



Event Transcript

Project:	Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park
Event:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 1
Date:	4 February 2026

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

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. 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 event.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:07:22 - 00:00:26:05

Good morning everyone. It's now 10 a.m. and time for this hearing to begin. I'd like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing on environmental matters relating to the Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park project. Can I just confirm that everyone can hear me clearly?

00:00:27:24 - 00:00:47:03

Thank you. Can I also confirm with the case team that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced? Thank you. So my name is Doctor Andrea McGeehan. I'm a chartered town planner, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead panel member to examine this application. I'm now going to ask the other panel members to introduce themselves.

00:00:47:22 - 00:00:57:21

Good morning everyone. My name is Graham Hobbins and I'm a chartered civil engineer and planning inspector. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a panel member for this examination.

00:00:59:21 - 00:01:11:25

Um, good morning everyone. My name is Doctor Philip Brewer. I'm a member of the Institute of Acoustics and a planning inspector. I have also been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a panel member for this examination.

00:01:13:25 - 00:01:48:16

Thank you. So together, we constitute the examining authority for the application. We'll be reporting to the Secretary State with a recommendation on whether or whether or not to the development order. Sorry for the recommendation on whether or not the development consent order should be made. So just a couple of housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Um, could you please set all devices and phones to silent? Um, toilets are available through the double doors at the back of the room and straight ahead. And we aren't expecting any fire drills today, so if the alarm sounds, then please use one of the fire exits.

00:01:50:01 - 00:02:22:24

The meeting will follow the agenda published on the National Infrastructure Planning website on 23rd January 2026. Um, it will be helpful if you had a copy of that in front of you. The agenda is for guidance only, and we may add other considerations or issues as we progress. We'll conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to that said, if the discussions can't be concluded, it may be necessary for us to prioritize some matters and refer others to written questions.

00:02:23:05 - 00:02:31:15

Likewise, if you can't answer the questions being asked or require time to get the information requested, then please indicate that you wish to respond in writing.

00:02:34:25 - 00:02:51:05

Today's hearing is being undertaken in the hybrid way, meaning some of you are present with us here at the hearing venue, and some of us, some of you are joining virtually using Microsoft Teams. We'll make sure that you, however you decided to attend today, you'll be given a fair opportunity to participate.

00:02:53:13 - 00:03:21:03

In a recording of today's hearing will be made available on the Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park section of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing has finished. With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone stating your name and who you're representing each time before you speak. If you're not at a table with a microphone, there is a roving mic. So please make sure that one of these is brought to you before you speak.

00:03:24:08 - 00:03:58:23

A link to the Planning Inspectorate Privacy Notice was provided in the notification for this hearing. We assume that everyone here has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in the data protection laws. Please speak to a member of the case team if you have any questions about this. So I'm now going to ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to introduce yourselves. When I state your organization's name, could you please introduce yourself stating your name and who you represent, and on which a gender item you wish to speak.

00:03:59:01 - 00:04:21:05

If you're not representing an organized organization, please confirm your name. Summarize your interest in the application and confirm the agenda item upon which you wish to speak. And could you please indicate how you wish to be addressed during the hearing? Whether it's Mr. Mis mis, Mrs.. Or, and so on. So starting first with the applicant and and their advisors, please.

00:04:22:08 - 00:04:41:14

Uh, good morning ma'am. Uh, my name is Peter Nesbit. I'm a solicitor and a partner at Eversheds Sutherland, a law firm representing the applicant. Um, to my right. Um, for the first couple of agenda items, I'm joined by Mr. Matthew Sharp. Uh, he's a senior director at planning consultancy quad.

00:04:43:01 - 00:04:57:25

Um, then we have Mrs. Mary Fisher, partner and landscape architect. Architect at Absalon landscape planning. Uh, and then we have Mike gray, director and ecologist at Rams.

00:05:00:06 - 00:05:12:24

Uh, then we have Miss Elena Sarajevo, head of planning for the applicant. And then finally we have Doctor Paul Phillips, director at M VMs. Thank you.

00:05:19:04 - 00:05:19:22

Thank you.

00:05:24:09 - 00:05:33:07

And moving on to organizations and individuals that have given notice of their intention to speak, starting with those in the room. First of all, Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:05:35:06 - 00:05:55:20

Good morning, Mr. Will Lawrence, planning and infrastructure manager in Nottinghamshire County Council. I have two colleagues joining me today who will also be speaking. To my right is Miss Sarah Hancock, principal highways development management officer, and she'll be speaking on item three. I also have Mr. Jason Morden who's a senior practitioner for historic buildings, and he'll be speaking on item four.

