

File Name: OES_SEPT4_ISH2_PT5.mp4

File Length: 01:15:19

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:07:14 - 00:00:39:04

Okay. It's now a 2:15 and it's time for us to resume this issue. Specific hearing. Thank you. So, um, can I just check that the recording and the live streams recommenced? Yep. Thank you very much. So. And again, also just check that those who are online can see and hear as clearly. Super. Thank you. All right. We'll move then on to um the agenda on covering biodiversity and or ecology.

00:00:39:16 - 00:01:17:04

Excuse me. Uh, just really seeking additional clarification from the applicant. How your approach to a animal movement across the site, uh, is to be managed. And what elements of the DCO secure that planet approach? Now we note the response to our written question. 7.0 0.1 um, and you refer us to the appendix C of the vegetation removal plans of the Outline Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, which is Rep 1053.

00:01:17:10 - 00:01:27:05

I wonder if it's possible to have that shown on the screen, please. Um, just whilst that's being found. Um.

00:01:29:18 - 00:01:35:16

Oh, well. Wait. Oh, wait. Otherwise, the point I'm trying to make is going to get completely lost.

00:02:13:18 - 00:02:51:26

When you look at each of the sheets in in detail, I think you can see the proposed fence lines. But what it's very difficult to navigate through is where the gaps align, because you can't do it as a whole. So just as a simple request, is it possible to provide in a similar way to the illustrative master plan, a plan showing the route through the site that you anticipate animals are going to be able to follow so that we can see and understand more readily the connectivity across the site as a whole.

00:02:54:13 - 00:02:59:12

Thank you sir. I'm going to, um, introduce Doctor Alan Kirby from Logica to. To deal with these questions.

00:03:02:09 - 00:03:12:22

Allen Kirby, on behalf of the applicant. Um. Simple answer is yes. Um, what we'll try and do is highlight areas within and outside of a fence line. Um, so it's quite

00:03:14:20 - 00:03:37:00

easy to follow. Thank you. And I think the other detail point that was you gave in response was about the fence design, I think, as much as anything. Um, do we have the details of that, those fence designs to look at on a document that you could point us towards?

00:03:39:10 - 00:04:10:23

Allen Kirby, on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the the fence, it would be the typical sort of deer fencing as described in chapter five. Um, excuse me, what's being described in more detail is the, um, the entrances, if you like, for medium sized mammals, things like badgers, foxes, uh, brown hares, um, and even muntjac deer or likely fit through.

00:04:12:29 - 00:04:23:02

There's a specification on how those are usually built. They're usually built with a gate, um, as a badger gate. And Defra publishes a, uh,

00:04:24:17 - 00:05:00:16

part of the Countryside Stewardship. It has a prescription. Um, the only difference here is on request from one of the local authorities that we don't have the gate. We simply have a framed entrance to allow things to move in and out. So it would just be fitted to the standard wire mesh, um, uh, deer fencing. So the fencing as described in chapter five. And we saw on some of the visualisations yesterday, um, it would be that type of fence, except it would have small gaps around every 150m, as described in the environmental measure.

00:05:00:18 - 00:05:06:28

I think it's C9 in table 6.6 of the chapter six biodiversity.

00:05:08:19 - 00:05:40:18

Okay, so just to clarify that point is the intention then, that for each fence, every 150m, there will be that gap? And appreciate that you've made reference to where badger sets are closer. There may be closer together than that, but overall there will be a minimum of 150 meter separation between each of those, uh, larger gaps. Yes. Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, that's the intention.

00:05:41:06 - 00:05:51:28

Okay. Thank you. That's quite helpful. Um, I just then come to the councils to see if they have any additional points or concerns on any of those aspects.

00:05:54:02 - 00:06:14:23

Amy Rhodes. Nottinghamshire County Council. My only query would be with the fence locations that there is at the very edges of the fence, to buy any hedgerows to keep that linear connectivity and where animals will pass is that there are gaps in each of the edges and that's it. Thank you.

00:06:16:00 - 00:06:18:21

So when you say each of the edges, I'm not quite sure.

00:06:19:01 - 00:06:44:02

The very edge of the fetch. So if you've got a fence and it's next to a hedgerow, um, to keep the gaps open next to the hedge, because a lot of animals would use a hedge to get up and down for commuting. So it's just to keep that connectivity across the site by using the hedgerows and then making sure there's gaps in the fences for them to continue that connectivity. That makes sense. Sorry, not very technical.

00:06:44:07 - 00:07:25:27

No, no. That's fine. Um. It's helpful. Thank you. And again, are you able to confirm that? that's the intention. So Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant. So the final design would be, um, uh, described in the, uh, the landscape and Ecology Management plan when it's been detailed. Um, at deadline two, the Olymp was updated um, in section seven to describe um working in partnership with local authorities and uh, Natural England and others to have a steering group in terms of informing those things.

00:07:25:29 - 00:07:43:21

So the actual, um, alignment location of those gaps would be discussed and agreed at the time. And so there's no issue with putting those in in places as, as um, Notts County Council were just saying there along hedgerows.

00:07:45:21 - 00:08:19:19

Okay. Thank you. Um, okay then I think unless there's any other comments from any other parties. I'll move on to the sort of next point in looking at the surveys that have been undertaken and their suitability, and whether further work needs to be undertaken to ensure an appropriate level of understandings in place at this stage of the process, to ensure the Secretary of State can be fully informed to meet their obligations in respect of habitats regulations assessment and also protected sites and species.

00:08:19:28 - 00:08:33:24

Now, there was obviously quite a lot of updates provided at deadline too. So can I just come firstly to Nottinghamshire County Council to understand your latest position following those submissions. Thank you.

00:08:34:21 - 00:08:45:04

Amy Rhodes, Nottinghamshire County Council and we're happy with the level of survey effort, mostly happy with the level of survey effort now undertaken, especially in regards to breeding birds.

00:08:46:03 - 00:08:52:29

You say mostly. What are the detailed elements that would remain are remaining outstanding.

00:08:53:01 - 00:09:19:07

I think the main, the main one would be the bat activity, but we've had discussions with the applicant where we realized that the mitigation, even if more surveys were undertaken, would remain the same. So on that basis, although we would have preferred more surveys to be done, we are okay with what has been done and the level of mitigation proposed for bats.

00:09:20:13 - 00:09:22:02

Okay. Thank you.

00:09:25:05 - 00:09:27:17

I just come in to, uh.

00:09:30:14 - 00:09:41:18

Sorry, just struggling to read my notes. Uh, Newark and Sherwood, because you also expressed some concerns, uh, on this matter. So just see what your latest position is, please.

00:09:42:26 - 00:09:43:21

Yeah. Hayley Hurst.

00:09:43:24 - 00:09:44:29

Representing Newark and Sherwood.

00:09:45:01 - 00:10:04:09

District Council. Um, we're in the same position that we're we're happy with the level of survey that's been undertaken in terms of the mitigation provided. And any further surveys in terms of proportionality would not necessarily change the outcome of the mitigation requirements. And so, yeah, we're happy with the the survey effort to date.

