from the action group in my name. I can give you a reference if you need it. I think, um, if it's come in and it's, uh, you've got the reference, the exam library reference, and it's coming at deadline two, then I'm sure the applicant will be responding at deadline three.

01:50:22:08 - 01:50:59:09

So it's not it won't just disappear into a void if that's your, your, your concern, which we would, we would expect to see a written response to that from the applicant. And you may not be able to see but they are nodding their heads in confirmation. Just just to clarify that what happens if there's no, uh, if from there if we because if, if we get a response from them that we're not happy with what happens at that point, or ultimately if there are two parties in disagreement, and I unfortunately expect that that's probably likely to be the case.

01:50:59:12 - 01:51:43:20

We, as an examining authority, need to look at both parties evidence and come to a view as to which side of the argument we would sit in addressing our recommendation to the Secretary of State. So what? We will be looking for clarity from yourselves and the applicant is, uh, a clearer picture as we can. As the differences between you and why those differences are what they are, so that we can make as clear an understanding as to your respective positions and the scientific basis of what you're relying upon.

01:51:44:07 - 01:51:55:09

Um, so that we can give a clearer picture to the Secretary of State as to, uh, what our view is relative to those different perspectives.

01:51:57:04 - 01:52:30:28

Do you mind if I ask an additional question? No. By all means. Um, going back to this and about the loss of agricultural land and plastics and all that sort of thing. Um, the obviously there's a substantial infrastructure across this site. Uh, best substations over cabling and all the access roads and everything. Um, I do have a question about why some of this would be built, and I didn't know.

01:52:31:07 - 01:52:40:21

Um, I do have a point I wanted to raise, and I don't know if this is the right time or whether it's to, um, later on down your sort of list, if you like.

01:52:42:12 - 01:53:09:06

Well, I think we're getting towards with today's agenda. So if it's related to agricultural land and soils. Now is the time, I think. okay, I'm taking. You're taking into consideration the infrastructure that's being built and the loss of agricultural land and everything. This is in relation to the solar farm. Uh, of course, the one of the solar farm. If some of this infrastructure isn't solely about the solar farm is less important.

01:53:12:12 - 01:53:50:22

Um, you'll need to explain, rather than asking me a cryptic question, I'm afraid. Okay. That's fine. Um, the battery energy storage systems are massive. Uh, I think we're. I don't think we've been told. What how big they would be. Uh, in effect, they would be the largest in Europe if it was built. Um, I think there was a talk of 740MW, which is the the size of the solar capacity. Um, our point is that, uh, compared to other solar farms, which normally base best capacity on between 10 and 30% of the actually solar capacity.

01:53:50:24 - 01:54:22:01

This is could be much, much larger than that. And it's not actually going to be used to generate, uh, power from the, uh, from the solar panels. A big part of the year would be used for arbitrage. So it'll be charged through external power sources, uh, which we don't know. And then sold back to the grid the next day. It's a massive, uh, uh, way that solar developers can make money up to £100,000 a day, possibly looking at the figures.

01:54:22:07 - 01:54:52:12

Uh, and of course, that's that would they wouldn't even need to be plugged into the solar panels. And looking at the massive scale of this and how it is so much bigger than, uh, comparable solar farms

across Europe, for instance, this country, unfortunately, is different. We're building a massive bestiary, which, just to give you some perspective. It would be a third of the quarter To of the entire solar base in Germany. That's just this one application. So that would be a third of the German.

01:54:52:14 - 01:55:25:15

So the better capacity just here. Uh, so there's a lot going on here and massive infrastructure build. And it's not all about saving power from the solar panels. It's about also about arbitrage and making overnight money from cheap electricity. I wonder if that was relevant. I'm not sure it's directly relevant to the agriculture topic, but we did get some detail of that earlier today when we were talking about, uh, the best with regard to compulsory acquisition and the quantum of land.

01:55:25:20 - 01:55:38:15

So, um, we did get greater clarity, uh, in that respect. But I'd like to really just focus on agriculture at the moment. Um, so, uh.

01:55:40:18 - 01:56:15:03

Uh, are there any submission to you? Sorry, sorry. Should I make a written submission to you on this point? By all means, if you wish to. And then, um, clearly again, the applicant will have the opportunity to respond in due course. Um, I would say to any interested party. Written submissions are clearly key, and that you have the opportunity at various deadlines to provide the submissions you wish to, and then the applicant will have an opportunity to respond.