00:05:58:09 - 00:06:03:22

Thank you. And then moving on to Newark and Sherwood District Council, please.

00:06:05:17 - 00:06:22:27

Good morning, Mr. Simon Betts. Major. I'm sorry. Planning major projects. You can show a district council. Um, I was going to suggest that I've got a number of colleagues with me today, both in the room and one online. I was just going to suggest they introduce themselves under each item. If that's okay, that's fine.

00:06:22:29 - 00:06:23:14

Yes.

00:06:23:16 - 00:06:24:05

Okay. Thank you, thank you.

00:06:29:09 - 00:06:34:17

And, um, then, um. JPG. Mr. Northcott, did you introduce yourself?

00:06:35:18 - 00:06:36:03

Um.

00:06:36:10 - 00:06:49:12

Good morning madam. Uh, my name is Mr. Anthony Northcote. I'm a charter town planner, um, representing, uh, jpeg, the joint parish's action group, uh, potentially today, looking to speak on items 1 to 5, inclusive. Thank you.

00:06:54:14 - 00:06:57:04

Mr. Williams, are you here?

00:07:00:28 - 00:07:01:21

Good morning, Paul.

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

Williams.

00:07:02:24 - 00:07:14:23

Norrell solar farm steering group. I'm not sitting at the table because I intend to speak on the last item regarding the Bess, which looks like it's going to be tomorrow. Um, can be addressed as Mr..

00:07:15:09 - 00:07:20:20

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. Um, Elizabeth Hopkins.

00:07:33:03 - 00:07:34:18

Hello. Mrs..

00:07:34:20 - 00:07:54:04

Elizabeth Hopkins, I'm norrell. No, I'm not Norrell. It's because it says Norrell. Then I'm calling on Trent Parish Council. Uh, I'm sat with the parish council or the councilor, and I hope to or contribute during the proceedings to the various items as they arise that are relevant to us.

00:07:54:06 - 00:07:54:21

All right.

00:07:54:23 - 00:07:55:11

Thank you.

00:07:58:25 - 00:08:03:12

And Sally drew, is Sally drew in the room? Okay. Thank you.

00:08:04:28 - 00:08:08:09

So moving now to those present online. Um.

00:08:11:25 - 00:08:25:27

Do we have. I know we've got various members of Newark and Sherwood District Council. And, Mr. Betts, you said they'd introduce themselves as as we go along, which is. Which is fine. Um, do we have a representative of Historic England online?

00:08:28:27 - 00:08:37:18

Not yet. No. Okay. Thank you. And then, um, the Environment Agency, I think we've got various, um, individuals representing the Environment Agency. Um.

00:08:38:17 - 00:08:39:22

Hi. Yes.

00:08:39:27 - 00:08:40:12

Good morning.

00:08:40:23 - 00:08:50:17

I'm Ryan Smitherman, uh, for the Environment Agency. Uh, I've got a number of colleagues on the call. Um, I'll let them introduce themselves under each agenda item as well.

00:08:50:25 - 00:08:53:09

All right then. Thank you, Mr. Smitherman.

00:08:56:00 - 00:08:58:13

And then, um, National highways.

00:08:59:23 - 00:09:07:28

Uh, good morning, Mr. Oliver Smith representing National Highways. And I'll be speaking at agenda item 3.3 today.

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

All right. Thank you very much. Thank you. Is there anybody else from National Highways intending to speak today? Do you.

00:09:14:09 - 00:09:14:25

No not.

00:09:14:27 - 00:09:15:12

Not.

00:09:15:14 - 00:09:16:07

Okay. All right.

00:09:16:10 - 00:09:16:25

Thank you.

00:09:16:27 - 00:09:17:19

Smith. Thank you.

00:09:17:21 - 00:09:18:16

Cheers. Bye bye.

00:09:18:22 - 00:09:19:12

Bye bye.

00:09:21:10 - 00:09:26:05

And then I think we've got a representative of bug life with us virtually.

00:09:27:01 - 00:09:27:17

Oh, hi.

00:09:27:19 - 00:09:37:24

I'm Mr. Jamie Robins from Bug Life. I wish to speak on, uh, just agenda item 2.2 on the ecological receptors. And it's only me from bug life today. All right.

00:09:38:25 - 00:09:40:03

Thank you, Mr. Robbins.

00:09:44:29 - 00:09:48:26

Is there anybody else in the room who wishes to speak today?

