



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	EN010159 - One Earth Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 – Part 2
Date:	06 November 2025

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

00:00:05:08 - 00:00:35:16

Okay, it's 10 to 1, so hopefully everyone's returned and I can confirm that the hearing now resumes. So if I can revert back then to the applicant, are you able to, uh, provided a response to the two points? First, the point that I raised with regard to the overlapping issue of noise and how it's dealt with in climate 16, but also the consequential effects on the.

00:00:38:17 - 00:00:39:21

Flood element.

00:00:42:03 - 00:00:52:04

In me standing on behalf of the applicant. Yes. Um, thank you for being with us. So we are ready to respond to both of those points. So if you're happy for me to just kick off, please do.

00:00:52:09 - 00:00:52:24

Please do.

00:00:52:26 - 00:01:26:01

Yeah. Um, in relation to requirement 16, um, we, um, will undertake to see if we can add some more specificity. Take your point about the reference out to chapter 15. We'll see if there are any specific parts of chapter 15. We can refer to any particular tables, etc., which would provide more granularity to the the noise mitigation that we're proposing within the requirement. And we could commit to doing that for deadline five in relation to the PCs specifically and the noise mitigation.

00:01:26:13 - 00:02:05:24

Um, the main point is that there are several ways that we can mitigate noise at the PCs to ensure that we meet requirements. 16 acoustic fencing and acoustic barriers are one of those mitigation options. If those mitigation options, if it was necessary to include acoustic vents or acoustic barrier in the PCs in the flood risk areas, there are I understand there are design solutions, which, for example, could mean that those fences or barriers are elevated above the ground And essentially encapsulate the top side of the pieces to provide noise mitigation without impacting the, um, floodplain.

00:02:05:28 - 00:02:36:09

We are conscious that that isn't set out in the outlined design parameters, so we, um, will make necessary updates to the outline design parameters for deadline five, again, to provide more specificity to the noise fencing and barrier solutions specifically for the PCs. And also we were intending to do it in any case for work number two, um, so that you have confidence that the relevant parameters are secured and there wouldn't be any impact on on flood risk.

00:02:37:22 - 00:03:24:10

That would certainly be helpful. Um, one of the other things I'm mindful of is if you're elevating your, uh, power converter stations, I believe that you need access to them because you're having manual control mechanisms within them. And so workers will need to access them during normal operations. If, uh, they're elevated and there is a barrier around them. I think you need to also consider how you will access these units, and whether those methods of access also have consequential effects for calculation of flood risk, because presumably, if they're elevated above

00:03:26:03 - 00:03:53:00

a minimum of 300 mil to create, um, your freeboard, um, steps or something similar may also be required. So it may well be, uh, something you need to think through in a bit more detail than we currently have so that we can have, again, confidence that all of the elements that need to be included in the, uh.

00:03:55:27 - 00:04:06:05

Current assessment do cover all of the consequential effects of siting these various elements, uh, within areas of flood risk.

00:04:07:18 - 00:04:32:27

Uh, Jack Piazza for the applicant. I can answer this one here. So currently the approach, um, for this is effectively a pull down ladder design, which goes up to effectively a platform next to the PCs or inverter. Um, and this has been allowed for within the outline design parameters to make sure it fits within the overall dimensions that we have mentioned.

00:04:34:04 - 00:04:35:23

Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

00:04:39:06 - 00:05:00:20

For then come on to the uh, so you're going to revisit, uh, requirement 16 to look at how that defines the noise limit. So that's helpful. Um, and then the other point was the point that Mr. Fox raised. Um, and, um, if you're able to respond to that, please.

00:05:03:17 - 00:05:25:07

You know, he's telling on behalf of the applicant. I mean, I'm speaking on behalf of Aecom. They're obviously a large multidisciplinary organization. I understand that the specific people involved, um, on either side, are in separate business units, separate offices, and that there are firewalls in place to ensure no conflict of interest.

00:05:27:23 - 00:05:28:15

Thank you.

00:05:32:20 - 00:05:39:03

Okay. I think that takes me to the end of the DCO section. Um,

00:05:41:02 - 00:05:53:20

can I note, Mr. Fox, you have your hand up, and I also. Mrs. Fox also had her hand up, but it's now gone down. So it. Mr. Fox is there anything further? Oh, yeah.

00:05:53:23 - 00:06:30:03

Yeah. I'll take Mrs. Fox's point for her. The. She wrote specifically to Acorn requesting information on this thing, and they said, well, it isn't a conflict because we're, we're they're only using us i.e. the applicant on. Um, rubbish. You know, rubbish tips. I can't remember the technical term, but you know what I mean. The second point is I was going to support your, um, think there are lots of things not taking account into the flood risk, um, um, storage loss, all the fencing and posts, for example.

00:06:30:05 - 00:06:40:24

All these things need to be included. And if we're moving on from the DCI, I've got two other points I made.

00:06:41:17 - 00:06:42:28

Regarding the DCO.

00:06:43:02 - 00:06:59:25

Yeah, okay. I made a detailed submission to to you or to the. To the thing on the need for a much stronger DCO. I think it was one of the documents that you withheld, and I would like that to ensure that that is taken into account of.

00:07:02:03 - 00:07:06:21

Also, there's my point on order limits. When did you want to take that footpath?

00:07:10:05 - 00:07:32:09

Well, the rights of way issue will be dealt with under transport. I think in terms of the order limits question. Um, I don't think that's specifically covered under the agenda, but if you want to raise it now, we'll hopefully close that off as it's obviously linked to the DCO. Um, so if you want to raise that now okay.

00:07:32:11 - 00:07:43:11

We believe not only me, but the rest of the village believe that the order limits are wrongly drawn down the Trent Lane lane. There is a submission on that, um, deadline soon.

00:07:43:17 - 00:07:44:07

Yeah.

00:07:44:18 - 00:08:15:18

Um, and also we like further details on what they mean by they will close off the pass, because it's not defined in any way, really close up all the footpaths. They are the major footpaths where loans are probably hundreds of people use daily or weekly in the areas they're proposing to close off. And I think we're entitled to details of when and to what extent and for how long they intend to impose these things on the local community.

00:08:17:21 - 00:08:23:27

I did I did also write to the applicant directly on this, but as you know, they don't reply to my emails.

00:08:26:17 - 00:08:36:22

Okay. Well, I'll come back to the applicant in a moment. Um, Mrs. Fox, you also have your hand raised. Is there an additional point you would wish to to raise?

00:08:43:03 - 00:09:21:04

Yes, sir. This is sort of clarification on the business, whether a com or the, uh, were entirely truthful about the work said, because on the 8th of October I emailed NCT with regarding this issue when I

discovered that Aecom were consulting on the waste disposal issue as well as the flood resistant issue on the 19th of October, I emailed them again to see if they could give me clarification, and on November 3rd, I got a response from NCC and I can read you this because it's relevant to what they were told.

00:09:21:06 - 00:09:50:29

I have spoken to colleagues and Aiken regarding this. The team conducting a review of the Fra is a separate team and specialism in the team undertaking the review as regards waste. The separate involvement was not known to the team conducting the review of the flood risk assessment on behalf of Half NCC. Well, nobody stepped up to say they were doing the flood risk assessment for the applicant. Thank you sir.

00:09:52:06 - 00:10:09:05

Thank you. Can I come to Nottinghamshire County Council, please? Can you provide us clarity as to the position that you are in and how you're using the consultants?

00:10:10:25 - 00:10:43:15

Thanks, sir. We obviously we recognise the concern being raised here, but ultimately, you know, I have to agree with what the applicant has said here. Two different business units at one organisation providing advice on two separate matters. We have raised that concern with air con. We have had the assurance from Acorn that there is no conflicts of interest there. And I would point out that the flood risk assessment that was produced by the applicant, I believe, was produced by Logica, which was a separate organisation at the scope of Acorn on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council, was only to review the flood risk assessment.

00:10:43:17 - 00:11:16:17

So essentially to review the work of Logica, not review the work of Aecom. So it's not the case that one organisation is reviewing its own work. That there is that separation there. Um, ultimately, you know, we use Aecom as a preferred, uh, provider for a lot of environmental advice where the county council doesn't have sufficient capacity because, you know, they're trusted to their trusted and preferred contract. And we have confidence in their ability and legitimacy. Um, I don't think there's much more we can say as an authority than that, to be honest.

00:11:16:19 - 00:11:27:25

So, um, you know, I we've raised the issue when we, we trust what Aecom have told us if we felt there was a conflict of interest, um, clearly we would have took a different course of action.

00:11:28:20 - 00:11:37:09

Thank you. Thank you. Um, the applicant want to say anything further in response to any of the points that you've just heard.

00:11:38:10 - 00:12:11:25

Amy Stirling on behalf of the applicant. I'll start from the end. And yeah, just to confirm, it is Logica who, um, who are a separate environmental consultancy here prepared to flood risk assessment for the applicant. Perhaps where the confusion is, is coming in. The point that I was referring to it earlier is that Aiken provide engineering support to the project. And of course, there is some necessary

crossover between engineering support and the flood risk assessment. But nevertheless, I don't think we've got anything further to say on conflict of interest. And I agree with everything West Lindsey District Council has just said in relation to public rights of way.

00:12:11:27 - 00:12:44:10

Just to be absolutely clear, there is no proposal to permanently close any public rights of way. The draft DCO we are seeking does not include any such power, and it only includes power to temporarily and close and divert for, for example, construction works. The outline Public Rights of Way Management plan is a secure document. It's secured by requirement. Paragraph 31. One of that document confirms that access to all existing public rights of way will be maintained during the construction phase, with no permanent closures or diversions.

00:12:45:00 - 00:12:53:10

I hope that provides the clarity that is being sought. Otherwise, we will seek to provide clarity in writing and our submission.

00:12:54:11 - 00:13:12:15

That's helpful. Thank you. I think the only other point that Mr. Fox has raised is the question about the red line to the order limits around Trent Lane. Now, that is something that's been previously referenced, but again, I'll just give you the opportunity, if you wish to, to clarify your position in that respect.

00:13:19:21 - 00:13:21:25

And that's to the applicant if I'm sorry. If I'm.

00:13:22:18 - 00:13:33:28

Sorry. Yeah. We're just canvassing the room. I think that's a point we'll respond to in writing. Sorry, I'm not entirely sure we've fulfilled the point being made, so I wouldn't want to give an uninformed or incorrect answer.

00:13:34:11 - 00:13:40:18

Okay. Well, we look forward to to that at the next submission deadline. Thank you.

00:13:42:26 - 00:14:15:19

Okay. Well I think that takes me towards the end of the matters on the DCO, but I notice we've got Mr. Wyatt, your hand, uh, raised. Is there any particular points on the DCO before we move on? Yeah. Thank you so much for allowing me to speak. David White, on behalf of senior Civil Action Group. Just going back to this red line, it's very odd because when you go down to the bottom of that trend line, the red line also goes across land that we understand hasn't been registered properly.

00:14:15:21 - 00:14:43:13

And we're we're concerned that the owners of the farm are running their boundaries not only across lanes, they're public rights of way when there's no seemingly no need to, but also they're running across some land that's not registered. Um, that. So I just wanted to make that point. And just so it's on the record. Okay. Thank you. Um, Mr. Fox, is your hand raised again, or is that just not to come down from a previous.

00:14:43:15 - 00:15:17:06

No, it's it's raised. I, I have to make two points. Firstly, the answer given to the conflict issue is incredulous. We're sat here taking evidence. We've just had a gentleman chipping in from Acorn on flood risk elements and the flood risk authority. Think there's no there's no no conflict. Um. Incredible. It goes on to the next point is that with due respect to everybody present, the it's quite clear that the applicant is working at a distinct advantage to everybody.

00:15:17:08 - 00:15:28:00

They have a team of lawyers dealing with it. And the people that are meant to be vetting this thing just don't have the legal advice that's required. Thank you.

00:15:29:27 - 00:15:31:07

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

00:15:33:11 - 00:15:54:18

Okay. Um, I don't think there was any new points raised there. So, um, I just want to clarify then. And the final item on the veto. Are there any other matters within the DCO that, uh, people are concerned about that, that they wish to raise?

00:15:56:06 - 00:15:57:04

Mr. Fox?

00:15:59:10 - 00:16:02:21

It's a little confusing. It's not meant to be up. All right.

00:16:03:03 - 00:16:06:17

No, that's fine, thank you. Um. Mr. Betts.

00:16:10:18 - 00:16:12:22

Simon Betts, new district council.

00:16:12:24 - 00:16:15:16

So, not a specific point, but only to reflect.

00:16:15:18 - 00:16:16:09

That.