01:56:15:09 - 01:56:17:26

And ultimately, we will then, uh,

01:56:19:18 - 01:56:39:24

consider those and they will help inform our report to the Secretary of State. So, um, by all means, include that as part of your submission, Mr. White. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Um, does the applicant wish to make any further response.

01:56:40:14 - 01:57:31:28

For the applicant? I'll just respond very briefly, but in terms of the 0.9 metres. That's obviously, um, the practice, the current practice. And as I said, that's been agreed by Natural England. We did set out at the specific hearing one and that's in our written summary. Rep 1077 page 32, that there is a mechanism in the damp reflecting that that decommissioning will happen in some many years in the future, so that if there is a change in the industry practice and guidance and and what's established is being acceptable at that time, then there is the mechanism there for, for example, if it means cables who move to a deeper depth, that sort of thing, or as we've said, the cables removed entirely, there is the mechanism there to do that and that that approval has to be done by the relevant planning authority in consultation with, um, the Environment Agency, I think Natural England as well.

01:57:32:00 - 01:58:06:07

Um, and I know on um, other projects where a similar approach has taken, they've been perfectly happy with that approach. Um, I think the um, the subsequent point about the best, as you indicate it, sort of straight into the associate development point, which we've discussed this morning, and we will be following up some of the actions from the compulsory acquisition hearing with a note in that



respect. We've also responded in detail to a lot of the points mentioned there in response to question 1.0.2, deadline two, which which deals with a few of those points, including the, um, the ancillary services and grid balancing, that sort of aspect.

01:58:06:09 - 01:58:08:05

So I won't I won't get into that further now.

01:58:08:28 - 01:58:17:24

Thank you. So I'd just then seek finally um, are there any final points? Mrs. Fox?

01:58:18:19 - 01:58:52:29

Thank you sir. Heather Fox, resident of North Clifton. I've submitted a document for deadline to. It's including information from a report commissioned by the Welsh Government. Specifically, it's commissioned from um Ceska Das by the Welsh Government in 2023 specifically to deal with the impact of solar farms on the health of soils and the reversibility once hit. Decommission. Um, the most devastating, devastating was the compaction.

01:58:53:01 - 01:59:24:09

That's what they said. The extraction of piles can be complex because they break. They also contribute to corrosion. But the zinc zinc comes from the corrosion if they use galvanized piles. That's a further complication of the soil health because that affects microbial activity. Um, and any benefit, any alleged benefit accrued joined the term of carbon capture or soil structure improvement is mostly destroyed at decommissioning.

01:59:27:29 - 01:59:29:13

Okay. Thank you.

01:59:29:15 - 01:59:30:25

I thought that was relevant, sir.

01:59:30:28 - 01:59:49:18

It is. It is very relevant. And, um. And I've noted, um, the report that you submitted and the link to it, and obviously we'll be expecting a response from the applicant at the next deadline. But whether you wish to make any response in light of what Mrs. Fox has said this afternoon.

01:59:49:24 - 02:00:01:02

I did mention previously that Mr. Hill could talk to some of the techniques which will cover the compaction point, and I can see that he's got his hand up. Um, probably been in there quite patiently for a while, so I'll hand it over to Mr. Hill.

02:00:01:11 - 02:00:02:09

Okay. Thank you.

02:00:03:14 - 02:00:37:19

Yeah. Hello. Um, Kirkhill from the applicant. My camera doesn't seem to be wanting to turn on. Perhaps I'm just not good looking enough, I'm afraid. Oh, yeah. Here we go. Right. Um, yeah. I'm

obviously aware of the report that, um, was referred to there, and I think I think my probably my name is on there as QA as well. Um, yeah, it was a bit of research that we did for, for the Welsh Government. Uh, it's we're still in early days with, with solar farms. And that's part of the issue that we don't know how the piles are going to be taken out and what type of piles panels they used.

02:00:37:21 - 02:01:14:23

And so there was a there was a lot of a lot of vagaries. But in essence, the scale of the construction activities is is pretty minor compared to other contemporary works like cross-country pipelines and other cable activities, which are, you know, larger cables and, and so forth, or even just temporary compounds for the building sites. So compaction definitely is the biggest risk, but is, you know, usually reversible is particularly if the soil management plan is followed correctly and soils are handled during the soil moisture conditions for that suitable for that particular operation.

02:01:15:03 - 02:01:47:02

Um, with regards to zinc, I'm not quite sure what, um, what the the piles will be coated with if zinc or anything else is used. But it was a kind of a precautionary approach really, in the report as to the obstacles and problems that that could arise from different materials that are that are used, for example, in the past there has been an issue with with lead from the paint on pylons and things like that, but it's a been a localised issue and there are sort of ways of reviewing that.