00:09:53:15 - 00:10:14:03

All right. Thank you. Um, if at some point during proceedings you decide you do wish to speak. Then that's. That's fine. Just just let us know and you can introduce yourself at that point. And then moving back to virtual attendees, is there anybody online that wishes to speak today that hasn't hasn't been introduced or their organization hasn't been introduced? Yes. I can see a virtual hand up.

00:10:17:20 - 00:10:23:14

Would you like to speak? I can't see who it is, but I can see her hand.

00:10:24:03 - 00:10:24:26

Good morning.

00:10:24:28 - 00:10:25:13

Ma'am.

00:10:26:29 - 00:10:27:15

Sorry. Do you want.

00:10:27:17 - 00:10:28:02

To?

00:10:29:12 - 00:10:32:03

Sorry, I can't quite hear. Would you like to introduce yourself?

00:10:32:06 - 00:10:32:21

Yes.

00:10:32:26 - 00:10:33:29

John Groves.

00:10:34:01 - 00:10:37:19

John. Rose Groves. Oh, okay. Mr. Groves. Hello there.

00:10:37:21 - 00:10:52:23

Hi. Good morning. Um. Uh, Groves, town planning, charter town planner representing Mr. Richard Gill and Drone Defense Services Limited. Um, I think my participation will be confined to item one on the agenda.

00:10:53:19 - 00:10:55:00

All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Groves.

00:10:55:02 - 00:10:55:24

Thank you.

00:11:07:09 - 00:11:42:26

So in terms of how we will manage proceedings, we've allocated up to two days for these discussions, and we don't anticipate requiring the full two days, but we'll obviously see how the discussions go as things stand. Um, we do anticipate dealing with at least the first three topics today that's landscape and visual ecology and biodiversity and construction effects. So it's possible that we will go on to heritage matters as well. Um, the discussion today will go on till around 5:00, with 20 minute breaks mid-morning and mid-afternoon, and around an hour at lunch time at around 1:00.

00:11:44:20 - 00:12:07:09

Okay. I'm going to go on to, um, briefly explain the purpose of this issue. Specific hearing three. So its, its main purpose is to review some of the environmental matters associated with the project. Um, this is selective in the sense that we're not able to cover all of the issues raised in the time available. Um, it focuses on the things that we think would benefit from discussion.

00:12:08:25 - 00:12:39:16

Um, the purpose of an issue specific hearing more generally is so that we may probe a test and assess the evidence through direct questioning of persons present. And we will lead the the questioning of the hearing. Cross questioning of a person giving evidence by another person will only be permitted if we think it's necessary to ensure that representations are adequately tested, um, or that an interested party has a fair chance to put its case. We will be noting down actions arising from the discussion as we go along.

00:12:39:20 - 00:12:43:02

Um, and we will summarize these, um, when we conclude the meeting

00:12:44:18 - 00:12:49:08

before we start. Does anybody have any questions about the nature of the proceedings?

00:12:51:10 - 00:12:52:00

Okay.

00:12:52:16 - 00:13:00:00

All right. Thank you. So moving on to the first substantive item then that relates to landscape and visual matters.

00:13:02:04 - 00:13:19:00

So the issues for discussion today relate to those raised in written submissions received at deadline one and deadline two, including the local impact reports as well as relevant reps. And some of these follow on from the discussion that we did hold. At issue specific hearing one.

00:13:20:17 - 00:13:52:27

Now noted as a first item, um, uh, the suggestion that, um, the the existing landscape, character and quality of the study area be summarized by the applicant. But I'm going to suggest that we will leave that for now. It's something that we may come back to later, but in terms of, um, best managing the time, um, I'm going to suggest we, um, We don't cover that at this, this precise moment. I'd like to move instead on to item 1.2, which is the methodology for assessing the significance of landscape and visual effects.

00:13:57:16 - 00:14:44:23

And at the first point I want to address is how the significance effect is, is assessed in terms of the disagreement between the applicant and new consumer district Council. And I note, particularly the statement of common ground between these two parties, which is rep two um, 088 at .2.3.6, specifically in relation to the significance of effects is assessed. Um, so this refers to the landscape and visual methodology, um, which sets out and that's sorry, that's document AP 209 um, paragraph 7.6.36 which sets out that where an effect has been classified as major or major stroke moderate.

00:14:44:25 - 00:15:31:24

This is considered to be equivalent to likely significant effects referred to in the EIA regulations, where moderate effects are predicted. Professional judgment is applied to ensure that the potential potential for significant effects arising has been thoroughly considered. So that's what we're that's that's the set out in the applicant's methodology. And that's what that's what's been followed in the the landscape and visual impact assessment. So the concern that Newark and Sherwood have raised in their relevant representation, um, is that it's not clear why moderate or moderate adverse landscape effects haven't been judged as significant, noting that other chapters have treated moderate effects as being of significance.