00:16:16:11 - 00:16:17:22

In the latest iteration.

00:16:17:24 - 00:16:18:09

Of the.

00:16:18:11 - 00:16:43:00

Statement of common ground between the authority and the applicants. We haven't yet covered the draft DCO, but there is a meeting scheduled for early next week, so I would anticipate that we, we may be able to sort of update our position on record in terms of matters agreed and matters not agreed. Um, hopefully by deadline five. So just to follow on from some of the previous points.

00:16:43:24 - 00:16:46:00

Okay. Now that's helpful. Thank you.

00:16:49:02 - 00:16:49:17

Sir.

00:16:50:07 - 00:16:50:22

So sorry.

00:16:51:03 - 00:17:24:17

Richard Griffiths on path of the applicant. Just going back to the Trent Lane point. We have covered this previously at the last issue specific hearing. Where, where and I've written a summary of that hearing. Says that myself on behalf of the applicant confirmed that there is no proposal to close Trent Lane, but works will be required to install cabling. That's the only power we're seeking on Trent Lane is to install cabling. I'm not sure there's any further action upon us on regarding Trent Lane. We answered it at the last hearing and we've put our with what I said in writing, and that's our position.

00:17:25:24 - 00:17:55:28

I understand that, but it is clearly an issue that remains a concern for interested parties. And, uh, I'm not quite sure, uh, how it can be resolved, because obviously, um, both parties have set out their positions and they don't appear to agree. Now, I don't know whether it's a communication issue or something else. Mr. Vox, just finally, one last time, is there anything you can do to clarify?

00:17:56:00 - 00:18:12:09

Well, that was a classic response. He talked about the what they're going to do down there, touch on the order limits or the closure of the footpaths. And there is a specific um, submission in, in, in the, in the, in the record that hasn't been replied to.

00:18:13:04 - 00:18:29:01

And I think there has been a reply in terms of there isn't a proposal to close a public footpath, albeit only temporary closure, I think is the phrase that's been used to allow works to be undertaken, um,

00:18:30:25 - 00:18:59:29

in terms of the red line boundary again. The applicant has provided a response to that, and we did discuss it previously. Mr. Griffiths is quite right to point that out. But a previous issue specific hearing. So is there any further clarity you can provide, Mr. Fox, as to exactly what it is that or the area of land to which you, uh, are concerned, um, to help the applicant, um,

00:19:01:15 - 00:19:03:07

respond in more detail.

00:19:03:17 - 00:19:33:25

Yes. Um, to two lengths. The we'd like some detail on the type at the timing of the footpath closes, how long they're going to close them for. And the second and most important point, well, equally important point is Trent Lane, that all the limits are clearly shown going down Trent Lane. They're on. They're on the wrong side. They they they imply that they believe they own or have got control of the whole of Trent Lane. It shouldn't be there.

00:19:33:27 - 00:19:48:25

It should be along the dike so that they don't control that Trent Lane or the car park at the end. And that has been avoided every time it's been raised. Give me a written answer to the submission. It'd be great.

00:19:50:19 - 00:20:06:11

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mr. Griffiths, does that help? Are you able to provide any more detail? Uh, now that Mr. Fox has set that out, or is it something you'd wish to respond to in writing, if at all?

00:20:07:06 - 00:20:41:08

Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicants, I mean, just on the we're not taking control of Trent Lane. The power that is being sought in the order is a right to install cables. That is it. The Trent Lane will be able to be used post that installation as it is used for now during construction on Trent Lane and any public rights of way, there will be a temporary closure, the length of which will depend on what is happening in that location.

00:20:41:10 - 00:21:13:28

But it is temporary and that is the only power we are seeking. When that happens, will be communicated to the local community as is secured already in both the outline, our public rights of Way management plan and through a liaison officer that we have secured in the order. Their job is to communicate when certain works are being carried out, when there might be a temporary public right of way diversion, how long that will be so the community know when that work is carried out.

00:21:14:00 - 00:21:46:24

I can't sit here now and confirm that a certain public right of way will be closed for five weeks or two weeks or one week. That is down to what happens at the time. It could be whether it could have an impact on how long a public right of way is closed, for example, but that will be communicated during the construction process pursuant to the secured documents that I've set out in operation of the of the of the of the scheme, there will be no closure of the public rights of way, permanent or temporary.

00:21:46:26 - 00:22:02:22

We do not have the power under the order to do that. We can certainly put what I've said in writing. I'm not sure there's anything further I can I can say or we can go on this point. Um, but hopefully that provides the sufficient clarity for Mr. Fox and yourself, sir.

00:22:04:04 - 00:22:14:11

Thank you, Mr. Fox. I know you've got your hand up in your camera on again. I don't want to wish to do ping pong and round and round in circles on this, um.

00:22:15:05 - 00:22:15:22

Last one.

00:22:17:21 - 00:22:19:25

Right. Make it the last one, then.

00:22:19:27 - 00:22:32:00

Okay. The. It's a simple question. You've got the red line showing us one side of the road as if they own it. They don't own it. It's owned by. It's in common ownership.

00:22:33:18 - 00:22:57:12

Yeah. The red line doesn't define ownership, Mr. Fox. It merely defines the extent of the order limits. So there are two quite separate things. If that parcel of land that you're referring to is owned by several people or has rights from several people, that should be covered in the book of reference. So I don't know whether that helps you.

00:22:57:14 - 00:23:05:19

Well that's fine. The, the the question was specific in the in the submission. If it had been answered, I wouldn't bother you. Thank you.

00:23:06:06 - 00:23:31:14

Okay. Hopefully that helps. Thank you. Um, the okay. So I think then we can move on to the next item five, which is regarding hydrology, flood risk, water resources, and and the sequential test. Now, um, I'll pass over to my colleague, Mr. Jack in a moment. Um, but.

00:23:33:19 - 00:24:36:03

You might think I'm mad by raising this in light of what's just happened, but I'm going to anyway. Now, because we're conscious that the issues related to the water environment are of significant concern to a number of parties. And as things stand, there appear to be significant distance between parties and their views. And to date, we don't appear to be getting much closer in resolving those issues or narrowing the issues between parties. And if things may change, uh, after the discussions that follow, um, but we are keen to ensure that we have a very clear understanding of people's respective Positions and in these circumstances, just want to ask the applicant to think about whether it would actually help the examining authority if you were to be able to prepare either a statement of common ground or a principal area of disagreement statement with, uh, Mr.

00:24:36:05 - 00:25:10:11

Fox and or others, bearing in mind the strength of feeling. So I just posed that as a question. You don't have to answer straight away. It might be something you'd want to reflect on before you come back to us, but it just seemed to me that it might help us in understanding very clearly the differences between you and assuming that they remain differences by the end of the examination. So, um, I don't know whether you wish to respond now as a mr.

00:25:10:13 - 00:25:14:17

Griffiths or whether you'd want to reflect on it and come back.

00:25:21:25 - 00:25:56:19

Thank you, Sir Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so we we absolutely agree that, um, this topic, hydrology, flood risk, water resources is, uh, probably the key topic that is outstanding, uh, uh, in this examination. Um, that is why all our efforts at the moment are focused on this topic to reach agreement, notably with the Environment Agency. Um, and our consultants are working hard, uh, with the Environment Agency, and they are to working hard with us to reach agreement at, on various points that are, uh, outstanding.

00:25:56:21 - 00:26:31:25

And we are getting, uh, to give you comfort, sir. We are moving forward with the Environment Agency, uh, on, uh, various outstanding points. And there is a meeting only, uh, um, this week on Monday, I understand, and our efforts therefore are quite. Which I think are given where we are in the examination. Um, focused on reaching agreement with the EA, uh, in order to present you with, um, hopefully a statement of common ground with them, uh, confirming that agreement. And with the EA being the statutory advisor, I think we think that is where our priority lies.

00:26:32:04 - 00:27:07:20

Um, so I think at this point, our view is that we should focus on that, um, rather than, uh, wider statement of common grounds that are that you just suggested. Um, I think that might be given the comments that we've heard today. I think that might be difficult, um, to to reach any form of document, uh, that would be of use to the examining authority. And so I, my, our position would be that we should focus with the EA and the local authorities on this key point.

00:27:09:08 - 00:27:35:16

Okay. Thank you. I think it's something we'll reflect on as we go through the agenda, because it just, um, seems to me it might be a way of helping parties to come together to, to resolve, if not resolve, things, um, help improve communication so that there is clarity, um, between parties as to what the concerns are.

00:27:37:14 - 00:27:39:17

Mr. Fox, you've got your camera.

00:27:39:28 - 00:27:53:22

I'll keep I'll keep it short. I raised all these things with them in July 19th, 2024. They have consistently hidden the questions and refused to respond to them. I'll leave it at that for now.

00:27:55:09 - 00:27:58:06

Okay. Well, Mr. White.

00:28:00:15 - 00:28:27:06

Yes. Thank you, sir, for allowing me to speak. David White could say no to one of the. So the representing 98% of the communities here. I noticed, Mr. Griffiths said, that they would be working with the EA and, um, I think he said one more party, but he didn't mention the councils. Yeah, yeah. He didn't mention working with the local communities as well. And I wondered whether that was going to be part of it.

00:28:29:17 - 00:28:49:12

I think from what Mr. Griffiths said, is there there in their intention is to seek to focus on dealing with statutory parties in the first instance. Um, it would not be usual to try and prepare a statement to common ground with a local community. Um, I think that would be quite challenging, but, um.

00:28:51:24 - 00:29:04:19

Yeah, we've heard what Mr. Griffiths response is, and I think we need to move on with the agenda. Um, and, uh, the examining authority will reflect on it in due course. Okay. Thank you.

00:29:06:21 - 00:29:07:24

This is Fox.

00:29:12:18 - 00:29:43:03

Sir. Heather Fox, resident in North Clifton. I see they want to have be discussing this with the EA. Sir, in this whole episode, I have been in contact with the local flood agency. I've tried to be in contact with the Environment Agency over this. And what I've discovered, sir, is that during the 2000 and the 2024 floods, these authorities were unaware of where the water was.

00:29:43:05 - 00:30:01:25

This is what gives me so little faith in what they say, because they didn't know it was in my house. Unless you tell them they don't know. And all the time this was going on, I felt secure because I felt the authorities would know. And apparently they did not, sir. Thank you.

00:30:02:15 - 00:30:03:08

Thank you.

00:30:09:03 - 00:30:41:27

Um, I will then, um, move on now to. I don't think, uh, I can ask anyone to respond to the point you made, Mrs. Fox. Um, I understand what you're saying. Um, and why it gives you additional cause for concern. Um, but I don't think there's a question I can pose to the applicant or the Environment Agency on that. I think we need to move on into the actual agenda itself. So if I can pass over to Mr.

00:30:41:29 - 00:30:49:12

Jack and I'll ask him to lead, um, on this first Roman item on on hydrology.

00:30:50:11 - 00:31:26:06

Thank you. So first question I have, um, was at deadline for, um, the EA Stated. Table 3.5 of the seventh still contains uncertainty over how surface water runoff will be disposed of, i.e. discharge to sewers or under a water discharge activity permit. Table 42 of the Fra and the drainage strategy also says that the stormwater may slowly release to the sewers.

00:31:26:15 - 00:32:01:04

This is unclear. Given that there is going to be no foul connection to the sewers. We queried this in rep 2094, but there doesn't appear to be updates on this matter to the same or chapter seven. It's hard to assess the site drainage until further details are provided, especially if it appears that the connectivity

that is different from the foul water strategy provide further information about which points are the connections for surface drainage.

00:32:01:12 - 00:32:12:07

Water are considered, if any, and what discharge permits will be applied for. So firstly, can the applicant confirm what the position is on this matter?

00:32:14:24 - 00:32:36:28

At great sites on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes, we know those comments were made. Um, to be clear, surface water discharge, um, will be directed to ordinary watercourses within the site or within, uh, directly adjacent to the boundaries. Um, both of both the Kemp and Chapter seven are going to be updated as part of deadline five. Um, for your review.

00:32:41:19 - 00:32:44:15

Okay. Thank you. Um.

00:32:48:03 - 00:32:56:09

The applicant confirmed that it's in accordance with the position set out in the statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water.

00:33:15:09 - 00:33:27:00

Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Sorry. So is your question. Do we agree with the statement of common ground with Anglian Water? We submitted that statement of common ground at deadline for.

00:33:30:27 - 00:33:32:05

Your muted Mr. Jack.

00:33:35:14 - 00:33:46:11

Thank you. Um I was just checking that it's um consistent with the, the the content between the two is consistent that that's what I'm checking.