02:01:47:08 - 02:02:10:00

Um, I don't know if uh, so you, you had any specific questions. You said you're obviously aware of the Welsh Government report already. I don't know if there's any point that you particularly want me to expand on, really. But in essence, it also says in that Welsh Government report that the you know, if the soil is handled carefully, it is reversible and it is a temporary activity.

02:02:12:03 - 02:02:30:17

I think the key is going to be the soil management plan. And then obviously also your choice of how you operate both during construction, subsequent operation and then the decommissioning soil management plan comes together to

02:02:32:12 - 02:03:08:10

give the As much confidence as possible that the soil is going to be returned to the condition it currently is, or better, which I think was the point I was making earlier. Um, I think it would be helpful, uh, for us, um, and for Mrs. Fox if when you provide your response to today, but also the written response to the comment that she's made. Um, she's obviously made some very detailed points about the concerns that that Welsh Government report raises.

02:03:08:12 - 02:03:42:22

And so it would be helpful to understand from you, uh, you know, how you, you know, the concerns that they raised, how you're going to address them to minimize the risks of consequential effects from this scheme, whether it's through pile choice, minimising compaction or whatever it happens to be. Yeah. And then obviously making sure that those elements are followed through into the soil management plan and the decommissioning plan so that we have that overall complete picture.

02:03:43:22 - 02:03:58:13

Yeah. For the applicant. Yeah. I mean, many of the considerations in the soil management plan are exactly the same kind of considerations that we have to take when we're farming land in the first place as well. But yeah, I'm quite happy to respond to that in in writing.

02:04:00:16 - 02:04:01:22

Thank you. Thank you.

02:04:09:14 - 02:04:17:14

I wasn't seeing your hand raised there. Thank you sir. Sam Franklin for Newark and Sherwood. I wonder if I could.

02:04:17:16 - 02:04:18:03

Just.

02:04:18:05 - 02:04:18:20

Ask.

02:04:18:22 - 02:04:19:07

The.

02:04:19:09 - 02:04:19:25

Applicant.

02:04:19:27 - 02:04:20:12

To.

02:04:20:14 - 02:04:20:29

Give.

02:04:21:01 - 02:04:22:01

Us a little bit more detail.

02:04:22:18 - 02:04:23:06

Obviously not.

02:04:23:08 - 02:04:23:23

Now.

02:04:23:25 - 02:04:24:10

But in.

02:04:24:12 - 02:04:24:27

Their response.

02:04:24:29 - 02:04:28:06

On soil health. Um, they haven't.

02:04:28:08 - 02:04:28:23

Really.

02:04:28:25 - 02:04:29:16

Defined it in the soil.

02:04:29:18 - 02:04:30:03

Management.

02:04:30:05 - 02:04:30:24

Plan.

02:04:30:26 - 02:04:32:05

And it would be helpful.

02:04:32:07 - 02:04:32:22

I think.

02:04:32:24 - 02:04:37:02

For us, when we come to look at the scheme, to see how they are proposing.

02:04:37:04 - 02:04:37:20

To measure.

02:04:37:22 - 02:04:38:21

Soil health.

02:04:38:23 - 02:04:39:08

What.

02:04:39:10 - 02:04:39:27

The baseline.

02:04:39:29 - 02:04:40:14

Is.

02:04:40:16 - 02:04:41:01

And some.

02:04:41:03 - 02:04:41:26

Kind of schedule of.

02:04:41:28 - 02:04:42:21

Condition of the.

02:04:42:23 - 02:04:43:08

Land.

02:04:43:10 - 02:04:43:25

Now.

02:04:44:24 - 02:04:46:05

And then. How they propose.

02:04:46:07 - 02:04:46:22

To.

02:04:46:24 - 02:04:47:14

Maintain.

02:04:47:28 - 02:04:50:23

The soil health post the decommissioning.

02:04:50:25 - 02:04:51:10

In order.

02:04:51:12 - 02:04:51:27

To.

02:04:51:29 - 02:04:52:14

Keep the benefit.

02:04:52:16 - 02:04:59:23

That is claimed. Or is it just a temporary benefit whilst the scheme is in operation, and as.

02:04:59:25 - 02:05:00:10

It's.

02:05:00:12 - 02:05:08:11

Been suggested from over there, that it will be lost once the scheme is over, because I think that's quite an important aspect.

02:05:08:13 - 02:05:09:28

That we need clarified.