00:15:32:21 - 00:16:09:07

So we try to explore the parties positions on this in and written question 11 .1.1, and in response, the applicant refers to the guidance in terms of the importance of consistent use of assessment criteria across projects, including EIA and non EIA projects. Newark and Sherwood, in their response to that question, referred to the fact that the One Earth solar project for that project, moderate effects are considered to be significant in EIA terms. So just in terms of I'm trying to take this forward, I'm just going to refer to the applicant and I assume it's Mrs.

00:16:09:09 - 00:16:23:01

Fisher to to address this point. And I suppose the question is, do you accept that it's reasonable for your consumer to refer to that or the project, the one to the solar project, and in drawing comparisons with the assessment matrix?

00:16:26:07 - 00:16:26:29

Thank you ma'am.

00:16:27:01 - 00:16:27:17

So.

00:16:27:28 - 00:16:32:16

Um, I think based on meetings we have with Newark and Sherwood.

00:16:32:25 - 00:17:03:03

Uh, team on Friday and Monday, I think we've reached the stage of agreeing that the threshold question is a bit of a red herring, right? Okay, I'll let Newark and Sherwood confirm or otherwise, but yeah, I think that's where we've reached. So I think we've agreed that the threshold being used here is appropriate, but that they may disagree as to, in relation to individual effects as to whether some of the moderate effects are significant. So I just let them respond. Thank you. But that's where I think we've got to. Thank you very much.

00:17:03:06 - 00:17:03:23

Yes.

00:17:08:15 - 00:17:22:21

Morning. Sarah Boland, landscape architect for Newark and Sherwood District Council. And I'm just going to pause it. Is it is it Mrs.. Miss, over to you. Mrs.. It's fine. Yeah. Boland. Thank you. Um, yeah.

00:17:22:23 - 00:17:53:02

We've had, um, productive discussions with the applicant over the last few days. Um, with regard to a number of issues, including this one, I think going back to your the overriding question, I think it is appropriate for us to refer to on Earth in terms of the use of moderate as being significant and appropriate for us to have raised the question about moderate being significant in assessment going forward with development, such as n SIPs.

00:17:53:10 - 00:17:54:16

That said.

00:17:57:20 - 00:18:37:20

As Mary, as Mrs. Fisher has said, um, we've reached a position where it really comes down to reviewing their assessment of moderate and moderate major and deciding whether there are any of those that we disagree with. Otherwise, we'll just go round and round in circles, putting not too fine a point on it. You know, the applicant has set out clearly with back to guidance, the the process that they've used to assess the moderate and the position that they've taken is incorrect in the sense that it's not right to amend your methodology midway through a and Elvia or midway through a project.

00:18:38:10 - 00:18:47:02

Um, so I think it comes down to a number of locations where we consider that moderate impacts would be significant.

00:18:49:10 - 00:18:57:16

That's helpful. Thank you. So I'm just going to come back to you on that particular point then. Um, so uh, the um,

00:18:59:14 - 00:19:15:25

in chapter seven, which is um, rep two and 022, I believe I'm just going to check that. Yes, it is, um, table 7.6 and 7.7. It may be helpful to have.

00:19:15:27 - 00:19:16:12

Got to.

00:19:16:14 - 00:19:31:13

Have that displayed on the screen if possible, please. So, um, it's page 88. Sorry, 83 even of rep 2023. Is it possible to put that up on the screen?

00:19:37:02 - 00:20:10:06

So I was just going to ask if we could run through those particular receptors where moderate effects have been identified, whether there are particular points of concern that the Council has in terms of those. Um, so is that is that. Yes, I think yeah, those are correct. Yeah. So that's the table 7.7. So, um, there are a number of landscape, um, receptors for which moderate effects have been identified. Are you able at this point to identify ones that are of particular concerns to the council?

00:20:10:12 - 00:20:52:11

Yeah. And we have again discussed this right with, with the applicant and helpfully, the applicant supplied, uh, some appendices to the written questions which set out the color code, really the levels of effect across particularly the visual receptors on public rights of way and on, on road users. I. There was a couple of places on those where I think there might be an error, but I think that's just worth a discussion between us outside of this. Um, but going back to the tables are of two locations, as we raised with the applicant at discussions this week were with regard to the Meadowlands LCT.

00:20:55:23 - 00:21:09:15

Um, and with regards to the road users, just into Group E north of Group F on the bit between Ossington Road and Thornton.