00:33:48:09 - 00:34:05:05

Amy Stirling on behalf of the applicant. Yes. Um, for example, on page eight of the Statement of Common Ground, it states the applicant can confirm that there are no current proposals to connect surface water flows to any Anglian Water public sewer. So the positions we believe are consistent.

00:34:05:27 - 00:34:08:19

Okay. Thank you. Um,

00:34:10:06 - 00:34:44:00

so moving on. Um, paragraph 5.8.37 of MPs. Ian one sets out the considerations for the Secretary of State's decision making in relation to drainage and the EPA and the PFAS. Please confirm their positions on the drainage implications of the proposed development and whether the proposed drainage system complies with the national standard referred to in paragraph 5.8.37.

00:34:44:02 - 00:34:47:09

So I'll start with the Environment Agency, please.

00:34:56:10 - 00:35:28:26

Lucy Horton for the Environment Agency. Um, so with regard to water quality for, uh, drainage and surface runoff, um, we have noted that, uh, section four of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage strategy, which we believe the most recent version is Rep 2-044, um, lists a number of drainage features, including sustainable drainage strategies, uh, not limited to permeable surfaces, swales, filter drains, etc..

00:35:29:01 - 00:35:56:22

Um, we support their use of the Syria Suds manual. Um, and as it stands at the moment, we agree that they should be providing sufficient mitigation. Um, and that many of which is also contained in the Construction Environmental Management plan. There's a few minor updates we're expecting to the operational environmental management Plan with regard to surface drainage. But as the applicant just confirmed, we're expecting an update of that at the next deadline. Um.

00:35:58:23 - 00:36:07:16

If there's any other questions from the Environment Agency regarding flood risk, I think that will come up next. So I'll hand over to the local authorities if they want to answer.

00:36:07:26 - 00:36:13:14

Okay. Thank you. So if I start with Nottinghamshire please. And Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:36:23:04 - 00:36:39:15

Jessica Scarborough um Nottinghamshire County Council, um lead local flood authority. Um I think I'm. Would you be able to repeat the question, please? I'm a little confused by the specific question being asked there and just trying to understand. Best answer.

00:36:40:15 - 00:37:06:06

Um, paragraph 5.8.37 of MPs. Ian one sets out the considerations for the Secretary of State's decision making in relation to drainage. Tan. So can you confirm your position on the drainage implications of the proposed development, and whether the proposed drainage system complies with the national standards referred to in paragraph 5.8.37?

00:37:08:23 - 00:37:41:22

Okay. Thank you. Yes. Nottinghamshire County Council lead local flood authority. So sort of looking at the proposed drainage. Um, we're we're generally pretty happy, um, pretty satisfied with, with what's been proposed on the site. Um, the, uh, review that we've had, um, of the flood risk assessment and proposed drainage, um, is satisfactory at this stage. It's not raised anything that we have any concerns about. Um, I think it's either from a policy perspective there.

00:37:42:01 - 00:38:14:02

Um, the design, certainly, from what we can understand, ensures flood risk is minimised minimized and keep sensitive infrastructure out of flood risk areas and during operation as well. It doesn't seem to increase flooding on or off site. From our understanding. So with the planned mitigation measures, um, we're very happy that the project will have a negligible neutral impact on on flood risk and

drainage. If you want anything else, I think you would want to respond in writing afterwards, if that's okay.

00:38:14:12 - 00:38:20:21

Yeah. No that's fine. Thank you for that. Um, so I'll move on to the Lincolnshire County Council now, please.

00:38:21:08 - 00:38:44:23

Good afternoon, Sir Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. So Mr. Field, who assists us with um matters pertaining to the for as part of Lincolnshire County Council hasn't given me any comments for this section. So he's. Well he's expressed that he doesn't have any comments. Um, he's not with us today on the call, but he's reviewed the agenda as I understand it and doesn't have any comments on any of the. Oh, hello.

00:38:46:26 - 00:38:56:04

So I wasn't informed that you were going to be with me. Um, my note says no comments next to your name, but, um, so I'll just pass to Mr. Field, who can speak for himself, I'm sure.

00:38:57:00 - 00:38:58:22

Thank you. Please go ahead. Mr.. Yes.

00:38:59:04 - 00:39:17:28

Sorry. Mr. peel from Lincolnshire County Council. Um. Like Nottinghamshire. We've gone through the flood risk assessment and our content with the proposed outline design that's in there that it won't affect, um, won't make surface water flood risk worse. Um, so, yes, we're happy with the design that's been submitted to date.

00:39:18:23 - 00:39:20:03

Brilliant. Thank you very much.

00:39:25:04 - 00:40:05:07

Okay, so now, um, the we've we've previously raised the issue of, uh, sort of surface water runoff from solar panels. Um, it's been stated by the applicant that the ref the reference to the report on the effects of solar panel on water runoff is standard practice within the industry. So firstly, can the applicant confirm whether the assessment for the proposed mitigation measures relating to this accounts for seasonal variability? So for example, we'll probably get the vegetation that's being used as mitigation perform differently during different seasons.

00:40:08:04 - 00:40:13:04

Amy Stirling on behalf of the applicant, understand your question. If you just give us a second, so we'll come back to you.

00:40:33:23 - 00:41:04:01

On behalf of the applicant. Um, so just to touch on the the research that you're referring to, that, um, which we believe is as the BMT, SL research. Um, so to clarify, um, that research is based on an assessment undertaken on bare soil, um, in both essentially looking at the baseline and proposed

scenario. Um, we are proposing um, within the order limits, which are predominantly agricultural. So do consist of bare soil across much of the much of the year.

00:41:04:03 - 00:41:39:14

Um, we're proposing that we will have, uh, species rich grassland, um, across the site. Um, which essentially is in line with the recommendations of numerous, um, research papers on this, um, and provides the mitigation, um, required in terms of surface water runoff. Um, in addition to that, just to just to touch really quickly on it, on addition to that, um, we're also um, proposing that additional sub features will be incorporated. So be that sort of filter drain swales and, uh, basins, slash scrapes. Um, and to which provides, I guess, further mitigation beyond just the well-maintained grassland.

00:41:39:19 - 00:41:52:19

Um, to answer your question directly, in terms of seasonal variation, um, we don't anticipate or we anticipate that the mitigation provided, um, will be consistent across those variants. Are those seasonal variations?

00:41:54:02 - 00:41:58:02

Okay. Thank you. Uh, Mr. Morgan, do you have a question?

00:41:59:02 - 00:42:03:25

No, no, no, no, I just Mr. Fox has got his hand up, so just, uh.

00:42:06:14 - 00:42:07:14

Mr. Fox.

00:42:08:27 - 00:42:10:27

I think we, um.

00:42:13:02 - 00:42:13:25

Sorry.

00:42:20:21 - 00:42:53:09

I think can the applicant needs us to study what a controlled experiment is. The, um. The science behind this clearly isolates the question of what the ground coverage is, and it clearly, um, Focuses on the impact of the solar panels themselves. It's quite clear from from the paper that that is um. That is what it does. And it's okay having, um.

00:42:56:00 - 00:43:15:16

Um, the appropriate grass, etcetera, underneath. But it's the estimations of what the amount of that is needed is based on a total misunderstanding of the impact of the solar panels in the first place. It's an irrelevance of how much grass you've got, but you need to do as proper model of the impact.

00:43:17:27 - 00:43:26:12

Solar panels, but do create additional, um, channeling and the like. It's all I spelled it out in granular detail.

00:43:29:00 - 00:43:29:15

Thank you.

00:43:30:06 - 00:43:32:15

Nothing like a proper answer to it.

00:43:33:23 - 00:43:35:19

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Um.

00:43:37:05 - 00:43:40:13

yeah. I couldn't have anything to say in response to that point.

00:43:41:25 - 00:44:12:18

And Craig fights on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. If I could just point us, um, towards the discussion and conclusions in the Belmont research. Um, so if I just if I'm just going to read two statements quickly. Um, so they state these results, although predictable and based on simplified assumptions, quantify the effect of solar panels on on runoff generation and suggest the erosion control methods should be used to mitigate soil detachment and transportation. Thus, a grass cover beneath the panels and in the interspace between panels is highly recommended. They also state in the conclusions.

00:44:12:20 - 00:44:39:27

The evidence provided by this research suggests that agricultural soils should preferentially not be left bare under soil panel structures, because of an increased risk of runoff and of the relative soil erosion process. Um, so with those statements in mind, um, we're of the opinion that the applicant's proposal was comply with the recommendations and in fact, go beyond them by including additional subs features that I mentioned previously. Um. Thank you.

00:44:40:09 - 00:44:40:25

All right.

00:44:42:25 - 00:44:46:07

Okay. Uh, Mr. Fox?

00:44:46:15 - 00:45:21:13

Yeah. Basically, there is a fundamental misunderstanding of the science and and a totally inadequate reading of the research paper. Um, they quoted Cooke and McEwan, um, against me on this issue when they replied to my submissions. They their work is actually a continuation of Cooke and McEwan's work, and their work specifically said that they it cannot be, you know, it's based on very limited evidence. Um, this needs properly look at looking at because it has implications not only to this project but across the whole region.

00:45:21:21 - 00:45:30:16

Um, and I would say it's incumbent on the examination authority to get proper advice. Don't take my word, but get proper advice on it. Thank you.

00:45:31:13 - 00:45:43:27

Thank you, Mr. Box. Um, so I can now go to the Environment Agency on this matter and the lead local flood authorities. Um,

00:45:45:16 - 00:45:56:19

are you satisfied that, uh, surface water runoff rate will not increase as a result of the drip line that could be caused by rain running off solar panels, please.

00:45:57:21 - 00:45:58:21

Um, I'll jump in first.

00:45:58:23 - 00:46:12:18

From Sean Holden from the Environment Agency. Um, we defer to the local authority to comment on this. We expect all such drainage and the impacts of surface water runoff to be assessed by them. Um, as we feel they are the experts in this over us.

00:46:14:12 - 00:46:14:29

Thank you.

00:46:17:13 - 00:46:20:18

So if I go to, uh, Nottinghamshire County Council now.

00:46:24:00 - 00:46:24:23

Thank you. Sir.

00:46:24:25 - 00:46:38:27

Ross Marshall, principal flood risk management officer for Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, as lead local authority, we are satisfied that the proposals do not increase surface water flood risk across the site. Thank you.

00:46:39:17 - 00:46:43:21

Thank you very much. And Lincolnshire. Lastly.

00:46:45:27 - 00:46:58:01

Yes, sir. Ian Field from Lincolnshire County Council. Um, like Nottinghamshire, we're happy with the proposals. Uh, they do not, um, would not increase flood risk, surface water flood risk across the site.

00:47:00:23 - 00:47:01:15

Thank you.

00:47:07:27 - 00:47:12:11

But Mr. White first. So you got your hand up?

00:47:18:13 - 00:48:06:20

Yes. Thank you sir. David White, speaking on behalf of Say No to one southern, um, 99% of the local communities here. There are recent scientific studies that are showing localized cooling around large scale solar farms, cooling up to -2.5°C , with the average local temperatures lows in the winter months in December, January and February at two degrees Celsius. If this localized cooling scientific studies to be accepted, then it will push the average lows down below 0°C , which could introduce semi permafrost effects on the ground around here, which would have massive effects with the flow of hydrology in this area.

00:48:06:22 - 00:48:20:10

And I don't think this is even being considered or it doesn't seem to be. We they don't know what these large solar farms are going to do. It's all it all seems to our communities. It's a bit of a guessing game. And we do feel that it's

00:48:21:28 - 00:48:26:06

the considerations are lacking across the board. Thank you.

00:48:27:20 - 00:48:48:06

Thank you, Mr. White. Um, so before I go on, just been notified that there is a technical issue with our website. Um, so that which needs to be looked into. So I think it's probably a good time now for us to adjourn for lunch. So we have an hour for lunch and.

00:48:48:12 - 00:49:23:22

And just need to pause it. Can I just clarify with the case team or the video company? Is this, uh, effect on the website directly influencing our ability to run this? Um, hearing the reason I pose that is Anglian waters representative needs to leave by 230, and we won't if we adjourn now, have the opportunity to hear from them. So can I just clarify with the case, seeing what the the situation is, please, or the the video company?

00:49:24:06 - 00:49:25:12

Uh, At Mr. Monde. I'm waiting.

00:49:25:14 - 00:49:26:01

To hear back.

00:49:26:03 - 00:49:26:18

From.

00:49:26:20 - 00:49:27:05

The.

00:49:27:07 - 00:49:27:22

AV.

00:49:27:24 - 00:49:28:09

Company.

00:49:28:11 - 00:49:29:08

My understanding at the.