02:05:10:00 - 02:05:12:23

Thank you. Thank you.

02:05:15:04 - 02:05:32:23

Mr.. The applicant. Yes, we can provide that. I did also mention previously section ten of the Soil Management Plan, which deals with the aftercare in terms of ensuring return to the original condition and that sort of thing. But yes, we can expand on that in writing as requested. I don't know if Mr. Hill looks like he might want to.

02:05:33:09 - 02:06:14:00

Yeah, let me say yes, I did forget. So I cook for the applicant. I did forget to address that point that was raised earlier. I mean, yes, soil health is is a the benefits of putting agricultural land under grass and for a period of time is a sort of well understood practice since since the dawn of agriculture. Really. And I did submit, um, some references to research document that, uh, that backs that up, including one based around a solar farm as well. Um, but it is correct that the, the, the soil is principally based about building up of organic matter levels and the health benefits that derive from that.

02:06:14:03 - 02:07:04:29

Um, but it does find its own level according to use. So the organic matter level will build up over time, because you'll be taking off less organic matter with your crops, and more will be incorporated in the soil. And so over the period of the lifetime, You get greater in organic matter, greater nutrient content, greater species diversity and soil structure, drainage, infiltration, and all these other benefits and silence alone. But when you do take out the the piles and put it back in our culture and it goes back into cultivation, yes it will. The soil organic matter will deteriorate to it slowly over time until it finds that its level for that individual use, depending on what that land management is at that point in time, which of course, you know, in 60 years at the time, you know, farming could have changed and there could be more minimal cultivation all the rest of it, but it will find its plateau for the management that it's that it's under.

02:07:08:03 - 02:07:11:02

Okay. Thank you. Um,

02:07:12:20 - 02:07:35:27

Mr. Weiss, I know your hand is raised again. Is there an additional point you were wishing to raise on soil health? Uh, yeah. I just want to again, just to clarify that we dispute what I was saying very strongly. And after this to do with the very cabling, the plastics and everything, and hopefully this, uh, I'm hoping this will be addressed at some point.

02:07:38:05 - 02:07:41:03

Okay. Thank you. That's understood.

02:07:51:03 - 02:07:55:11

Mr. Hill. Have you got a further point you were wanting to to raise?

02:07:55:13 - 02:08:27:12

Yeah, it was just that point. It dates back to, um. Sorry. Mr. health on the applicant. The point about bank plastic. I mean, the only impact on, uh, on agricultural productivity, uh, of plastic in the soil that I'm aware of as any researcher has been, I think, has been more to do with recycled municipal waste

that's been composted and applied to land. And there's I think there's been some research that says it may, uh, Impede some nutrient uptake from for the crops then.

02:08:27:14 - 02:09:01:06

But I say that I don't think it was necessarily conclusive. And also that is where the the material is applied to the surface of the soils incorporated within the topsoil, which is where all the nutrients are, or the plastic from the in the in the cable ducts that will be used in solar farm will be in the subsoil where there would be, where there's very little nutrient content uptake in anyway. So it wouldn't have that that impact. And we've got, you know, hundreds and hundreds of thousands of, uh, of plastic, uh, under our fields already with water mains and fuel drains and cables that have been there for the last 50 years.

02:09:01:08 - 02:09:09:10

And there's no implication or, um, hint that that's causing a reduction in, in crop, uh, crop performance.

02:09:11:12 - 02:09:55:18

Um, I don't want to open up the debate on this particular topic again at this time. Mister Hill, what I would ask is that you have a look at the representations that Mr. White has House made and uh, on behalf of both himself, but also the interest groups he represents and their South Clifton Parish Council. In addition, because each of them have raised some quite specific concerns about, um, plastics and various other elements being left in the ground, and I think it would be helpful to get a detailed response to that, so that, again, we have that clarity of understanding the difference of positions from both parties.

02:09:55:29 - 02:10:09:22

Um, so if I can ask you to do that as part of your response, uh, to today, um, I think it's likely to be on your to do list as an applicant in any event. But if I can just reaffirm that.

02:10:10:06 - 02:10:11:19

Okay. Thank you. Yeah, certainly.

02:10:11:29 - 02:10:31:23

Thank you, thank you, thank you very much. Thank you, thank you. So I think that probably brings us to the end of, um, Item three. So I just want to clarify that there's no further items or any other business that anyone would wish to raise. Mrs. Fox.

02:10:32:08 - 02:10:53:15

Thank you. So it's a question for yourself, actually. Um, Lincoln County Council also raised this, and I've raised it with Newark and Sherwood District Council. I don't understand the term, which is one reason why an area to the west of High Mountain was excluded simply on account of.