00:10:05:03 - 00:10:06:28

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:10:10:10 - 00:10:12:08

And so um.

00:10:15:28 - 00:10:46:28

There's no despite the slight difference of views of the councils that have been previously expressed and the response that the applicant gave to the local impact report. And, um, make specifically reference to um page 52 of that report, and it's the applicant's reference, LA 57. Um, effectively, you're now content that the position has been clarified, um, as you've both stated. So I can probably move on.

00:10:48:20 - 00:11:02:18

Yes. Okay. Thank you. Um, does Nottinghamshire County Council still have ongoing concerns in respect of buffers to the local wildlife sites, or is that matter now also resolved?

00:11:06:12 - 00:11:19:20

I think that matter has been resolved in part of, um, our statement of common ground. I think the main issue was the buffer for the River Trent. I think that's been increased now to 16.

00:11:21:29 - 00:12:01:23

Okay. Well, I'll come to the applicant and seek that at the side of the on the position. Thank you. So, uh, Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant, um, at deadline one, the, uh, stand off to local wildlife sites was increased from 5m to 10m. Um, other than for an access track, um, alongside what? Um, I believe it's Westwood local wildlife site where an existing track already exists. Um, and in terms of the River Trent, it was a consistency point of some, um, standoffs to the River Trent were quoted as ten meters and others as 16.

00:12:01:25 - 00:12:06:19

It's been made consistent at 16m in line with the Environment Agency guidance.

00:12:09:05 - 00:12:10:17

Okay. Thank you.

00:12:13:05 - 00:12:27:09

So again, before I move on to my next point, is anyone else got any matters covering that particular topic that they would wish to raise. Thank you. Lincolnshire county Darren Clarke, Lincolnshire county Council. Um, it just goes back to the.

00:12:27:11 - 00:12:29:00

Point on adequacy.

00:12:29:02 - 00:12:31:07

Of surveys. Um, I think that.

00:12:31:09 - 00:13:05:27

We're generally in agreement with, um, other councils in terms of the level of survey effort that's been deployed and that there is sufficient information there to, to sort of to base decisions on There's sort of slight outstanding concern that we've got relates to whether breeding bird surveys, um, specifically picked up, um, presence of quail. Um, we have discussed this with the applicant, and the second point was on the great crested newt. There were certain ponds within the, um, the area of search, the survey area.

00:13:06:01 - 00:13:39:18

There was no access for surveys. Um, there are historic records of great crested newt in the area. Um, and it's just whether those, um, there is a residual risk of the presence of great crested newt discussions that we have had with the applicant are sort of have been positive. And I think we are of the opinion that this could probably be dealt with via requirements for pre commencement surveys and precautionary working method statements detailed in the camp. Just so it's worth making that point. And the applicant has indicated through meetings that we've had that that will be acceptable to them.

00:13:39:20 - 00:13:42:22

But just so it's worth having on record. Thank you.

00:13:43:04 - 00:14:00:22

Thank you. So are you content with the wording in the outline construction environmental Management plan and the requirement as they stand that they will secure those, uh, pre commencement works in line with what you're, uh, hoping for.

00:14:01:10 - 00:14:25:04

Darren Clarke for Lancashire County Council. Um, not at present. Um, we've asked for a specific reference to, to quail surveys because they wouldn't generally be picked up on a standard methodology, um, breeding bird survey because of the timing of their breeding activity around dusk.

Um, so we've asked for a specific reference for pre commencement surveys to, to be carried out in such a way that any breeding quail activity would be picked up.

00:14:26:04 - 00:15:07:20

Okay. Thank you. Can I come back to the applicant on that detail? Uh, Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant at Lincolnshire County Council, um, just stated, um, we're in positive discussions. And for both, um, quail and for great crested newts. Um, what we're seeking to do, um, for deadline three is first, um, make a minor, um, amendment to chapter six biodiversity in table 6.6, which is the list of environmental measures, and then also capture those within, um, the outline construction environmental management plan.

00:15:07:22 - 00:15:09:09

Um, in order to secure them.

00:15:12:23 - 00:15:17:04

It's not likely to be done at the next deadline then. Yes it is. Okay. Thank you.

00:15:26:29 - 00:16:10:01

Okay. Um, I'll then move on then in terms and I think again, we've got a positive answer to this in respect of the commitment to, uh, BNG and the assessment that Was uh undertaken. Um, and then requirement nine of the draft development consent order has now been revised, which now states it will secure a minimum of 50% biodiversity net gain in area based habitat units, a minimum of 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units for all of the authorised development during the operation of the authorised development.

00:16:10:03 - 00:16:18:21

So I just seek clarification now that that revised wording is something that the councils are content with.

00:16:22:10 - 00:17:05:13

Okay, I'm getting nods. So for the audio, yes. Thank you. So that's fine. I don't need to come back to the applicant on that. And then, um, reference was made to the habitat management and monitoring plan. Um, in, I think page 46 of the applicants response to relevant reps at D1, which was rep 1075 just for the applicant. Can you just let me know where this sits within the hierarchy plans and supporting documents? It doesn't obviously appear in appendix A to the response you gave as to, uh, um, those written questions in rep 204.

00:17:07:08 - 00:17:50:14

So Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant, um, so it's slightly confusing because it's called a plan, but it's it's a habitat management and monitoring plan based on a template created by Natural England, um, which is used typically to inform the almost day to day management of biodiversity net gain. What we did at deadline one was, um, add wording into the outline landscape and ecology Management plan to show how the relationship between biodiversity net gain, the Lemp and then the HMP, which is sort of a uh, a subordinate document to the lamp will will function.

00:17:51:03 - 00:18:27:00

So the lamp itself looks at the big picture, um, what will be created where uh, in general how that will be, you know, the planting plans, etc.. And then the HMP provides the additional sort of management detail. And it's also a live document that over the years will be updated with the management actions taken. And it allows then this steering group that is, is again mentioned in the latest version of the outline, Landscape and Ecology Management plan to plan for the future years.

00:18:27:02 - 00:18:52:26

Look at things like adaptive management. Should things be going um, not according to plan on on some particular habitats. So although it is a plan, it's not a not the HMP, the habitat management and management management plan. It's not in the same sense in terms of of how the securing mechanism works within the DCA. So it's secured through the lamp.

00:18:57:27 - 00:19:11:21

Okay. Um, so does the lamp make specific reference to this, this new document, if it's a document or as opposed to a plan. Yes it does. Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

00:19:14:24 - 00:19:23:02

I'm sorry I've got the paragraph reference. If it's if it's useful. Useful. It's in 7.1. 14.

00:19:27:15 - 00:19:30:22

And that's the outline landscape. Thank you.

00:19:40:11 - 00:20:12:27

Okay. So then that just leads me on to, I think the final point I've got on on these matters, which is, uh, in your response to first written questions, we sought clarification with regard to the quantity of land under environmental stewardship. And, um, in that response to Q 13 .0.3, it helpfully sets out the quantity of land, but doesn't provide us an explanation of how this has been taken into account in your calculation for biodiversity net gain.