00:49:29:10 - 00:49:44:01

Moment is that it's just affecting the live stream on our website. So it would affect people, um, following watching on online. Um, but the AV company may be able to clarify if there are any technical issues. Um, their side as well.

00:49:47:17 - 00:49:53:02

Is the representative of the AV company able to, uh, advise us, please?

00:49:55:08 - 00:50:27:01

Amy Sterling, on behalf of the applicant. And I will answer for them because they are in the room. It seems like the Planning Inspectorate website has is having technical issues. I know personally I'm not able to access the One Earth solar page. Um, so I would expect that that does mean people couldn't access to join. Now, I don't know if anyone who was watching the live stream is still able to watch or I'm not sure, but it seems like it's a Planning Inspectorate website issue. They can still watch it.

00:50:27:04 - 00:50:31:04

I'm told by the AV team. Anyone who is currently watching is still able to watch.

00:50:33:00 - 00:50:37:10

Okay. I think on that basis it would be.

00:50:39:24 - 00:51:10:14

Sensible to continue because we do need to hear from Anglian Water before they leave. And so, um, as long as the recordings are not adversely affected, then people will be able to watch and catch up in the event that they try to log on and can't. Um, so as long as we get that reassurance from the AV company, um, then I'll be content to continue.

00:51:11:18 - 00:51:19:24

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I was supportive of that approach, and I'm being told that the recordings are all, um, fine running as they should be.

00:51:20:07 - 00:51:25:08

Thank you. Thank you. Can I just then revert back to you, Mr. Jackson? We can carry on.

00:51:27:24 - 00:51:42:15

Thank you. Um, so I will jump back. I'll now move on to, uh, item two on this, uh, under this sub item two. So, so

00:51:44:00 - 00:52:12:17

the, um, first question for Anglian Water is, are Anglian Water satisfied that the water management plan that is proposed to be secured as part of the seventh will not be finalised until the project reaches the detailed design stage? So the first question is, are you satisfied with that approach? The second question is what are the risks of leaving it to be, um, finalised at the detailed design stage?

00:52:14:26 - 00:52:15:16

Thank you.

00:52:15:23 - 00:52:17:12

Karen Murphy from Anglian Water.

00:52:17:14 - 00:52:18:26

And thank you for accommodating.

00:52:19:20 - 00:52:20:06

The with.

00:52:20:08 - 00:52:21:03

The timetable.

00:52:21:05 - 00:52:21:26

Um with.

00:52:21:28 - 00:52:22:29

With the problems.

00:52:23:01 - 00:52:24:00

Uh, in.

00:52:24:02 - 00:53:03:01

Terms of the, uh, the first question, uh, yes. We are satisfied that, um, the further details, um, would be discussed as and obviously we will be a consultation that, um, at detailed design stage. Um, we've reviewed the, um, outline, um, where it refers to the water management plan, but obviously it doesn't say much about it. We have, um, prepared our written response previously on the, the types of issues that we would, um, be concerned about.

00:53:03:03 - 00:53:22:06

And we've had a meeting with the applicant as well to discuss those. So I believe there would be further, further need for discussions to sort of flesh out those issues. But at this stage it it would be acceptable to keep that until the detailed design stage.

00:53:23:01 - 00:53:29:28

Okay. Thank you. Um, and are there any are there any risks of leaving it to the detailed design stage?

00:53:30:22 - 00:53:31:14

Um.

00:53:34:22 - 00:54:08:01

I can't think of anything, um, that. Yeah, would warrant sort of a different approach being taken. Um, I'm. I'm not sort of an expert in this area, so it's just I've been obviously, uh, liaising with colleagues, and they are happy, um, to, to leave it until later on. But it's obviously it's it's, um, we do have a statement of common ground, which is we're finalizing. So there are aspects of, of it being covered in that. And we've been identified as a contour t um under the requirements.

00:54:08:03 - 00:54:12:26

So yeah. Colleagues haven't um, sought a different approach.

00:54:14:06 - 00:54:17:05

Yeah. Okay. Thank you for that. Um.

00:54:21:14 - 00:54:56:24

Yes. That's good. Thank you. Um, I've got a question for the applicant. Next. Um, at deadline for in relation to the water management plan, the EA made a number of comments relating to, um, the monitor, um, monitoring upstream and downstream or any proposed surface water outfalls. Um, that made some comments around, um, our the frequency that the inspections that take place and how they should be taking place.

00:54:56:26 - 00:55:09:20

Um, so I would like the applicant to confirm whether the points raised by the EA in their deadline for submission will be included in an in an updated outline sent.

00:55:11:22 - 00:55:21:03

To the applicant. Yes, I can confirm that will be the case for the for the Osmo and also for the O, uh, operational Environmental management plan as well.

00:55:22:17 - 00:55:23:11

Thank you.

00:55:27:15 - 00:55:35:25

Does anybody else here in attendance have any points to raise on the water management plan?

00:55:39:00 - 00:55:42:01

No. Okay. In that case, I'll move on.

00:55:48:29 - 00:55:51:01

Moving on to flood risk.

00:55:53:12 - 00:56:13:19

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Sorry. I wonder, given the Anglian Water's time constraints. Um, whether we. I would suggest perhaps we deal with the water resources topic first. I believe we can close that off pretty quickly. And then, um, we're sure to make the the 230 deadline on conscious. The flood risk topic may take some time.

00:56:14:09 - 00:56:22:09

Thank you. I will, I will take you up on that. Um, so moving on to water resources. Um.

00:56:24:21 - 00:56:43:21

Question for Anglian Water. Ken. Anglian water and the applicant for Anglian Water. First, please confirm that the um WRI assessment has now been completed. The deadline, I think, was stated and the deadline for submissions was yesterday. Um, and that the outcome is now known.

00:56:47:09 - 00:57:14:10

Harry Murphy for Anglian water. Um, I've discussed this with the applicant and I'm going to defer, uh, to them explaining about, um, the, um, outcome. With it being pre-application, I just don't want to, um, get into sort of sticky, sticky, um, sticky water with, um, the fact that there's GDPR are sort of requirements involved. So if I could defer to the applicant.

00:57:14:28 - 00:57:18:06

Yes you can. Okay. Applicant please.

00:57:18:28 - 00:57:46:05

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. And yes, sir, a water resources assessment was completed and shared with Anglian Water before the deadline for. We received the response actually on the 30th of October. So a couple of days early and Anglian Water confirmed that they would be able to provide the water supply to the proposed development from the existing mains, and that this is during both the construction and the operational phases.

00:57:48:04 - 00:57:48:28

Thank you.

00:58:28:17 - 00:58:36:03

Just last year. Thank you, Mr. Jack. We have a hand raised, sir. Just worth, uh, bringing in Mr. Corcoran.

00:58:41:05 - 00:59:14:27

Thank you. Good afternoon. Um, yeah, just on that point, um, from the environmental point of view for the, um. Sorry. Mark. Rockland Water Resources environment agency. Um, just on that point, really, around the water resources assessment, uh, from the Environment Agency point of view on this, this issue, it's something that is also outstanding. Um, with our statement of common ground and our position at deadline for, um, so basically the Environment Agency Agencies still are still seeking confidence that this is sustainable and and more significantly, practical source of supply available to meet consumptive water demands during construction.

00:59:15:08 - 00:59:53:00

Um, so just to put a bit of context around that, in addition to the drinking water and domestic supply required for the welfare in terms of construction phase, those things include things like dust suppression, uh, machine washing and running fluids like bentonite clay mixing, horizontal directional drilling where that's employed. Um, now with the operational demand, we don't anticipate the volumes required to be massively significant. And the construction phase is, of course, temporary in nature. But for projects of this size, we do ask or we look for a basic water supply strategy to

basically outline and broadly quantify the the quantity of water that these demands will require for the project.

00:59:53:07 - 01:00:23:28

Um, and to provide a really basic option to appraisal of what sources of supply are available to, to the project as well. So from the comments there, from the applicant, it sounds like the water results, assessments and agreement with Anglian Water covers covers that which in theory we would be absolutely happy with. Um, but I think, um, we haven't been party too to that level of detail and we haven't been passed to the water resources assessment. Um, now, there might be good reasons for that. I think one of them just came up earlier on GDPR.

01:00:24:14 - 01:00:57:04

Um, but I think from our point of view, to have the matter resolved from the EA's perspective, um, we would still be seeking to see that level of detail, really in terms of a very broad assessment of quantities required and options considered. In addition to Anglian water supply, which include rainwater harvesting, third parties, tinkering or abstraction requirements, if that is, um, if it comes to it. The reason being, um, there was some ambiguity around whether the water assessment would be provided, um, in advance of detailed design or at detailed design.

01:00:57:06 - 01:01:32:18

This is information that we would ordinarily want a preamp, which of course is behind us now. and with the environmental statement. Um, but for the the demands that have been described in the, the EIA and the environmental statements and the project description. Um, it's not entirely clear what's been covered by the quantities that have been stated in those documents to date. I think there are some quantities, um, within those documents, but it's not clear whether they cover the full scope of what we anticipate was to be required for. So just that level of detail. Um, is all that required to, to resolve that? Um, if we were party to the water resources assessment.

01:01:32:20 - 01:01:53:06

Um, I've every confidence that would cover that. Um, we obviously don't want to duplicate that effort and that work in terms of producing a different water supply strategy. Um, so I'm wondering whether or not that is information that is able to be shared either through submission to the examination or to be shared with the EPA directly. I think that's what we'll be requiring to have a look at.

01:01:55:15 - 01:01:59:28

Thank you. That's helpful. Any applicant. Got any comments on that base.

01:02:00:22 - 01:02:31:22

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Yes. First of all, more than happy to share the water resources assessment both directly to the EA and subject to any sort of confidential information that needs to be removed. Um, for GDPR, you know, any personal information into examination. Also, just to be clear that the response from Anglian Water confirming that they could provide the water supply during construction and operation, covered domestic welfare and non-domestic supply. So it did cover the situation in which the EA has described also in response to this.

01:02:31:24 - 01:02:45:13

We also have in our ceremony of healing note, we're happy to do a bit of signposting for the EA to signpost, where we have set out essentially what the water requirements are for the scheme in more granular detail.

01:02:45:20 - 01:02:56:21

Yeah, I think that'd be useful because it sounds like that boxes have been fixed there that they need to be need to have the information identified to them. So if you could do that, please. Thank you.

01:03:09:20 - 01:03:15:14

So I'm just going to do my questions to make sure there's nothing else for Anglian Water.

01:04:07:10 - 01:04:13:15

Mr. White, do you have your hand up? Do you have a point to make on the other resources?

01:04:13:23 - 01:04:50:12

I do, yes. Thank you. I'm not sure what's happening here, but I can't really tell whether this connection keeps dropping out. He seems to go silent, and I'm not sure if those are pauses. Um, so we had a direct question for, uh, that we wanted a response for from Anglian Water, and we're disappointed that they seem to be leaving early. Uh, this question was going to come at the end on cumulative effects. I guess I don't want to, um, sort of introduce this item now, possibly because I realize I might slow things down, but, um, unless you want me to.

01:04:50:14 - 01:04:54:07

But, uh, if they are leaving, then that's disappointing.

01:04:55:08 - 01:05:06:06

Um, maybe if you've got a point to raise on a different topic. Um, perhaps put it in writing to the examination and then they can respond to it.

01:05:06:26 - 01:05:15:24

Okay. That's yeah, that's fine, I will I will still bring it up with the cumulative effects because there are other policies, including in place which are facing forward. So that's fine. Thank you.

01:05:17:15 - 01:05:18:00

Right.

01:05:18:02 - 01:05:54:20

I think so if, if I'm if I may. Um, we've been discussing internally and I wondered if we're finished with Anglian Water, if it might be appropriate to have a comfort break. Um, conscious including everyone on the teams, has been on line now for several hours. Um, in relation to lunge, we wondered, conscious again. We have quite a few items still remaining on the agenda, whether we could sort of combine our comfort break and short lunch and perhaps reconvene after, say, 30 minutes. I think with one hour given it's 2:00, we'd sort of be stretched at getting through all of the agenda items within the remaining hearing time.

01:05:58:04 - 01:06:29:28

I think what I will do is I was going to suggest that we have a break now. Um, I think because of the technical issues that we are having with, um, our website, we've been told that they, we should be, um, resolved in about 45 minutes. So I'm going to say that we will break for lunch now, which will be 45 minutes. Um, because hopefully then the, uh, it issues will be resolved within that time.

01:06:30:00 - 01:06:46:10

So it's just coming up to where it's just, it's I to to say we'll be back at resume adjourn now and we'll resume at 240. Thank you.