02:10:53:26 - 02:11:17:19

Wider sustainable development objectives in n five, eight, nine and ten. There's an. I've gone around in circles, sir, trying to find out what I asked. Mr. Betts, what are these wider sustainable development objectives? Because you go around in a circle. Is it simply the provision of solar farms?

02:11:22:12 - 02:11:26:13

I'll leave the applicant respond because it's their response to some of the points.

02:11:29:00 - 02:11:40:01

And also, I think it's probably something we'll touch on tomorrow on the hydrology to an extent, because it links into the sequential assessment response that we've, we've got. But Mr. Griffiths.

02:11:41:20 - 02:12:16:13

The applicant. Um, yes. I think the point is that, um, the site selection is driven by various different factors. So best and most versatile and being one of them flood risk and in um M3. So that's national policy statement. Um from for renewable energy infrastructure M3 there's a section on solar that sets out, um, things that should be considered in citing the um scheme. So it deals with irradiance, topography, um, proximity to grid connection, proximity to dwellings, um, um, agricultural land that I've just mentioned.

02:12:16:15 - 02:12:52:27

But also but it's always a balancing of all the environmental effects that we've been talking about today and tomorrow and in our environmental statement, because we have to apply a mitigation hierarchy to try and avoid and minimize effects across all environmental effects. So landscape, um, heritage ecology, the whole lot. So it's never it's always a balancing exercise of those various impacts. Um, and I think that's probably um, what I don't know from the expression on Mr. Fox's face, maybe that's not the question, but, um, perhaps if it's in writing, then we can answer it.

02:12:53:07 - 02:12:57:09

Um, more usefully than that. But maybe I've misunderstood. What? Your point.

02:12:59:27 - 02:13:14:14

There's the Fox resident of North Plympton. When I hear the phrase, y'know, wider sustainable development objectives, I assumed it was something that was going to be made development.

02:13:17:06 - 02:13:18:19

I think it's a

02:13:20:12 - 02:13:21:16

planning term

02:13:23:09 - 02:13:26:15

and they're not always helpful. Um, but.

02:13:26:21 - 02:13:31:14

Can I just ask? Sorry. Can you just refer me to you, the passage you're reading so I can look at the text?

02:13:32:15 - 02:13:34:22

You just switch your microphone on, please, Mr. Fox.



02:13:35:00 - 02:14:07:00

Beg your pardon, sir? On the post, hearing submissions on behalf of LK at DL one item five alternatives. El-Sisi remained concerned that submitting information does not demonstrate that the sequential test has been passed. There are areas in flood zone one within the search area, even assuming the applicant search is appropriate. El-Sisi reserves its position on the point. They have simply been dismissed based on their right. Other sustainable development principles. Actually, the phrase is a development.

02:14:07:16 - 02:14:12:13

Other sustainable sustainable development objectives in

02:14:14:00 - 02:14:18:20

One, five, eight, nine and ten. And so I've just gone round in circles with it.

02:14:19:15 - 02:14:26:10

Perhaps as Lincolnshire County Council wrote it, it might be as well for putting them on the spot.

02:14:26:12 - 02:14:56:24

So I think it will be relevant in tomorrow's discussion around the sequential circles. I have found the reference myself now, which, yes, relates to looking for lower risk, lower risk sites in areas of lower risk flood risk, but if there are other factors, would mean that a site in that area would otherwise be refused permission, basically. Um, so yes, it's 5.8.1 of and three are Ian one. Sorry. Um, which you may have said, but um, I think that's probably exactly what we'll get into tomorrow, just to build the anticipation.

02:15:07:14 - 02:15:33:29

Um, are you proposed to attend tomorrow? Okay. Well, no, that's absolutely fine. I think we'll leave that tomorrow, because I think we're going to get into the sequential test and the the balancing exercise that the applicant has undertaken. Um, so, uh, if I can leave that for now, um, and, uh, hopefully bring this hearing to an end.

02:15:34:02 - 02:15:38:22

No, sir. I want you to go home tonight to hammer it, but no, I can't. No, I can't.

02:15:40:04 - 02:16:06:14

Well, I hope nevertheless, you get a reasonable night. Um, and if there's no final points, then I will bring this hearing to an end. It's now just coming up to 7:00. Um, thank you all for your stamina, um, and your contributions and, uh, no doubt. See most of you tomorrow. So this hearing or this portion of the hearing is now closed. Thank you.