00:20:12:29 - 00:20:56:08

So could you assist us on that, please? Sure. Thanks. Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant. So the way that the biodiversity net gain calculations, um, work following the guidance from Defra, it doesn't recognize the Countryside stewardship prescriptions Per se for them being there, but the habitat survey picks up. Should they have put in, um, you know, a particular type of, uh, field margin or manage for a particular type of grassland? All of those things are categorized, and they they form habitat descriptions that are then fed into the metric, the statutory biodiversity metric.

00:20:56:10 - 00:21:31:12

So, for example, if a farmer had winter bird cover, uh, which would be um, one type of margin that he might have countryside stewardship for that would be recorded during the habitat survey. That would have a higher value in the statutory biodiversity metric than if he had just left that margin. Um, as you know, as grass or plowed up to the hedge. And that is how it's reflected. So the value that the farmer is adding by taking those environmental measures is reflected.

00:21:31:14 - 00:21:42:20

it. But there isn't a direct link to say we. We looked at every countryside stewardship prescription and then added them into the metric. It's delivered through the habitat survey.

00:21:45:24 - 00:22:00:06

So helpful. Thank you. So can I just check then? Does any other party have any concerns or issues that they would wish to raise on any of the matters that we've covered on, on these topics?

00:22:02:04 - 00:22:08:06

No. Um, no one virtually either. Okay.

00:22:08:08 - 00:22:40:25

Thank you. Um, just before you move on, I know yesterday in the compulsory acquisition hearing, we did touch on being we took away an action just to come back in terms of, um, mitigation land versus land for being. Um, appreciate. That's an entirely different hearing. And and we do have the action. I don't want to prolong things any further. But if it's helpful, obviously I have Doctor Kirby here now, um, who can expand upon that in terms of generally, that the being is provided in areas that are already used for mitigation, but just sort of adding extra value to them. But would it be helpful for us to expand upon that now, or would it be.

00:22:40:27 - 00:22:41:17

The way it would?

00:22:41:19 - 00:22:42:23

Thank you. Okay.

00:22:44:05 - 00:23:19:03

Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant. So within the draft order limits, there is no area that has been defined specifically just to deliver biodiversity net gain. The areas, um, both within and around the uh, solar PV and other above ground infrastructure, as well as those areas that are derived for or outlined for mitigation outside of um, of areas with, uh, about above ground infrastructure.

00:23:19:05 - 00:23:50:26

Are there for the purpose of delivering either mitigation and compensation for other types of environmental concerns, and from a biodiversity perspective, That includes things such as um, providing, uh, improved habitat for skylark. So for those that will be displaced from the solar array, there is, um, locations that they can go to to breed, um, whilst whilst remaining in the area, as opposed to displacing them completely from the site.

00:23:53:09 - 00:24:02:20

So that in itself could be seen as a, as a positive consequence of the scheme in itself. So, um.

00:24:06:24 - 00:24:37:15

In terms of the importance of the species that are going to benefit, uh, should additional weight be given for your reference Skylark. But, uh, are there particular sensitive species which are going to benefit as a consequence that uh would facilitate greater weight being attributed to it, or is it not something that you would look at in that way? Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant.

00:24:37:17 - 00:25:27:09

So within, um, the ecological impact assessment, we have concluded a number of significant beneficial effects. And through the delivery of biodiversity net gain, we're also delivering a level of enhancement that is over and above what could be considered to be a minimum of at least 10%. I think from the start, we've always tried to, um, design in elements for local conservation priorities, um, with the idea that it's better to build those in from the start, thereby delivering better benefits and longer term benefits than to, um, uh, add additional things that, that stakeholders request.

00:25:27:11 - 00:26:16:17

And in that respect we've added things such as beetle banks, types of hedgerow size, hedgerow management, temporary scrapes, all elements that are there to drive um, increase in species diversity, increase in species abundance, um, providing better habitats, some of which are habitats of principal importance. You know, same thing as priority habitats and also, um, uh, providing for species that, uh, you know, from an example of birds might be on the British, the birds of conservation concern, Red list, things like turtle dove, things like gray partridge, uh, things like corn bunting, all habitats that, um, those type of birds, um, might use.

00:26:16:22 - 00:26:21:24

We would also expect to see an expansion of, um, uh,

00:26:23:24 - 00:26:57:25

legally protected species. Things such as water bowl. Through better ditch management and also through the provision of mink trapping. So there's a whole myriad of species, um, from invertebrates all the way through birds and mammals and herp tiles, which we would expect to have a benefit. It's true to say that there will be a small number of species that don't get on that well with solar farms such as Skylark, but we've provided the mitigation for those outside of the of the area where aboveground infrastructure would be provided.

00:27:01:10 - 00:27:14:19

Okay. Again that's helpful. Um, to the council's wish to come back on anything they've heard. Not obliged to it, but just obviously it's additional information. Thank you. Lincolnshire county.

00:27:15:10 - 00:27:51:11

Oh. Hayley Harris from Newark and Sherwood district Council. Um, it was just a comment on the habitat management and monitoring plan. Actually, it's the template. The Natural England template is a very technical document and it's currently under review in terms of its functionality. Um, so whilst it can be quite easily understood by an ecologist, at the end of the day, it's not ecologists that are going to be implementing the habitat creation on the ground necessarily. Um, there always is a bit of a risk having multiple documents that sort of have the same thing say the same thing.

00:27:51:13 - 00:28:28:25

So having a landscape and management plan and a habitat management monitoring plan. I'm not sure that I have a suggested alternative solution, but I do worry that if the Natural England template is used, it's very heavily focused on biodiversity, net gain, and not necessarily this holistic view of how these habitats are going to function for species, and obviously how they have to be managed in

slightly different ways, not just for being, but obviously for scarlet mitigation and whether perhaps the habitat management monitoring plan should be a slightly different document, not necessarily the actual template.

00:28:31:13 - 00:28:38:10

Okay. Thank you. Um, what's the applicant's view on that? Alan Kirby, on behalf of the applicant.

00:28:40:26 - 00:29:13:27

I think, uh, the applicant would be open to working with the the steering group as described in the outline landscape and the Ecology Management plan in section seven to create the document that would work best for that steering group to move forward. Um, the reason that we've, uh, currently described it as the Hmm Natural England template is, um, I'm not sure which stakeholder it was, but one of the stakeholders mentioned, um, that that's what they would like to see. So so we're very flexible.

00:29:13:29 - 00:29:22:23

What we would want is a document that works best for delivering those environmental benefits that the scheme would provide. Okay. Thank you.

00:29:26:17 - 00:29:59:12

Um, you made reference to, uh, waterfall in particular as part of that response. And, um, within the responses at deadline two, you made, uh, I think, a commitment to additional mink control. And that appeared to be a reference to, uh, funding for a particular scheme. I wonder how that is secured through the DCO, because there doesn't appear to be any side agreement through a 106 or anything like that.