00:00:05:08 - 00:00:35:16

Okay, it's 10 to 1, so hopefully everyone's returned and I can confirm that the hearing now resumes. So if I can revert back then to the applicant, are you able to, uh, provided a response to the two points? First, the point that I raised with regard to the overlapping issue of noise and how it's dealt with in climate 16, but also the consequential effects on the.

00:00:38:17 - 00:00:39:21

Flood element.

00:00:42:03 - 00:00:52:04

In me standing on behalf of the applicant. Yes. Um, thank you for being with us. So we are ready to respond to both of those points. So if you're happy for me to just kick off, please do.

00:00:52:09 - 00:00:52:24

Please do.

00:00:52:26 - 00:01:26:01

Yeah. Um, in relation to requirement 16, um, we, um, will undertake to see if we can add some more specificity. Take your point about the reference out to chapter 15. We'll see if there are any specific parts of chapter 15. We can refer to any particular tables, etc., which would provide more granularity to the the noise mitigation that we're proposing within the requirement. And we could commit to doing that for deadline five in relation to the PCs specifically and the noise mitigation.

00:01:26:13 - 00:02:05:24

Um, the main point is that there are several ways that we can mitigate noise at the PCs to ensure that we meet requirements. 16 acoustic fencing and acoustic barriers are one of those mitigation options. If those mitigation options, if it was necessary to include acoustic vents or acoustic barrier in the PCs in the flood risk areas, there are I understand there are design solutions, which, for example, could mean that those fences or barriers are elevated above the ground And essentially encapsulate the top side of the pieces to provide noise mitigation without impacting the, um, floodplain.

00:02:05:28 - 00:02:36:09

We are conscious that that isn't set out in the outlined design parameters, so we, um, will make necessary updates to the outline design parameters for deadline five, again, to provide more specificity to the noise fencing and barrier solutions specifically for the PCs. And also we were intending to do it in any case for work number two, um, so that you have confidence that the relevant parameters are secured and there wouldn't be any impact on on flood risk.

00:02:37:22 - 00:03:24:10

That would certainly be helpful. Um, one of the other things I'm mindful of is if you're elevating your, uh, power converter stations, I believe that you need access to them because you're having manual control mechanisms within them. And so workers will need to access them during normal operations. If, uh, they're elevated and there is a barrier around them. I think you need to also consider how you will access these units, and whether those methods of access also have consequential effects for calculation of flood risk, because presumably, if they're elevated above

00:03:26:03 - 00:03:53:00

a minimum of 300 mil to create, um, your freeboard, um, steps or something similar may also be required. So it may well be, uh, something you need to think through in a bit more detail than we currently have so that we can have, again, confidence that all of the elements that need to be included in the, uh.

00:03:55:27 - 00:04:06:05

Current assessment do cover all of the consequential effects of siting these various elements, uh, within areas of flood risk.

00:04:07:18 - 00:04:32:27

Uh, Jack Piazza for the applicant. I can answer this one here. So currently the approach, um, for this is effectively a pull down ladder design, which goes up to effectively a platform next to the PCs or inverter. Um, and this has been allowed for within the outline design parameters to make sure it fits within the overall dimensions that we have mentioned.

00:04:34:04 - 00:04:35:23

Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

00:04:39:06 - 00:05:00:20

For then come on to the uh, so you're going to revisit, uh, requirement 16 to look at how that defines the noise limit. So that's helpful. Um, and then the other point was the point that Mr. Fox raised. Um, and, um, if you're able to respond to that, please.

00:05:03:17 - 00:05:25:07

You know, he's telling on behalf of the applicant. I mean, I'm speaking on behalf of Aecom. They're obviously a large multidisciplinary organization. I understand that the specific people involved, um, on either side, are in separate business units, separate offices, and that there are firewalls in place to ensure no conflict of interest.

00:05:27:23 - 00:05:28:15

Thank you.

00:05:32:20 - 00:05:39:03

Okay. I think that takes me to the end of the DCO section. Um,

00:05:41:02 - 00:05:53:20

can I note, Mr. Fox, you have your hand up, and I also. Mrs. Fox also had her hand up, but it's now gone down. So it. Mr. Fox is there anything further? Oh, yeah.

00:05:53:23 - 00:06:30:03

Yeah. I'll take Mrs. Fox's point for her. The. She wrote specifically to Acorn requesting information on this thing, and they said, well, it isn't a conflict because we're, we're they're only using us i.e. the applicant on. Um, rubbish. You know, rubbish tips. I can't remember the technical term, but you know what I mean. The second point is I was going to support your, um, think there are lots of things not taking account into the flood risk, um, um, storage loss, all the fencing and posts, for example.

00:06:30:05 - 00:06:40:24

All these things need to be included. And if we're moving on from the DCI, I've got two other points I made.

00:06:41:17 - 00:06:42:28

Regarding the DCO.

00:06:43:02 - 00:06:59:25

Yeah, okay. I made a detailed submission to to you or to the. To the thing on the need for a much stronger DCO. I think it was one of the documents that you withheld, and I would like that to ensure that that is taken into account of.

00:07:02:03 - 00:07:06:21

Also, there's my point on order limits. When did you want to take that footpath?

00:07:10:05 - 00:07:32:09

Well, the rights of way issue will be dealt with under transport. I think in terms of the order limits question. Um, I don't think that's specifically covered under the agenda, but if you want to raise it now, we'll hopefully close that off as it's obviously linked to the DCO. Um, so if you want to raise that now okay.

00:07:32:11 - 00:07:43:11

We believe not only me, but the rest of the village believe that the order limits are wrongly drawn down the Trent Lane lane. There is a submission on that, um, deadline soon.

00:07:43:17 - 00:07:44:07

Yeah.

00:07:44:18 - 00:08:15:18

Um, and also we like further details on what they mean by they will close off the pass, because it's not defined in any way, really close up all the footpaths. They are the major footpaths where loans are probably hundreds of people use daily or weekly in the areas they're proposing to close off. And I think we're entitled to details of when and to what extent and for how long they intend to impose these things on the local community.

00:08:17:21 - 00:08:23:27

I did I did also write to the applicant directly on this, but as you know, they don't reply to my emails.

00:08:26:17 - 00:08:36:22

Okay. Well, I'll come back to the applicant in a moment. Um, Mrs. Fox, you also have your hand raised. Is there an additional point you would wish to to raise?

00:08:43:03 - 00:09:21:04

Yes, sir. This is sort of clarification on the business, whether a com or the, uh, were entirely truthful about the work said, because on the 8th of October I emailed NCT with regarding this issue when I

discovered that Aecom were consulting on the waste disposal issue as well as the flood resistant issue on the 19th of October, I emailed them again to see if they could give me clarification, and on November 3rd, I got a response from NCC and I can read you this because it's relevant to what they were told.

00:09:21:06 - 00:09:50:29

I have spoken to colleagues and Aiken regarding this. The team conducting a review of the Fra is a separate team and specialism in the team undertaking the review as regards waste. The separate involvement was not known to the team conducting the review of the flood risk assessment on behalf of Half NCC. Well, nobody stepped up to say they were doing the flood risk assessment for the applicant. Thank you sir.

00:09:52:06 - 00:10:09:05

Thank you. Can I come to Nottinghamshire County Council, please? Can you provide us clarity as to the position that you are in and how you're using the consultants?

00:10:10:25 - 00:10:43:15

Thanks, sir. We obviously we recognise the concern being raised here, but ultimately, you know, I have to agree with what the applicant has said here. Two different business units at one organisation providing advice on two separate matters. We have raised that concern with air con. We have had the assurance from Acorn that there is no conflicts of interest there. And I would point out that the flood risk assessment that was produced by the applicant, I believe, was produced by Logica, which was a separate organisation at the scope of Acorn on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council, was only to review the flood risk assessment.

00:10:43:17 - 00:11:16:17

So essentially to review the work of Logica, not review the work of Aecom. So it's not the case that one organisation is reviewing its own work. That there is that separation there. Um, ultimately, you know, we use Aecom as a preferred, uh, provider for a lot of environmental advice where the county council doesn't have sufficient capacity because, you know, they're trusted to their trusted and preferred contract. And we have confidence in their ability and legitimacy. Um, I don't think there's much more we can say as an authority than that, to be honest.

00:11:16:19 - 00:11:27:25

So, um, you know, I we've raised the issue when we, we trust what Aecom have told us if we felt there was a conflict of interest, um, clearly we would have took a different course of action.

00:11:28:20 - 00:11:37:09

Thank you. Thank you. Um, the applicant want to say anything further in response to any of the points that you've just heard.

00:11:38:10 - 00:12:11:25

Amy Stirling on behalf of the applicant. I'll start from the end. And yeah, just to confirm, it is Logica who, um, who are a separate environmental consultancy here prepared to flood risk assessment for the applicant. Perhaps where the confusion is, is coming in. The point that I was referring to it earlier is that Aiken provide engineering support to the project. And of course, there is some necessary

crossover between engineering support and the flood risk assessment. But nevertheless, I don't think we've got anything further to say on conflict of interest. And I agree with everything West Lindsey District Council has just said in relation to public rights of way.

00:12:11:27 - 00:12:44:10

Just to be absolutely clear, there is no proposal to permanently close any public rights of way. The draft DCO we are seeking does not include any such power, and it only includes power to temporarily and close and divert for, for example, construction works. The outline Public Rights of Way Management plan is a secure document. It's secured by requirement. Paragraph 31. One of that document confirms that access to all existing public rights of way will be maintained during the construction phase, with no permanent closures or diversions.

00:12:45:00 - 00:12:53:10

I hope that provides the clarity that is being sought. Otherwise, we will seek to provide clarity in writing and our submission.

00:12:54:11 - 00:13:12:15

That's helpful. Thank you. I think the only other point that Mr. Fox has raised is the question about the red line to the order limits around Trent Lane. Now, that is something that's been previously referenced, but again, I'll just give you the opportunity, if you wish to, to clarify your position in that respect.

00:13:19:21 - 00:13:21:25

And that's to the applicant if I'm sorry. If I'm.

00:13:22:18 - 00:13:33:28

Sorry. Yeah. We're just canvassing the room. I think that's a point we'll respond to in writing. Sorry, I'm not entirely sure we've fulfilled the point being made, so I wouldn't want to give an uninformed or incorrect answer.

00:13:34:11 - 00:13:40:18

Okay. Well, we look forward to to that at the next submission deadline. Thank you.

00:13:42:26 - 00:14:15:19

Okay. Well I think that takes me towards the end of the matters on the DCO, but I notice we've got Mr. Wyatt, your hand, uh, raised. Is there any particular points on the DCO before we move on? Yeah. Thank you so much for allowing me to speak. David White, on behalf of senior Civil Action Group. Just going back to this red line, it's very odd because when you go down to the bottom of that trend line, the red line also goes across land that we understand hasn't been registered properly.

00:14:15:21 - 00:14:43:13

And we're we're concerned that the owners of the farm are running their boundaries not only across lanes, they're public rights of way when there's no seemingly no need to, but also they're running across some land that's not registered. Um, that. So I just wanted to make that point. And just so it's on the record. Okay. Thank you. Um, Mr. Fox, is your hand raised again, or is that just not to come down from a previous.

00:14:43:15 - 00:15:17:06

No, it's it's raised. I, I have to make two points. Firstly, the answer given to the conflict issue is incredulous. We're sat here taking evidence. We've just had a gentleman chipping in from Acorn on flood risk elements and the flood risk authority. Think there's no there's no no conflict. Um. Incredible. It goes on to the next point is that with due respect to everybody present, the it's quite clear that the applicant is working at a distinct advantage to everybody.

00:15:17:08 - 00:15:28:00

They have a team of lawyers dealing with it. And the people that are meant to be vetting this thing just don't have the legal advice that's required. Thank you.

00:15:29:27 - 00:15:31:07

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

00:15:33:11 - 00:15:54:18

Okay. Um, I don't think there was any new points raised there. So, um, I just want to clarify then. And the final item on the veto. Are there any other matters within the DCO that, uh, people are concerned about that, that they wish to raise?

00:15:56:06 - 00:15:57:04

Mr. Fox?

00:15:59:10 - 00:16:02:21

It's a little confusing. It's not meant to be up. All right.

00:16:03:03 - 00:16:06:17

No, that's fine, thank you. Um. Mr. Betts.

00:16:10:18 - 00:16:12:22

Simon Betts, new district council.

00:16:12:24 - 00:16:15:16

So, not a specific point, but only to reflect.

00:16:15:18 - 00:16:16:09

That.

00:16:16:11 - 00:16:17:22

In the latest iteration.

00:16:17:24 - 00:16:18:09

Of the.

00:16:18:11 - 00:16:43:00

Statement of common ground between the authority and the applicants. We haven't yet covered the draft DCO, but there is a meeting scheduled for early next week, so I would anticipate that we, we may be able to sort of update our position on record in terms of matters agreed and matters not agreed. Um, hopefully by deadline five. So just to follow on from some of the previous points.

00:16:43:24 - 00:16:46:00

Okay. Now that's helpful. Thank you.

00:16:49:02 - 00:16:49:17

Sir.

00:16:50:07 - 00:16:50:22

So sorry.

00:16:51:03 - 00:17:24:17

Richard Griffiths on path of the applicant. Just going back to the Trent Lane point. We have covered this previously at the last issue specific hearing. Where, where and I've written a summary of that hearing. Says that myself on behalf of the applicant confirmed that there is no proposal to close Trent Lane, but works will be required to install cabling. That's the only power we're seeking on Trent Lane is to install cabling. I'm not sure there's any further action upon us on regarding Trent Lane. We answered it at the last hearing and we've put our with what I said in writing, and that's our position.

00:17:25:24 - 00:17:55:28

I understand that, but it is clearly an issue that remains a concern for interested parties. And, uh, I'm not quite sure, uh, how it can be resolved, because obviously, um, both parties have set out their positions and they don't appear to agree. Now, I don't know whether it's a communication issue or something else. Mr. Vox, just finally, one last time, is there anything you can do to clarify?

00:17:56:00 - 00:18:12:09

Well, that was a classic response. He talked about the what they're going to do down there, touch on the order limits or the closure of the footpaths. And there is a specific um, submission in, in, in the, in the, in the record that hasn't been replied to.

00:18:13:04 - 00:18:29:01

And I think there has been a reply in terms of there isn't a proposal to close a public footpath, albeit only temporary closure, I think is the phrase that's been used to allow works to be undertaken, um,

00:18:30:25 - 00:18:59:29

in terms of the red line boundary again. The applicant has provided a response to that, and we did discuss it previously. Mr. Griffiths is quite right to point that out. But a previous issue specific hearing. So is there any further clarity you can provide, Mr. Fox, as to exactly what it is that or the area of land to which you, uh, are concerned, um, to help the applicant, um,

00:19:01:15 - 00:19:03:07

respond in more detail.

00:19:03:17 - 00:19:33:25

Yes. Um, to two lengths. The we'd like some detail on the type at the timing of the footpath closes, how long they're going to close them for. And the second and most important point, well, equally important point is Trent Lane, that all the limits are clearly shown going down Trent Lane. They're on. They're on the wrong side. They they they imply that they believe they own or have got control of the whole of Trent Lane. It shouldn't be there.

00:19:33:27 - 00:19:48:25

It should be along the dike so that they don't control that Trent Lane or the car park at the end. And that has been avoided every time it's been raised. Give me a written answer to the submission. It'd be great.

00:19:50:19 - 00:20:06:11

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mr. Griffiths, does that help? Are you able to provide any more detail? Uh, now that Mr. Fox has set that out, or is it something you'd wish to respond to in writing, if at all?

00:20:07:06 - 00:20:41:08

Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicants, I mean, just on the we're not taking control of Trent Lane. The power that is being sought in the order is a right to install cables. That is it. The Trent Lane will be able to be used post that installation as it is used for now during construction on Trent Lane and any public rights of way, there will be a temporary closure, the length of which will depend on what is happening in that location.

00:20:41:10 - 00:21:13:28

But it is temporary and that is the only power we are seeking. When that happens, will be communicated to the local community as is secured already in both the outline, our public rights of Way management plan and through a liaison officer that we have secured in the order. Their job is to communicate when certain works are being carried out, when there might be a temporary public right of way diversion, how long that will be so the community know when that work is carried out.

00:21:14:00 - 00:21:46:24

I can't sit here now and confirm that a certain public right of way will be closed for five weeks or two weeks or one week. That is down to what happens at the time. It could be whether it could have an impact on how long a public right of way is closed, for example, but that will be communicated during the construction process pursuant to the secured documents that I've set out in operation of the of the of the scheme, there will be no closure of the public rights of way, permanent or temporary.

00:21:46:26 - 00:22:02:22

We do not have the power under the order to do that. We can certainly put what I've said in writing. I'm not sure there's anything further I can I can say or we can go on this point. Um, but hopefully that provides the sufficient clarity for Mr. Fox and yourself, sir.

00:22:04:04 - 00:22:14:11

Thank you, Mr. Fox. I know you've got your hand up in your camera on again. I don't want to wish to do ping pong and round and round in circles on this, um.

00:22:15:05 - 00:22:15:22

Last one.

00:22:17:21 - 00:22:19:25

Right. Make it the last one, then.

00:22:19:27 - 00:22:32:00

Okay. The. It's a simple question. You've got the red line showing us one side of the road as if they own it. They don't own it. It's owned by. It's in common ownership.

00:22:33:18 - 00:22:57:12

Yeah. The red line doesn't define ownership, Mr. Fox. It merely defines the extent of the order limits. So there are two quite separate things. If that parcel of land that you're referring to is owned by several people or has rights from several people, that should be covered in the book of reference. So I don't know whether that helps you.

00:22:57:14 - 00:23:05:19

Well that's fine. The, the the question was specific in the in the submission. If it had been answered, I wouldn't bother you. Thank you.

00:23:06:06 - 00:23:31:14

Okay. Hopefully that helps. Thank you. Um, the okay. So I think then we can move on to the next item five, which is regarding hydrology, flood risk, water resources, and and the sequential test. Now, um, I'll pass over to my colleague, Mr. Jack in a moment. Um, but.

00:23:33:19 - 00:24:36:03

You might think I'm mad by raising this in light of what's just happened, but I'm going to anyway. Now, because we're conscious that the issues related to the water environment are of significant concern to a number of parties. And as things stand, there appear to be significant distance between parties and their views. And to date, we don't appear to be getting much closer in resolving those issues or narrowing the issues between parties. And if things may change, uh, after the discussions that follow, um, but we are keen to ensure that we have a very clear understanding of people's respective Positions and in these circumstances, just want to ask the applicant to think about whether it would actually help the examining authority if you were to able to prepare either a statement of common ground or a principal area of disagreement statement with, uh, Mr.

00:24:36:05 - 00:25:10:11

Fox and or others, bearing in mind the strength of feeling. So I just posed that as a question. You don't have to answer straight away. It might be something you'd want to reflect on before you come back to us, but it just seemed to me that it might help us in understanding very clearly the differences between you and assuming that they remain differences by the end of the examination. So, um, I don't know whether you wish to respond now as a mr.

00:25:10:13 - 00:25:14:17

Griffiths or whether you'd want to reflect on it and come back.

00:25:21:25 - 00:25:56:19

Thank you, Sir Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so we we absolutely agree that, um, this topic, hydrology, flood risk, water resources is, uh, probably the key topic that is outstanding, uh, uh, in this examination. Um, that is why all our efforts at the moment are focused on this topic to reach agreement, notably with the Environment Agency. Um, and our consultants are working hard, uh, with the Environment Agency, and they are to working hard with us to reach agreement at, on various points that are, uh, outstanding.

00:25:56:21 - 00:26:31:25

And we are getting, uh, to give you comfort, sir. We are moving forward with the Environment Agency, uh, on, uh, various outstanding points. And there is a meeting only, uh, um, this week on Monday, I understand, and our efforts therefore are quite. Which I think are given where we are in the examination. Um, focused on reaching agreement with the EA, uh, in order to present you with, um, hopefully a statement of common ground with them, uh, confirming that agreement. And with the EA being the statutory advisor, I think we think that is where our priority lies.

00:26:32:04 - 00:27:07:20

Um, so I think at this point, our view is that we should focus on that, um, rather than, uh, wider statement of common grounds that are that you just suggested. Um, I think that might be given the comments that we've heard today. I think that might be difficult, um, to to reach any form of document, uh, that would be of use to the examining authority. And so I, my, our position would be that we should focus with the EA and the local authorities on this key point.

00:27:09:08 - 00:27:35:16

Okay. Thank you. I think it's something we'll reflect on as we go through the agenda, because it just, um, seems to me it might be a way of helping parties to come together to, to resolve, if not resolve, things, um, help improve communication so that there is clarity, um, between parties as to what the concerns are.

00:27:37:14 - 00:27:39:17

Mr. Fox, you've got your camera.

00:27:39:28 - 00:27:53:22

I'll keep I'll keep it short. I raised all these things with them in July 19th, 2024. They have consistently hidden the questions and refused to respond to them. I'll leave it at that for now.

00:27:55:09 - 00:27:58:06

Okay. Well, Mr. White.

00:28:00:15 - 00:28:27:06

Yes. Thank you, sir, for allowing me to speak. David White could say no to one of the. So the representing 98% of the communities here. I noticed, Mr. Griffiths said, that they would be working with the EA and, um, I think he said one more party, but he didn't mention the councils. Yeah, yeah. He didn't mention working with the local communities as well. And I wondered whether that was going to be part of it.

00:28:29:17 - 00:28:49:12

I think from what Mr. Griffiths said, is there there in their intention is to seek to focus on dealing with statutory parties in the first instance. Um, it would not be usual to try and prepare a statement to common ground with a local community. Um, I think that would be quite challenging, but, um.

00:28:51:24 - 00:29:04:19

Yeah, we've heard what Mr. Griffiths response is, and I think we need to move on with the agenda. Um, and, uh, the examining authority will reflect on it in due course. Okay. Thank you.

00:29:06:21 - 00:29:07:24

This is Fox.

00:29:12:18 - 00:29:43:03

Sir. Heather Fox, resident in North Clifton. I see they want to have be discussing this with the EA. Sir, in this whole episode, I have been in contact with the local flood agency. I've tried to be in contact with the Environment Agency over this. And what I've discovered, sir, is that during the 2000 and the 2024 floods, these authorities were unaware of where the water was.

00:29:43:05 - 00:30:01:25

This is what gives me so little faith in what they say, because they didn't know it was in my house. Unless you tell them they don't know. And all the time this was going on, I felt secure because I felt the authorities would know. And apparently they did not, sir. Thank you.

00:30:02:15 - 00:30:03:08

Thank you.

00:30:09:03 - 00:30:41:27

Um, I will then, um, move on now to. I don't think, uh, I can ask anyone to respond to the point you made, Mrs. Fox. Um, I understand what you're saying. Um, and why it gives you additional cause for concern. Um, but I don't think there's a question I can pose to the applicant or the Environment Agency on that. I think we need to move on into the actual agenda itself. So if I can pass over to Mr.

00:30:41:29 - 00:30:49:12

Jack and I'll ask him to lead, um, on this first Roman item on on hydrology.

00:30:50:11 - 00:31:26:06

Thank you. So first question I have, um, was at deadline for, um, the EA Stated. Table 3.5 of the seventh still contains uncertainty over how surface water runoff will be disposed of, i.e. discharge to sewers or under a water discharge activity permit. Table 42 of the Fra and the drainage strategy also says that the stormwater may slowly release to the sewers.

00:31:26:15 - 00:32:01:04

This is unclear. Given that there is going to be no foul connection to the sewers. We queried this in rep 2094, but there doesn't appear to be updates on this matter to the same or chapter seven. It's hard to assess the site drainage until further details are provided, especially if it appears that the connectivity

that is different from the foul water strategy provide further information about which points are the connections for surface drainage.

00:32:01:12 - 00:32:12:07

Water are considered, if any, and what discharge permits will be applied for. So firstly, can the applicant confirm what the position is on this matter?

00:32:14:24 - 00:32:36:28

At great sites on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes, we know those comments were made. Um, to be clear, surface water discharge, um, will be directed to ordinary watercourses within the site or within, uh, directly adjacent to the boundaries. Um, both of both the Kemp and Chapter seven are going to be updated as part of deadline five. Um, for your review.

00:32:41:19 - 00:32:44:15

Okay. Thank you. Um.

00:32:48:03 - 00:32:56:09

The applicant confirmed that it's in accordance with the position set out in the statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water.

00:33:15:09 - 00:33:27:00

Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Sorry. So is your question. Do we agree with the statement of common ground with Anglian Water? We submitted that statement of common ground at deadline for.

00:33:30:27 - 00:33:32:05

Your muted Mr. Jack.

00:33:35:14 - 00:33:46:11

Thank you. Um I was just checking that it's um consistent with the, the the content between the two is consistent that that's what I'm checking.