00:29:59:14 - 00:30:09:16

So funding is always a bit of a challenge in that respect. So can you just explain to me how that, uh, is intended to work?

00:30:13:12 - 00:30:49:01

For the applicant? Um, I think because it's not referring to specific sums of money to be paid and it's more just about, um, funding or covering costs, that sort of thing. And it's a commitment in the Olymp. Um, I assume you're asking. You know, do it. Does it need to be under a legal agreement in the same way, like a 1 in 6 contribution would be? Um, which we say it doesn't. Um, and I have seen examples of alarms in particular, for example, covering the costs of certain aspects of the provisions within it, which is sort of what this amounts to, as opposed to a, um, a contribution like a specific amount to be paid.

00:30:50:09 - 00:30:58:17

I'm just always wary when it comes to financial, um, commitments as to how they

00:31:00:05 - 00:31:12:15

get secured and that the mechanism in place meets the legal obligations for securing that. So it's just understanding that subtlety, if you like. Um, so, um,

00:31:14:05 - 00:31:27:01

uh, if you can just explain that and happy for it to be a written submission. Um, but just so that we make sure that we're not, uh, being tripped up inadvertently.

00:31:27:05 - 00:31:28:13

That's fine. Yes, we can do that.

00:31:28:15 - 00:31:29:09

Thank you.

00:31:43:17 - 00:32:23:26

Okay, so I can then, I think, move on to concerns with regard to waste management. Um, and so if I can start off seeking clarification on the system that's proposed for managing waste during construction, operation and decommissioning. Um, I think the outline operational, Environmental and Environmental Management plan, which is Rep 1049, paragraph 2.9.5, as referenced by the applicant in their response to the local impact reports and the concerns raised by both Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire county councils.

00:32:24:02 - 00:32:55:23

Can I just check that, um, your content that that responds sufficiently to the concerns in respect of waste management and in conjunction with the similar commitment in the Outline Demolition environmental Management Plan and then the subsequent additional commitment and the applicant's made at deadline to to provide an annual planning maintenance schedule. So perhaps I come to Lincolnshire County first and then I'll revert to Nottinghamshire.

00:32:58:00 - 00:32:59:03

Alison Richards, Burt.

00:32:59:05 - 00:33:00:16

Lancashire County Council yes.

00:33:00:18 - 00:33:01:03

We.

00:33:01:05 - 00:33:01:20

Welcomed.

00:33:01:22 - 00:33:02:21

The applicants. Um.

00:33:03:04 - 00:33:05:06

Provided um updated.

00:33:05:08 - 00:33:06:16

Documents which would.

00:33:06:18 - 00:33:07:05

Provide.

00:33:07:07 - 00:33:08:20

Um annual maintenance.

00:33:08:22 - 00:33:10:02

Figures and.

00:33:10:04 - 00:33:10:28

Waste generation.

00:33:11:00 - 00:33:11:23

Figures, which will help.

00:33:11:25 - 00:33:12:10

Us to.

00:33:12:12 - 00:33:13:09

Plan for the future.

00:33:14:18 - 00:33:15:11

Thank you.

00:33:17:27 - 00:33:48:18

Nottinghamshire County Council. Yeah. As with Lincolnshire County Council, we obviously support the the monitoring and maintenance information being provided on a periodic basis to inform, um, you know, decisions around waste, local planning moving forward. Obviously what the commitment doesn't do is provide an assurance that those, um, you know, recycling facilities that are required will be in place that's obviously outside of the hands of the applicant, largely. So it doesn't fully address all the concerns within the law. But, you know, it goes certainly goes some way in terms of supporting the waste planning authority.

00:33:49:24 - 00:33:50:18

Thank you.

00:33:55:05 - 00:33:57:28

So taking on that point, um.

00:34:00:21 - 00:34:16:24

Obviously as part of the response that the applicant gave, um, you made reference to other, uh, solar farm schemes and dsos on, on this matter. Um, is there anything further you would wish to add beyond that.

00:34:18:25 - 00:34:49:26

Which is on behalf of the applicant? Um, no, sir. I think the mitigation we're putting in place, um, uh, and our statement and our response to the questions, um, aligns with, um, particular what Lincolnshire said on other example, West Burton and what the Secretary of State has agreed to that. Uh, I think we have to recognise that the solar utility scale solar industry is in its infancy. Um, and we are talking about, uh, waste.

00:34:49:28 - 00:35:32:13

That will be a few years in the future. And that, as with emerging technologies, the industry has evolved, uh, seeking that opportunity to deal with the waste. And that conclusion was accepted by both the examining authority and secretary of state in West Burton and in the East Yorkshire, um, uh, solar That dsos. And on top of that, as if just as it's just been mentioned, we've included the commitment in the Kemp, the the operational Management plan and the decommissioning management plan to provide the updates on our future waste to the local authorities, which means we're in dialogue with them.

00:35:32:15 - 00:35:49:28

They can see our projections that will help them manage their, um, waste planning provisions, uh, to help plan for future waste facilities as the industry evolves. Um, that's all we've got to say. And whether, um, my note, you know, that's all we have to say. Thank you.

00:35:50:13 - 00:36:04:14

Okay. Thank you. Um, just in terms of what the Waste Authority's position is in future planning. Um, can you clarify for me how you're responding to the.

00:36:06:18 - 00:36:18:11

Uh, increase in solar provision across the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire area and how that's being addressed within your waste and management plans going forward.

00:36:21:29 - 00:36:53:20

Well, Lawrence, Nottinghamshire County Council. County council is about to adopt a new waste local plan. It doesn't include a policy that specifically relates to recycling of PV, but it does have an enabling policies in there to support expansion and new recycling facilities in whatever form they may take. Obviously, during the preparation of the Local Plan, we weren't in a position where these schemes were at an advanced stage. And so it was it was too early.

00:36:53:22 - 00:37:13:12

Plus, you know, the information on the sort of the waste streams coming out of these sites during operation. It's still largely, uh, you know, unqualified. So, you know, again, there's insufficient information to be able to have a specific policy. But clearly, you know, the plan as a whole supports recycling and recycling facilities going forward through enabling policies.

00:37:18:12 - 00:37:19:13

For Lancashire County.

00:37:19:15 - 00:37:20:00

Council.

00:37:20:02 - 00:37:26:03

We are currently updating our Minerals and Waste Local Plan. We had a regulation.

00:37:26:05 - 00:37:31:06

18 consultation last year and using a 2021.

00:37:31:08 - 00:37:32:12

Waste needs assessment.

00:37:32:14 - 00:37:35:06

We're going to be updating that waste needs assessment.

00:37:35:12 - 00:37:36:18

It's just been commissioned.

00:37:36:20 - 00:37:40:27

And we are will be including information on solar in.

00:37:40:29 - 00:37:41:14

That.

00:37:41:16 - 00:37:42:23

To ensure.