00:33:48:09 - 00:34:05:05

Amy Stirling on behalf of the applicant. Yes. Um, for example, on page eight of the Statement of Common Ground, it states the applicant can confirm that there are no current proposals to connect surface water flows to any Anglian Water public sewer. So the positions we believe are consistent.

00:34:05:27 - 00:34:08:19

Okay. Thank you. Um,

00:34:10:06 - 00:34:44:00

so moving on. Um, paragraph 5.8.37 of MPs. Ian one sets out the considerations for the Secretary of State's decision making in relation to drainage and the EPA and the PFAS. Please confirm their positions on the drainage implications of the proposed development and whether the proposed drainage system complies with the national standard referred to in paragraph 5.8.37.

00:34:44:02 - 00:34:47:09

So I'll start with the Environment Agency, please.

00:34:56:10 - 00:35:28:26

Lucy Horton for the Environment Agency. Um, so with regard to water quality for, uh, drainage and surface runoff, um, we have noted that, uh, section four of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage strategy, which we believe the most recent version is Rep 2-044, um, lists a number of drainage features, including sustainable drainage strategies, uh, not limited to permeable surfaces, swales, filter drains, etc..

00:35:29:01 - 00:35:56:22

Um, we support their use of the Syria Suds manual. Um, and as it stands at the moment, we agree that they should be providing sufficient mitigation. Um, and that many of which is also contained in the Construction Environmental Management plan. There's a few minor updates we're expecting to the operational environmental management Plan with regard to surface drainage. But as the applicant just confirmed, we're expecting an update of that at the next deadline. Um.

00:35:58:23 - 00:36:07:16

If there's any other questions from the Environment Agency regarding flood risk, I think that will come up next. So I'll hand over to the local authorities if they want to answer.

00:36:07:26 - 00:36:13:14

Okay. Thank you. So if I start with Nottinghamshire please. And Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:36:23:04 - 00:36:39:15

Jessica Scarborough um Nottinghamshire County Council, um lead local flood authority. Um I think I'm. Would you be able to repeat the question, please? I'm a little confused by the specific question being asked there and just trying to understand. Best answer.

00:36:40:15 - 00:37:06:06

Um, paragraph 5.8.37 of MPs. Ian one sets out the considerations for the Secretary of State's decision making in relation to drainage. Tan. So can you confirm your position on the drainage implications of the proposed development, and whether the proposed drainage system complies with the national standards referred to in paragraph 5.8.37?

00:37:08:23 - 00:37:41:22

Okay. Thank you. Yes. Nottinghamshire County Council lead local flood authority. So sort of looking at the proposed drainage. Um, we're we're generally pretty happy, um, pretty satisfied with, with what's been proposed on the site. Um, the, uh, review that we've had, um, of the flood risk assessment and proposed drainage, um, is satisfactory at this stage. It's not raised anything that we have any concerns about. Um, I think it's either from a policy perspective there.

00:37:42:01 - 00:38:14:02

Um, the design, certainly, from what we can understand, ensures flood risk is minimised minimized and keep sensitive infrastructure out of flood risk areas and during operation as well. It doesn't seem to increase flooding on or off site. From our understanding. So with the planned mitigation measures, um, we're very happy that the project will have a negligible neutral impact on on flood risk and

drainage. If you want anything else, I think you would want to respond in writing afterwards, if that's okay.

00:38:14:12 - 00:38:20:21

Yeah. No that's fine. Thank you for that. Um, so I'll move on to the Lincolnshire County Council now, please.

00:38:21:08 - 00:38:44:23

Good afternoon, Sir Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. So Mr. Field, who assists us with um matters pertaining to the for as part of Lincolnshire County Council hasn't given me any comments for this section. So he's. Well he's expressed that he doesn't have any comments. Um, he's not with us today on the call, but he's reviewed the agenda as I understand it and doesn't have any comments on any of the. Oh, hello.

00:38:46:26 - 00:38:56:04

So I wasn't informed that you were going to be with me. Um, my note says no comments next to your name, but, um, so I'll just pass to Mr. Field, who can speak for himself, I'm sure.

00:38:57:00 - 00:38:58:22

Thank you. Please go ahead. Mr.. Yes.

00:38:59:04 - 00:39:17:28

Sorry. Mr. peel from Lincolnshire County Council. Um. Like Nottinghamshire. We've gone through the flood risk assessment and our content with the proposed outline design that's in there that it won't affect, um, won't make surface water flood risk worse. Um, so, yes, we're happy with the design that's been submitted to date.

00:39:18:23 - 00:39:20:03

Brilliant. Thank you very much.

00:39:25:04 - 00:40:05:07

Okay, so now, um, the we've we've previously raised the issue of, uh, sort of surface water runoff from solar panels. Um, it's been stated by the applicant that the ref the reference to the report on the effects of solar panel on water runoff is standard practice within the industry. So firstly, can the applicant confirm whether the assessment for the proposed mitigation measures relating to this accounts for seasonal variability? So for example, we'll probably get the vegetation that's being used as mitigation perform differently during different seasons.

00:40:08:04 - 00:40:13:04

Amy Stirling on behalf of the applicant, understand your question. If you just give us a second, so we'll come back to you.

00:40:33:23 - 00:41:04:01

On behalf of the applicant. Um, so just to touch on the the research that you're referring to, that, um, which we believe is as the BMT, SL research. Um, so to clarify, um, that research is based on an assessment undertaken on bare soil, um, in both essentially looking at the baseline and proposed

scenario. Um, we are proposing um, within the order limits, which are predominantly agricultural. So do consist of bare soil across much of the much of the year.

00:41:04:03 - 00:41:39:14

Um, we're proposing that we will have, uh, species rich grassland, um, across the site. Um, which essentially is in line with the recommendations of numerous, um, research papers on this, um, and provides the mitigation, um, required in terms of surface water runoff. Um, in addition to that, just to just to touch really quickly on it, on addition to that, um, we're also um, proposing that additional sub features will be incorporated. So be that sort of filter drain swales and, uh, basins, slash scrapes. Um, and to which provides, I guess, further mitigation beyond just the well-maintained grassland.

00:41:39:19 - 00:41:52:19

Um, to answer your question directly, in terms of seasonal variation, um, we don't anticipate or we anticipate that the mitigation provided, um, will be consistent across those variants. Are those seasonal variations?

00:41:54:02 - 00:41:58:02

Okay. Thank you. Uh, Mr. Morgan, do you have a question?

00:41:59:02 - 00:42:03:25

No, no, no, no, I just Mr. Fox has got his hand up, so just, uh.

00:42:06:14 - 00:42:07:14

Mr. Fox.

00:42:08:27 - 00:42:10:27

I think we, um.

00:42:13:02 - 00:42:13:25

Sorry.

00:42:20:21 - 00:42:53:09

I think can the applicant needs us to study what a controlled experiment is. The, um. The science behind this clearly isolates the question of what the ground coverage is, and it clearly, um, Focuses on the impact of the solar panels themselves. It's quite clear from from the paper that that is um. That is what it does. And it's okay having, um.

00:42:56:00 - 00:43:15:16

Um, the appropriate grass, etcetera, underneath. But it's the estimations of what the amount of that is needed is based on a total misunderstanding of the impact of the solar panels in the first place. It's an irrelevance of how much grass you've got, but you need to do as proper model of the impact.

00:43:17:27 - 00:43:26:12

Solar panels, but do create additional, um, channeling and the like. It's all I spelled it out in granular detail.

00:43:29:00 - 00:43:29:15

Thank you.

00:43:30:06 - 00:43:32:15

Nothing like a proper answer to it.

00:43:33:23 - 00:43:35:19

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Um.

00:43:37:05 - 00:43:40:13

yeah. I couldn't have anything to say in response to that point.

00:43:41:25 - 00:44:12:18

And Craig fights on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. If I could just point us, um, towards the discussion and conclusions in the Belmont research. Um, so if I just if I'm just going to read two statements quickly. Um, so they state these results, although predictable and based on simplified assumptions, quantify the effect of solar panels on on runoff generation and suggest the erosion control methods should be used to mitigate soil detachment and transportation. Thus, a grass cover beneath the panels and in the interspace between panels is highly recommended. They also state in the conclusions.

00:44:12:20 - 00:44:39:27

The evidence provided by this research suggests that agricultural soils should preferentially not be left bare under soil panel structures, because of an increased risk of runoff and of the relative soil erosion process. Um, so with those statements in mind, um, we're of the opinion that the applicant's proposal was comply with the recommendations and in fact, go beyond them by including additional subs features that I mentioned previously. Um. Thank you.

00:44:40:09 - 00:44:40:25

All right.

00:44:42:25 - 00:44:46:07

Okay. Uh, Mr. Fox?

00:44:46:15 - 00:45:21:13

Yeah. Basically, there is a fundamental misunderstanding of the science and and a totally inadequate reading of the research paper. Um, they quoted Cooke and McEwan, um, against me on this issue when they replied to my submissions. They their work is actually a continuation of Cooke and McEwan's work, and their work specifically said that they it cannot be, you know, it's based on very limited evidence. Um, this needs properly look at looking at because it has implications not only to this project but across the whole region.

00:45:21:21 - 00:45:30:16

Um, and I would say it's incumbent on the examination authority to get proper advice. Don't take my word, but get proper advice on it. Thank you.

00:45:31:13 - 00:45:43:27

Thank you, Mr. Box. Um, so I can now go to the Environment Agency on this matter and the lead local flood authorities. Um,

00:45:45:16 - 00:45:56:19

are you satisfied that, uh, surface water runoff rate will not increase as a result of the drip line that could be caused by rain running off solar panels, please.

00:45:57:21 - 00:45:58:21

Um, I'll jump in first.

00:45:58:23 - 00:46:12:18

From Sean Holden from the Environment Agency. Um, we defer to the local authority to comment on this. We expect all such drainage and the impacts of surface water runoff to be assessed by them. Um, as we feel they are the experts in this over us.

00:46:14:12 - 00:46:14:29

Thank you.

00:46:17:13 - 00:46:20:18

So if I go to, uh, Nottinghamshire County Council now.

00:46:24:00 - 00:46:24:23

Thank you. Sir.

00:46:24:25 - 00:46:38:27

Ross Marshall, principal flood risk management officer for Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, as lead local authority, we are satisfied that the proposals do not increase surface water flood risk across the site. Thank you.

00:46:39:17 - 00:46:43:21

Thank you very much. And Lincolnshire. Lastly.

00:46:45:27 - 00:46:58:01

Yes, sir. Ian Field from Lincolnshire County Council. Um, like Nottinghamshire, we're happy with the proposals. Uh, they do not, um, would not increase flood risk, surface water flood risk across the site.

00:47:00:23 - 00:47:01:15

Thank you.

00:47:07:27 - 00:47:12:11

But Mr. White first. So you got your hand up?

00:47:18:13 - 00:48:06:20

Yes. Thank you sir. David White, speaking on behalf of Say No to one southern, um, 99% of the local communities here. There are recent scientific studies that are showing localized cooling around large scale solar farms, cooling up to -2.5°C, with the average local temperatures lows in the winter months in December, January and February at two degrees Celsius. If this localized cooling scientific studies to be accepted, then it will push the average lows down below 0°C, which could introduce semi permafrost effects on the ground around here, which would have massive effects with the flow of hydrology in this area.

00:48:06:22 - 00:48:20:10

And I don't think this is even being considered or it doesn't seem to be. We they don't know what these large solar farms are going to do. It's all it all seems to our communities. It's a bit of a guessing game. And we do feel that it's

00:48:21:28 - 00:48:26:06

the considerations are lacking across the board. Thank you.

00:48:27:20 - 00:48:48:06

Thank you, Mr. White. Um, so before I go on, just been notified that there is a technical issue with our website. Um, so that which needs to be looked into. So I think it's probably a good time now for us to adjourn for lunch. So we have an hour for lunch and.

00:48:48:12 - 00:49:23:22

And just need to pause it. Can I just clarify with the case team or the video company? Is this, uh, effect on the website directly influencing our ability to run this? Um, hearing the reason I pose that is Anglian waters representative needs to leave by 230, and we won't if we adjourn now, have the opportunity to hear from them. So can I just clarify with the case, seeing what the the situation is, please, or the the video company?

00:49:24:06 - 00:49:25:12

Uh, At Mr. Monde. I'm waiting.

00:49:25:14 - 00:49:26:01

To hear back.

00:49:26:03 - 00:49:26:18

From.

00:49:26:20 - 00:49:27:05

The.

00:49:27:07 - 00:49:27:22

AV.

00:49:27:24 - 00:49:28:09

Company.

00:49:28:11 - 00:49:29:08

My understanding at the.