00:37:43:01 - 00:37:45:18

Um, that we don't have a capacity gap.

00:37:45:20 - 00:37:58:06

Um, and with regard to policies in the plan, it would be very similar to Nottinghamshire's. It would be more a criteria based policy to give us that flexibility to respond to changing markets.

00:37:58:12 - 00:37:59:00

Um.

00:37:59:16 - 00:38:02:12

Um, and, and provide sufficient, um.

00:38:04:00 - 00:38:04:27

Space for.

00:38:05:06 - 00:38:05:28

For recycling.

00:38:06:00 - 00:38:06:28

Facilities.

00:38:08:25 - 00:38:27:01

Okay. Thank you. I mean, I'm mindful that obviously it is an evolving picture. And the as Mr. Griffith has said, the solar industry's I don't know whether it's in its infancy, but it's certainly at the beginning. Um, but, uh.

00:38:29:17 - 00:39:08:06

Can you just remind me when what's the period that the waste plans get, uh, reviewed over? Because I'm just thinking that clearly we are where we are today. But you'll be reviewing your plans over five, ten, 15 years as these various solar schemes, uh, those that have been committed to get built out and, uh, no doubt other schemes come forward. So does that give you the opportunity to avoid there being a gap in, um, appropriate recycling Cycling facilities.

00:39:09:12 - 00:39:10:00

A sort of.

00:39:10:02 - 00:39:11:15

Two points with regard to.

00:39:11:17 - 00:39:13:07

That. We will.

00:39:14:07 - 00:39:17:09

We have a 15 year. We have to plan for a 15 year period.

00:39:17:11 - 00:39:18:03

But there is a five.

00:39:18:05 - 00:39:26:15

Year review period. Um, the new planning bill that's going through at the moment, rather than reviewing local plans.

00:39:26:17 - 00:39:27:15

Is proposing.

00:39:27:17 - 00:39:42:02

That local plans are updated. Um, so that will be a five year updated local plan likely. Um, the second point is that waste needs assessment can be undertaken at any point, and.

00:39:42:07 - 00:39:42:28

That.

00:39:43:03 - 00:39:43:24

Will.

00:39:44:22 - 00:39:45:18

Assess.

00:39:46:02 - 00:39:54:28

The issues, um, and the waste arising, and that will help us to

00:39:56:19 - 00:40:09:17

determine if we need to update the local plan. Um, at an earlier point, um, the provision of data In the monitoring to monitor the.

00:40:09:19 - 00:40:10:18

The performance of the.

00:40:10:20 - 00:40:22:08

Local plan again can also trigger the update of the local plan. So um, we've got quite a few, um, opportunities, uh, through.

00:40:22:15 - 00:40:23:09

Data.

00:40:23:11 - 00:40:26:16

To, to review local plans as and when required.

00:40:28:26 - 00:40:45:17

But in terms of the final point of my question. Well, it appeared to me that one of the concerns that you you'd identified was that currently there isn't the facilities available. And you were concerned that, um.

00:40:49:00 - 00:41:12:17

They may not be available at the point in time that they would be required. So will the the plan that you're preparing give you the confidence that that possible gap might resolve itself? Or are you saying that that issue, despite ongoing updating of the plan, may still continue to arise?

00:41:14:19 - 00:41:23:04

The issue is we we don't as we can plan for waste. We can put in place policies, but we are not.

00:41:25:06 - 00:42:06:29

We don't create the market. Um, one of our waste needs, our waste needs assessment does help, um, waste operators to see where there are gaps, um, in the market. Um, and bring forward proposals. But as a planning authority, it's a bit like a local district. We can plan for housing, but we don't actually build the housing. It's the same sort of principle. Um, but we it is a it is a concern, not necessarily the decommissioning period, because that's so far in the future, but the ongoing failure rates of um, solar panels cumulatively Across the 13 tips that Lincolnshire is hosting.

00:42:07:08 - 00:42:38:21

Um, that that does worry me, um, personally, because if you look at the failure rates for the Tarp identified in other Sipp solar schemes range from 0.2% per annum, up to about 1.38% per annum. And if you look at that, against the number of solar panels that will be resident in Lincolnshire, that's a big annual failure rate.

00:42:38:24 - 00:43:12:02

Um, and what we don't know is whether those are going to be mended on site or are they going to be decommissioned as a, as a unit. The unit is going to go for recycling. So we could be looking at somewhere between 50,000 and 100 odd thousand, um, panel failures Is a year based on sort of a sort of a wide ranging kind of using the information from other solar schemes.

00:43:15:10 - 00:43:40:19

Okay. And I think it'll be helpful when you provide your information. You can give us a breakdown of how those figures have arisen and which schemes are included within it. Um, is it a similar position for Nottinghamshire? Obviously slightly different range of schemes in Nottinghamshire, but outside of that. Other issues similar.

00:43:41:13 - 00:44:35:27

Well Lawrence, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yeah. Fully support everything that's been said by my colleague at Lincolnshire. Um, you know there's nothing more to really repeat that the circumstances are the same. Um, I think I just want to reiterate that point about the fact that, you know, the Waste Planning Authority is not the delivery agent here and only has so much influence over the private industry. Conversely, the silver development industry may. Actually have more influence over that. And I think there was a question here whether cumulatively, you know, the solar development industry in the round ought to be, uh, you know, championing, uh, these, you know, this technology and supporting it to come forward and whether it's reasonable to ask that, you know, that's part of the the requirements or part of the the waste site management plan for this scheme, uh, you know, whether there's more of a commitment for proactive engagement and support from, from the development industry to to bring that technology forward.

00:44:35:29 - 00:44:42:19

We're doing all that we can on the planning side to ensure that, you know, those policies will facilitate them should they come.

00:44:44:17 - 00:44:48:06

Okay. Thank you. If I can then revert to the applicant, please.

00:44:49:28 - 00:45:12:06

Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant, um, I would just point out this is obviously not just a Lincolnshire, a Nottinghamshire, but a point. This is a nationwide, uh, point on a Technology that is supported in national policy. Um, our parts to Mr., um, Mike Baines from Acorn. Um, to see to add anything further from a technical perspective.

00:45:12:26 - 00:45:45:19

Thank you. Um, Mike Baines for the applicant. Um, I would just want to draw your attention to the commitment that the applicant has made to 100% reuse and recycling of panels, and we do recognise the concerns that the authorities have raised and the need to stimulate the market for these facilities. So by making this public commitment that is in the environmental management plans, the applicant is clearly signalling the demand to the market, which will help stimulate those recycling facilities.

00:45:46:11 - 00:46:00:09

Also, there is ongoing work from industry bodies such as Solar Energy UK on um helping develop and stimulate the recycling market. And it's recognised in the um, the government's solar roadmap, that there is.

00:46:00:11 - 00:46:00:26

A.

00:46:00:28 - 00:46:08:20

Need. So there's um, there's lots of different stakeholders are already coming together to try and stimulate that market.