00:49:29:10 - 00:49:44:01

Moment is that it's just affecting the live stream on our website. So it would affect people, um, following watching on online. Um, but the AV company may be able to clarify if there are any technical issues. Um, their side as well.

00:49:47:17 - 00:49:53:02

Is the representative of the AV company able to, uh, advise us, please?

00:49:55:08 - 00:50:27:01

Amy Sterling, on behalf of the applicant. And I will answer for them because they are in the room. It seems like the Planning Inspectorate website has is having technical issues. I know personally I'm not able to access the One Earth solar page. Um, so I would expect that that does mean people couldn't access to join. Now, I don't know if anyone who was watching the live stream is still able to watch or I'm not sure, but it seems like it's a Planning Inspectorate website issue. They can still watch it.

00:50:27:04 - 00:50:31:04

I'm told by the AV team. Anyone who is currently watching is still able to watch.

00:50:33:00 - 00:50:37:10

Okay. I think on that basis it would be.

00:50:39:24 - 00:51:10:14

Sensible to continue because we do need to hear from Anglian Water before they leave. And so, um, as long as the recordings are not adversely affected, then people will be able to watch and catch up in the event that they try to log on and can't. Um, so as long as we get that reassurance from the AV company, um, then I'll be content to continue.

00:51:11:18 - 00:51:19:24

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I was supportive of that approach, and I'm being told that the recordings are all, um, fine running as they should be.

00:51:20:07 - 00:51:25:08

Thank you. Thank you. Can I just then revert back to you, Mr. Jackson? We can carry on.

00:51:27:24 - 00:51:42:15

Thank you. Um, so I will jump back. I'll now move on to, uh, item two on this, uh, under this sub item two. So, so

00:51:44:00 - 00:52:12:17

the, um, first question for Anglian Water is, are Anglian Water satisfied that the water management plan that is proposed to be secured as part of the seventh will not be finalised until the project reaches the detailed design stage? So the first question is, are you satisfied with that approach? The second question is what are the risks of leaving it to be, um, finalised at the detailed design stage?

00:52:14:26 - 00:52:15:16

Thank you.

00:52:15:23 - 00:52:17:12

Karen Murphy from Anglian Water.

00:52:17:14 - 00:52:18:26

And thank you for accommodating.

00:52:19:20 - 00:52:20:06

The with.

00:52:20:08 - 00:52:21:03

The timetable.

00:52:21:05 - 00:52:21:26

Um with.

00:52:21:28 - 00:52:22:29

With the problems.

00:52:23:01 - 00:52:24:00

Uh, in.

00:52:24:02 - 00:53:03:01

Terms of the, uh, the first question, uh, yes. We are satisfied that, um, the further details, um, would be discussed as and obviously we will be a consultation that, um, at detailed design stage. Um, we've reviewed the, um, outline, um, where it refers to the water management plan, but obviously it doesn't say much about it. We have, um, prepared our written response previously on the, the types of issues that we would, um, be concerned about.

00:53:03:03 - 00:53:22:06

And we've had a meeting with the applicant as well to discuss those. So I believe there would be further, further need for discussions to sort of flesh out those issues. But at this stage it would be acceptable to keep that until the detailed design stage.

00:53:23:01 - 00:53:29:28

Okay. Thank you. Um, and are there any are there any risks of leaving it to the detailed design stage?

00:53:30:22 - 00:53:31:14

Um.

00:53:34:22 - 00:54:08:01

I can't think of anything, um, that. Yeah, would warrant sort of a different approach being taken. Um, I'm. I'm not sort of an expert in this area, so it's just I've been obviously, uh, liaising with colleagues, and they are happy, um, to, to leave it until later on. But it's obviously it's it's, um, we do have a statement of common ground, which is we're finalizing. So there are aspects of, of it being covered in that. And we've been identified as a contour t um under the requirements.

00:54:08:03 - 00:54:12:26

So yeah. Colleagues haven't um, sought a different approach.

00:54:14:06 - 00:54:17:05

Yeah. Okay. Thank you for that. Um.

00:54:21:14 - 00:54:56:24

Yes. That's good. Thank you. Um, I've got a question for the applicant. Next. Um, at deadline for in relation to the water management plan, the EA made a number of comments relating to, um, the monitor, um, monitoring upstream and downstream or any proposed surface water outfalls. Um, that made some comments around, um, our the frequency that the inspections that take place and how they should be taking place.

00:54:56:26 - 00:55:09:20

Um, so I would like the applicant to confirm whether the points raised by the EA in their deadline for submission will be included in an in an updated outline sent.

00:55:11:22 - 00:55:21:03

To the applicant. Yes, I can confirm that will be the case for the for the Osmo and also for the O, uh, operational Environmental management plan as well.

00:55:22:17 - 00:55:23:11

Thank you.

00:55:27:15 - 00:55:35:25

Does anybody else here in attendance have any points to raise on the water management plan?

00:55:39:00 - 00:55:42:01

No. Okay. In that case, I'll move on.

00:55:48:29 - 00:55:51:01

Moving on to flood risk.

00:55:53:12 - 00:56:13:19

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Sorry. I wonder, given the Anglian Water's time constraints. Um, whether we. I would suggest perhaps we deal with the water resources topic first. I believe we can close that off pretty quickly. And then, um, we're sure to make the the 230 deadline on conscious. The flood risk topic may take some time.

00:56:14:09 - 00:56:22:09

Thank you. I will, I will take you up on that. Um, so moving on to water resources. Um.

00:56:24:21 - 00:56:43:21

Question for Anglian Water. Ken. Anglian water and the applicant for Anglian Water. First, please confirm that the um WRI assessment has now been completed. The deadline, I think, was stated and the deadline for submissions was yesterday. Um, and that the outcome is now known.

00:56:47:09 - 00:57:14:10

Harry Murphy for Anglian water. Um, I've discussed this with the applicant and I'm going to defer, uh, to them explaining about, um, the, um, outcome. With it being pre-application, I just don't want to, um, get into sort of sticky, sticky, um, sticky water with, um, the fact that there's GDPR are sort of requirements involved. So if I could defer to the applicant.

00:57:14:28 - 00:57:18:06

Yes you can. Okay. Applicant please.

00:57:18:28 - 00:57:46:05

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. And yes, sir, a water resources assessment was completed and shared with Anglian Water before the deadline for. We received the response actually on the 30th of October. So a couple of days early and Anglian Water confirmed that they would be able to provide the water supply to the proposed development from the existing mains, and that this is during both the construction and the operational phases.

00:57:48:04 - 00:57:48:28

Thank you.

00:58:28:17 - 00:58:36:03

Just last year. Thank you, Mr. Jack. We have a hand raised, sir. Just worth, uh, bringing in Mr. Corcoran.

00:58:41:05 - 00:59:14:27

Thank you. Good afternoon. Um, yeah, just on that point, um, from the environmental point of view for the, um. Sorry. Mark. Rockland Water Resources environment agency. Um, just on that point, really, around the water resources assessment, uh, from the Environment Agency point of view on this, this issue, it's something that is also outstanding. Um, with our statement of common ground and our position at deadline for, um, so basically the Environment Agency Agencies still are still seeking confidence that this is sustainable and and more significantly, practical source of supply available to meet consumptive water demands during construction.

00:59:15:08 - 00:59:53:00

Um, so just to put a bit of context around that, in addition to the drinking water and domestic supply required for the welfare in terms of construction phase, those things include things like dust suppression, uh, machine washing and running fluids like bentonite clay mixing, horizontal directional drilling where that's employed. Um, now with the operational demand, we don't anticipate the volumes required to be massively significant. And the construction phase is, of course, temporary in nature. But for projects of this size, we do ask or we look for a basic water supply strategy to

basically outline and broadly quantify the the quantity of water that these demands will require for the project.

00:59:53:07 - 01:00:23:28

Um, and to provide a really basic option to appraisal of what sources of supply are available to, to the project as well. So from the comments there, from the applicant, it sounds like the water results, assessments and agreement with Anglian Water covers covers that which in theory we would be absolutely happy with. Um, but I think, um, we haven't been party too to that level of detail and we haven't been passed to the water resources assessment. Um, now, there might be good reasons for that. I think one of them just came up earlier on GDPR.

01:00:24:14 - 01:00:57:04

Um, but I think from our point of view, to have the matter resolved from the EA's perspective, um, we would still be seeking to see that level of detail, really in terms of a very broad assessment of quantities required and options considered. In addition to Anglian water supply, which include rainwater harvesting, third parties, tinkering or abstraction requirements, if that is, um, if it comes to it. The reason being, um, there was some ambiguity around whether the water assessment would be provided, um, in advance of detailed design or at detailed design.

01:00:57:06 - 01:01:32:18

This is information that we would ordinarily want a preamp, which of course is behind us now. and with the environmental statement. Um, but for the the demands that have been described in the, the EIA and the environmental statements and the project description. Um, it's not entirely clear what's been covered by the quantities that have been stated in those documents to date. I think there are some quantities, um, within those documents, but it's not clear whether they cover the full scope of what we anticipate was to be required for. So just that level of detail. Um, is all that required to, to resolve that? Um, if we were party to the water resources assessment.

01:01:32:20 - 01:01:53:06

Um, I've every confidence that would cover that. Um, we obviously don't want to duplicate that effort and that work in terms of producing a different water supply strategy. Um, so I'm wondering whether or not that is information that is able to be shared either through submission to the examination or to be shared with the EPA directly. I think that's what we'll be requiring to have a look at.

01:01:55:15 - 01:01:59:28

Thank you. That's helpful. Any applicant. Got any comments on that base.

01:02:00:22 - 01:02:31:22

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Yes. First of all, more than happy to share the water resources assessment both directly to the EA and subject to any sort of confidential information that needs to be removed. Um, for GDPR, you know, any personal information into examination. Also, just to be clear that the response from Anglian Water confirming that they could provide the water supply during construction and operation, covered domestic welfare and non-domestic supply. So it did cover the situation in which the EA has described also in response to this.

01:02:31:24 - 01:02:45:13

We also have in our ceremony of healing note, we're happy to do a bit of signposting for the EA to signpost, where we have set out essentially what the water requirements are for the scheme in more granular detail.

01:02:45:20 - 01:02:56:21

Yeah, I think that'd be useful because it sounds like that boxes have been fixed there that they need to be need to have the information identified to them. So if you could do that, please. Thank you.

01:03:09:20 - 01:03:15:14

So I'm just going to do my questions to make sure there's nothing else for Anglian Water.

01:04:07:10 - 01:04:13:15

Mr. White, do you have your hand up? Do you have a point to make on the other resources?

01:04:13:23 - 01:04:50:12

I do, yes. Thank you. I'm not sure what's happening here, but I can't really tell whether this connection keeps dropping out. He seems to go silent, and I'm not sure if those are pauses. Um, so we had a direct question for, uh, that we wanted a response for from Anglian Water, and we're disappointed that they seem to be leaving early. Uh, this question was going to come at the end on cumulative effects. I guess I don't want to, um, sort of introduce this item now, possibly because I realize I might slow things down, but, um, unless you want me to.

01:04:50:14 - 01:04:54:07

But, uh, if they are leaving, then that's disappointing.

01:04:55:08 - 01:05:06:06

Um, maybe if you've got a point to raise on a different topic. Um, perhaps put it in writing to the examination and then they can respond to it.

01:05:06:26 - 01:05:15:24

Okay. That's yeah, that's fine, I will I will still bring it up with the cumulative effects because there are other policies, including in place which are facing forward. So that's fine. Thank you.

01:05:17:15 - 01:05:18:00

Right.

01:05:18:02 - 01:05:54:20

I think so if, if I'm if I may. Um, we've been discussing internally and I wondered if we're finished with Anglian Water, if it might be appropriate to have a comfort break. Um, conscious including everyone on the teams, has been on line now for several hours. Um, in relation to lunge, we wondered, conscious again. We have quite a few items still remaining on the agenda, whether we could sort of combine our comfort break and short lunch and perhaps reconvene after, say, 30 minutes. I think with one hour given it's 2:00, we'd sort of be stretched at getting through all of the agenda items within the remaining hearing time.

01:05:58:04 - 01:06:29:28

I think what I will do is I was going to suggest that we have a break now. Um, I think because of the technical issues that we are having with, um, our website, we've been told that they, we should be, um, resolved in about 45 minutes. So I'm going to say that we will break for lunch now, which will be 45 minutes. Um, because hopefully then the, uh, it issues will be resolved within that time.

01:06:30:00 - 01:06:46:10

So it's just coming up to where it's just, it's I to to say we'll be back at resume adjourn now and we'll resume at 240. Thank you.