00:46:10:25 - 00:46:36:01

And as part of the commitment that you're making in not only to the 100% recycling, but the annual report that you'd be providing to the applicant, um, I'm assuming that report will be a public report. And then obviously that would help, again, provide more information to, uh, the necessary parties to help inform future planning for such facilities.

00:46:40:03 - 00:46:58:08

Which occurs on behalf of the applicant. It would be a report that is submitted to the authorities. Um, and then, uh, I presume the authorities would put it on, um, their planning portal as part of a document that's been submitted under the developed consent orders. You would do under the Planning Commission.

00:47:00:10 - 00:47:04:18

Ensure the answer be yes. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

00:47:08:00 - 00:47:27:02

So just then, finally then in light of that sort of, uh, discussion around the issue. Is there anything particular that the councils are looking for from the applicant that's not currently either identified or or secured with regard to this? And if there is, what is it?

00:47:32:29 - 00:47:56:05

Listen, Richards from Lancashire County Council, um, the only thing that I think would be useful for us is, um, in trying to look at these early years of the development is actually maybe some figures on on potential failure rates. So we can actually start to, to build that into our waste needs assessment.

00:48:00:04 - 00:48:03:03

Okay. And anything from Nottinghamshire?

00:48:06:09 - 00:48:20:29

County council? No. Nothing much further to add. Um, the question though, on the agenda around the waste management plan in the status of that, I would appreciate clarification as to whether indeed that is referred to in the draft eco or whether that falls outside the scope of the requirements.

00:48:22:22 - 00:48:52:06

I think it's not referred to on its face in the DCO, but it's referred to in one of the management plans. And I think we asked that question at a previous hearing, and the applicant gave the response that their intention was it would stay within the management plan structure rather than being specifically referenced within the D so itself. So if that's not something you're comfortable with as a response, then I think we would need to hear from you as to why that would be the case. But that's currently the position.

00:48:53:22 - 00:49:27:25

Which is on part of the applicant. That is the position that the site waste management plan is referencing all of the management plans. So, um, in the outline. Um, Kemp, for example, it's at section 2.8 in the outline and operational management plan, it's at 2.9. And in the outline um decommissioning management plan. It's at 2.8. And so there's a commitment in all of those sections for the production of a site waste management plan. And that and as um, the, as the main management plan is secured through the relevant requirements on the order.

00:49:27:27 - 00:50:08:28

So is the commitment to produce the site waste management plan, um, as well. And the trigger point for that production of that site waste management plan is the same trigger point as the production of the camp. So prior to construction, we have to submit the site waste management plan prior to final commissioning. We'll have to submit the site waste management plan for operation. Of course, it's then updated regularly as per the um wording in the management plan. So it is absolutely secured. Um, on the order and the schedule that we the um, consent envelope diagram that we produced in response to the first written questions, identifies that the site waste management plan forms part of the main management plans.

00:50:12:25 - 00:50:19:14

Will the county council. Appreciate the clarification? Uh, nothing further to comment at this time. Obviously, if we do, Will would respond in writing.

00:50:20:09 - 00:50:21:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:50:32:08 - 00:50:42:00

Okay. So I'll just clarify then whether there's any further points from anyone and also whether the applicants wish to make any final submission on on what we've heard.

00:50:44:21 - 00:50:47:18

Would you give us another applicant? No, I think we've got nothing further to add.

00:50:47:20 - 00:51:00:17

Thank you. Okay. Thank you then and then takes it on to, um, the cumulative effects part of the agenda. And, um.

00:51:02:27 - 00:51:13:24

I think really what I'm trying to start with is to getting an understanding of exactly where the respective parties are on the

00:51:15:10 - 00:51:53:06

cumulative impact assessment that the applicants provided and whether we that now includes the full list of, uh, schemes that, uh, you know, is it an agreed list? Now, that's the key, because it would appear that we've had slightly different responses from the councils as to whether that list is fully agreed, and it's taken into account all of the schemes that you would have expected and wished it to. So, um, Bassetlaw had made a specific point in their Representation was Rep 1086.

00:51:54:01 - 00:52:07:13

Um, so can I just then clarify with the councils, do do we now have an agreed list within the cumulative impact assessment that the applicant provided? Mr. Betts?

00:52:10:18 - 00:52:11:11

Simon Betts.

00:52:11:13 - 00:52:11:28

You can.

00:52:12:00 - 00:52:14:23

Show a district council. Um, I'll try.

00:52:14:25 - 00:52:15:10

And keep.

00:52:15:12 - 00:52:17:04

This, uh, short and sweet.

00:52:17:15 - 00:52:18:11

The the long.

00:52:18:13 - 00:52:52:29

List, um, is agreed in terms of the schemes that were considered the stage one process. The applicant has followed the relevant Pins guidance in that regard, where we don't necessarily have agreement and would seek discussion, is the move between the long list and the short list. So I alluded to it yesterday. We haven't necessarily had the dialogue, um, beyond some consultation at pre-application stage on the long list itself, and what we'd like to be able to.

00:52:53:01 - 00:52:53:17

Do.

00:52:53:19 - 00:53:27:17

Is interrogate and have further consultation on the list of schemes that are carried forward from the long list. The short list, and further explanation and discussion around why certain schemes have fallen away. Stage one and some schemes have been carried forward into stage two, subject to further assessment. So it's an area of discussion that we would like to have with the applicant. It's difficult to see how we could debate that within this limitations of sessions today.

00:53:27:19 - 00:53:29:18

So I think this would warrant.

00:53:29:20 - 00:53:30:05

A.

00:53:30:07 - 00:53:59:13

Certainty from the point of view of our authority. A session with the applicant. Um, to have that dialogue, because I think the way that schemes are presented, they've they've followed the guidance. But then the the explanation, often based upon the judgment of the different discipline area, is quite short. It's presented in tabular form, and I think we want to get behind that and have the opportunity to have that discussion, because it's quite important as to whether a scheme falls.

00:53:59:15 - 00:54:00:01

Away.

00:54:00:09 - 00:54:20:25

And is not considered further, or whether a scheme is included for further assessment. Um, my practical suggestion would be that discussion happens that then feeds into the statement of common ground and iteration of a statement of common ground. So we seek to, um, certainly from our perspective, reach an agreed position on that. So I.

00:54:20:27 - 00:54:21:12

Think.

00:54:21:14 - 00:54:28:10

Again, following the guidance, there was consultation at stage one. But I think the guidance talks about consultation at a later stages.

00:54:28:12 - 00:54:28:27

Stages.

00:54:28:29 - 00:54:40:21

Two and three of cumulative assessment. I don't think we've quite had the opportunity to have that. And that's what we're that's what we're seeking as an authority. Thank you. Thank you. Um.

00:54:43:03 - 00:55:05:12

What's the position from the other authorities present because I noticed Bassetlaw aren't in attendance today. So, um, to the other authorities have similar concerns about the step between stage one and stage two, as it were, from the long list to the short list. Or is it just Newark and Sherwood?

00:55:09:29 - 00:55:35:09

Alison Richards, Lancashire County Council. Yes, we've we've we've had a similar concern. Um, as we discussed yesterday. With regard to landscape, that's, uh, that that is a concern. And, um, the, uh, the document. Thank you very much for including Meridian and Linda in the long list. Um, but, um, yeah, we it's unclear how, uh, that that movement between the two.

00:55:36:27 - 00:55:43:27

Okay. Um, I'll just see what one's West Lindsey wish to say, if anything.

00:55:49:04 - 00:55:50:19

And we've nothing to hide.

00:55:52:23 - 00:55:58:03

So are you content with the lists or are you or not, as the case may be?

00:55:59:17 - 00:56:00:07

I think we'd have to.

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

Go.

00:56:00:26 - 00:56:04:25

Back and review them, but I don't think it's something we've disputed to this point. Sir, we've not.

00:56:04:27 - 00:56:05:18

Raised the issue with.

00:56:05:20 - 00:56:06:18

That previously.

00:56:06:27 - 00:57:02:01

Okay. So you'll understand the difficulty that we're in, in that we're getting slightly different views from the different authorities. And, um, it's important that we have a robust understanding of the cumulative assessment, and it has addressed the schemes it needs to address. So I think probably the best thing to do is if you can facilitate a joint meeting, um, as promptly as possible to try and, uh, provide the clarity that, um, hopefully will give us the certainty that the cumulative assessment then covers all of the topics it needs to, so that we can then make sure that the overall picture from the environmental statement is as set out, and if not, what needs to change as a consequence.

00:57:02:03 - 00:57:11:14

So, um, everyone's nodding, I think. So I'm assuming that you're going to set up a meeting in in the near future. Thank you.

00:57:11:18 - 00:57:41:01

Richard, give us some path. The applicant? Yes. Um, maybe we could explain how we get from stage one. Stage two? But I think, uh, as it goes into all the technical disciplines and the relevant zones of influence, it probably is in the right forum to discuss that without all the relevant technical experts from the local authorities here, but we're happy to have that discussion to explain the movement from stage one. Stage two will help facilitate the meeting between all the authorities, um, so that hopefully we can then reflect that in all the respective statements of common ground.

00:57:42:15 - 00:57:43:21

Super. Thank you.

00:57:50:14 - 00:58:10:16

So then I think that really just takes us to the final point on the agenda, which is the points that Lincolnshire County Council were making at previous sessions, really in the views of parties over the timing of the project relative to other projects which may be occurring and whether the

00:58:12:16 - 00:58:28:22

mitigation or consequential effects of those schemes overlapping with each other has been fully understood and addressed. So can I come to Lincolnshire County in the first instance to understand what your current position is on that? Thank you.

00:58:29:12 - 00:58:30:08

Alison Richards.

00:58:30:10 - 00:58:31:00

Lancashire County.

00:58:31:02 - 00:58:32:11

Council and

00:58:34:05 - 00:58:51:06

you have taken into account most of the other end cips and their, um, Potential construction dates. One of the issues that we've noted is that for both Cottam and West Burton, the,

00:58:52:22 - 00:58:53:10

um.

00:58:56:01 - 00:59:19:29

Commencement dates have. That were in your document have passed significantly. So there are potentially 12 months down the line. Um, so where you said there would be no impact, actually, because of the shift of the construction period, there will be a construction overlap. So that was just to highlight that, that that is an issue.

00:59:20:27 - 00:59:26:24

Okay. So there could be an overlap now because those schemes have been delayed. Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

00:59:36:01 - 01:00:19:23

Which is on behalf of the applicant. Um, I mean, we are. Obviously, we've prepared the cumulative assessments and the interrelationships based on the publicly available information, which is all we can do. We're obviously not in control of an applicant. Um, developers, um, time frame, of course. Um, appreciate that. We are in an examination and uh, uh, given they haven't started, um, that is publicly available, I suppose you could argue that they haven't started on site. Um, I would just point out the transport technical note to a rep to hyphen 114 does include a sensitivity analysis of assuming there is overlap between our project and the projects of Cottam and West Burton.

01:00:19:25 - 01:00:51:25

So there is the transport has already done that. Assumption has made that assumption. Um, what we will do is update the references to the projects not having an overlap, because I think given the time frame that um, is now unlikely, there will be an overlap. Um, but I will say that it's a full expectation that it won't actually change the conclusions given the zones of influence, so it might just be a reference to there will be an overlap, but the conclusion is still, um, no cumulative effect.

01:00:55:03 - 01:01:27:03

Okay. Well, I'm in no doubt that will be included as part of the discussion when you have your session in the near future, and we look forward to seeing the conclusions of that in the statements of common Ground in in due course. Um, so thank you for that positive response. Um, so, uh, that's really the the end of the questions that I have that we have. Is there anything else that anyone else would wish to raise? Hello, Mrs.

01:01:27:05 - 01:01:27:20

Fox.

01:01:29:15 - 01:01:37:26

Thank you sir. Heather Fox, resident of North Clifton. It's just a technical point. At what point of.

01:01:38:05 - 01:02:09:24

In this line of examination, asking a question and having a relevant answer no longer is available because I asked questions at deadline one and my question was to the applicant panels panel on alignment to the contours of the land, the response to which was they'll be south facing. So I'm going to go back to ask them again. So I'm just thinking at what point when I no longer be able to ask a question, get a relevant answer.

01:02:11:21 - 01:02:43:05

Ultimately, when we get to the end of the examination period, there will be a a cut off the comments that you can make and the applicant gets the final right of reply at the following deadline, which will be just before the closure of the examination. And I think, um, if at the point that you have your final submission to make. You have questions that remain outstanding, or you're not content with the answers given.

01:02:43:07 - 01:03:20:06

Or you know what? If you can set out clearly the issues as you see it that remain outstanding, that will help us in looking through the various documents to see what progress has been made in response to those. Um, but also, hopefully it will help the applicant in setting out their final response. Uh, and then obviously will help us in preparing the recommendations to the Secretary of State to understand with clarity the the differences on what matters remain outstanding between parties.

01:03:22:04 - 01:03:34:17

Heather Fox, resident of North Littleton. Thank you, sir. Just one more thing yesterday about the wider sustainable development objectives. We didn't cover it today and it just seems like a nebulous Surprise.

01:03:36:02 - 01:03:53:27

Okay. Um, well, I think I will do what I referenced yesterday, and bearing in mind it is a comment from Lincolnshire County Council, if you can help Mrs. Fox with what you mean by that. Um, I'd appreciate it.

01:03:57:21 - 01:04:01:21

Alison Richards, Lincolnshire County Council, can I write to you, please?

01:04:04:15 - 01:04:16:02

Heather Fox, resident of North Clayton. It's not just Lincoln County Council. It was in the Ian five eight. I forget what number I said, but yesterday that's the phrase they used. That's why I was going around in a circle.

01:04:16:29 - 01:04:19:13

So it's the phrase the applicant used in the first instance.

01:04:19:27 - 01:04:20:25

That Ian.

01:04:22:11 - 01:04:24:21

The national policy okay.

01:04:25:06 - 01:04:33:00

National overarching policy statement. Ian 5836 or something. So I was just going round in the circle.

01:04:33:12 - 01:04:55:03

Okay, well, as Lincolnshire have offered to give you a written explanation, that's perhaps the best way to leave it. And if when we see that at the next deadline, uh, people are still spinning on the spot, then maybe we can see if we can get further clarity. But, um.

01:04:56:28 - 01:05:02:27

Yeah, I'm not sure what more I can say, really. Um, it is what national policy says. And, uh.

01:05:04:26 - 01:05:11:28

Yeah, the box is in North Clifton. It's just it was it was used in relation to discounting an area to the west of Haymana.

01:05:14:22 - 01:05:15:12

Thank you.

01:05:16:07 - 01:05:17:00

Thank you.

01:05:47:02 - 01:05:50:28

So finally, any other business anyone would wish to raise.

01:05:53:03 - 01:06:04:10

Okay, so it's now 20 plus three, and it's time for me to formally close this issue specific hearing. Thank you everyone for your contributions and your patience.

01:06:04:27 - 01:06:10:27

So could we just run through the rich queries on the application? Could we just run through the action so that we're all aligned on.

01:06:10:29 - 01:06:11:14

Apologies.

01:06:11:16 - 01:06:12:08

Responsibilities?

01:06:12:15 - 01:06:18:03

Yeah. So we're not formally closed? Um, but no, you're quite right to remind me. Thank you.

01:06:46:04 - 01:06:55:29

Okay. So obviously this was both yesterday and today. There's not a substantial number you'll be pleased to hear. And.

01:07:00:16 - 01:07:01:03

You know.

01:07:04:17 - 01:07:07:18

Just bear with me whilst we try and get the.

01:07:19:01 - 01:07:21:13

Technology's a wonderful thing when it works.

01:07:23:09 - 01:07:24:04

Okay.

01:07:29:24 - 01:07:45:00

So from yesterday. Um, first action point was for the councils and Mr. Brown to set out the, uh, national policy requirements for concerns on cumulative landscape impacts on solar schemes.

01:07:47:05 - 01:08:01:13

Um, second point again, for the councils and Mr. Brown provide details of guidance on sequential assessment of landscape effects, as well as difference of effects between the applicant and the councils.

01:08:04:09 - 01:08:15:29

The third point is for the applicant to provide an updated list and plans of individual residential properties as receptors, with the outcomes of the assessments in a table.

01:08:19:07 - 01:08:37:20

And for the applicant. Fourth item to provide the broad visualisation. Link to visualisation showing the extent of the temporary fencing along the A11. 33 including the details of process and lidar data and the reference point for a scale.

01:08:40:14 - 01:08:57:14

Next point was for West Lindsey District Council to give us the details of the alternative locations for the East and Bess that um, and including reasons why they thought that location or locations were more suitable.

01:09:02:25 - 01:09:12:13

A sixth item provide a breakdown, and this is the applicant of the loss of BMV for the district and county Council's areas.

01:09:15:08 - 01:09:23:02

Um, and if it's possible to include the impact of the other end CIPs in those respective districts and county areas.

01:09:25:00 - 01:09:37:12

Point seven is for Newark and Sherwood District Council to help provide a response in respect of national policy reasoning for best and most versatile impact at the district level.

01:09:39:04 - 01:09:40:24

Um, and then

01:09:42:13 - 01:09:58:07

item eight again for the applicant made reference to a specific area. I think it was 11.8 hectares of the permanent loss of BMV. They were going to provide us with a plan indicating those areas.

01:09:59:25 - 01:10:27:17

And then again, for the applicant, a note on the distinction between the, uh, what Natural England we're referring to in their risk register. Um, and the reference guidance that they had quoted and

whether the conclusions or how the information reached relevant to the guidance you've referred to from Defra. Uh, How that works his way through.

01:10:29:25 - 01:10:52:01

And the final point from yesterday. Um, again, the applicant, just to check the wording and consistency for approach to the, uh, different management plans in respect to making sure that, um, they each align for ensuring that the agricultural land is, uh, able to be reverted to agricultural land.

01:10:55:00 - 01:11:25:03

And then from today, um, for the applicant review of the document, um, relevant to the A57 access versus the alternative route through Ragnall village, um, to be provided to Nottinghamshire County Council in the first instance for them, then to feedback so that in due course, um, the examining authority gets the overall picture from Uh, both parties.

01:11:29:16 - 01:11:45:19

So then the, um, again with the applicant, a supplementary submission on, um, abnormal loads going directly to National highways and, and to be submitted to the examination.

01:11:47:04 - 01:12:12:12

And then in response to, uh, West Lindsay's, uh, concern that they'd identified a review of gate G access and how the, uh, commitment to no loss of hedge and provision of passing of vehicles, uh, works to avoid the design tension or the possible conflict within those documents.

01:12:15:19 - 01:12:29:16

Then next one is for Lincolnshire County and Nottinghamshire County as lead local flood authority to clarify the position with regard to daily drainage and flood management, and the controls provided within the management plans.

01:12:32:23 - 01:12:46:16

Next one is for the Environment Agency. They were committed to give us a full detail, providing a written clarification of any outstanding matters on detail and including discussion on an additional requirement.

01:12:50:10 - 01:13:20:29

Next one is for the applicant. I think there was an agreement. There would be a setting out policy criterion for site selection relevant to paragraph 4.2.1 of the Sequential and Exception test assessment. To further explain the sequential approach that's been undertaken. Um, and then we had three points that were raised by Mr. Walker, Lincolnshire County and West Lindsey District Council in respect of the sequential test.

01:13:22:03 - 01:13:26:22

and response to those three, uh, elements, please.

01:13:30:09 - 01:13:55:07

Then when we came into this afternoon's session on apology, uh, provide a plan showing the wildlife routes across the site so we can understand it more clearly. And then a brief explanation, um, on how the financial contributions for mink trapping, uh, works within the DCO and is secured appropriately.

01:13:57:01 - 01:14:17:24

And then I think, finally, we've just got, um, commitment to have an ongoing discussion with the councils. Um, it's not really a submission, but it's just obviously a note that further discussions are ongoing with regard to the cumulative impact assessment. And then obviously in due course, uh.

01:14:20:27 - 01:14:40:23

TensorFlow update to activate application documents in respect to the cumulative effects assessment. I think that was the final point, so I don't think that's missed anything. But by all means, shout. If there was something else that we have neglected to pick up.

01:14:53:15 - 01:14:54:26

Thank you for the reminder.

01:14:56:15 - 01:15:13:19

Okay, so now 3:30 and, um, formally closed the hearing properly this time. Uh, thank you all for your contributions and your attendance. Um, look forward to seeing what we get at the next deadline.

Thank you.