00:21:10:17 - 00:21:33:04

Um, okay. So it's those those two receptors that you've got concerns that moderate effects are significant because. Yeah, the point is that where the methodology sets out that where moderate effects are identified, then it's about professional judgment and sort of of reviewing those and thinking about whether they slip into these significant Category. And so it's those two. All right.

00:21:33:06 - 00:22:04:19

And and I think if just I mean the applicant themselves makes reference to the latest Govia guidance where it sort of sets out that just because you have not significant effects doesn't mean that overall a proposal is acceptable. So I think, you know, the clear position is that we've reached now is where the applicant has done their assessment. We've got these couple of additional, not additional locations, these locations where we think that those moderate effects are significant and we can set those out.

00:22:04:21 - 00:22:06:19

And then that's the kind of clear position.

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

Yes.

00:22:07:17 - 00:22:08:28

To put yourself isn't it. Yeah.

00:22:09:00 - 00:22:22:18

That is. And sure. So so in terms of that that professional judgment then are you able to articulate what it is about those receptors that that is um, of significance and, and warrants that slightly different categorization?

00:22:23:13 - 00:22:26:18

Yes, I can do. Do you want me to do that now or. No, no, no, no.

00:22:27:00 - 00:22:40:05

I'm very happy for you to do that in writing. You should. Obviously, we need to have some sort of formal record of that so that that would be helpful. I mean, if you want to say in a couple of words now, why, why you think those those two are. Um, of of of that value, then that would probably be helpful.

00:22:40:07 - 00:23:16:05

Yeah. Well, with regard to the Meadowlands LCT, that's quite a small there pockets of, of, um, landscape character that go through the main host landscape character area. And there's some locations around viewpoint five. Viewpoint 13. This is what we've discussed over the last few days as well, where we consider that some of the although there are limited direct impacts, some of those areas are quite are surrounded quite intensely by solar array. And we consider that the perceptual and experiential experiential impact on the landscape character features warrants it being significant.

00:23:16:07 - 00:23:47:18

And then with regard to the area between Ossington and the AA one, effectively and around the edge of Group E and group F, the applicant does go sort of some way north of that road captured in Group F, but given the sort of openness of the landscape there and the um, degree of solar array in that location and the extent to which it will be experienced, we consider that that just tips a little bit further further north than is currently shown.

00:23:47:24 - 00:24:20:25

Um, but I did want to just establish a couple of things with the applicant, which again, I'm happy to do outside of this, just with regard to my understanding that effectively, the conclusions that we're reaching is that across all public rights of way, it's major moderate affects during construction and operation. And then those effects start to reduce. Okay. And but I think all of that my interpretation of these color coded and cross-referencing with the table, I think it's appropriate to just do in a sort.

00:24:20:27 - 00:24:51:03

Of understood in a meeting rather than sort of in this, in this environment here. Yeah, that's that's really helpful. Thank you, Mrs. Poland. So come back to Mrs. Fisher then. Obviously those those two particular points have been highlighted by the council. How have you been able to consider that and what's your response? Um, yeah. Sort of in that we knew roughly what what was going to be said.

Now, there was a bit of foreshadowing, but we were waiting for it to be confirmed. So it's really useful to have it confirmed.

00:24:51:16 - 00:25:22:02

Um, I mean, yes, it makes sense. There often is professional disagreement about detail, and that's what this is to a degree. Um, the one thing I just would say is when it is getting written up, the Meadowlands LCT has two moderate judgments, one for construction and early operation and another for after mitigation. So we'd need confirmation about whether you mean both or just one. Other than that, we can firm up the detail and see where we get to.

00:25:22:04 - 00:25:47:12

That's very helpful. It may be since we're both here, we can do it while you're talking about other topics later. That would be very helpful. Thank you. Thank you both. All right. Um. So, uh. Yeah. Clarification from from the council and a response from from the applicant in terms of where we where we've got to on the assessment of effects would be very helpful. Um, and I'm going to suggest that as an action point. Um, for, for deadline three.

00:25:49:02 - 00:26:38:28

Um, and just, just grateful to to both parties for obviously those very helpful discussions that have been taking place which may assist with, with some of the later items relating to, to to landscape and visual um, which we will come back to. So I'm going to move on to look at, um, the assessment of landscape and visual effects, item 1.3. Um, very, very aware that um, of the concerns of interested parties, um, about, uh, what's described as an open rural landscape that, um, and the strong perception that this will become dominated by industrial scale solar infrastructure, to quote some of the representations that we've received, um, and the need to ensure that this has been appropriately assessed.

00:26:40:03 - 00:27:18:24

And I want to, um, to pick up a particular point made by BJP in their, their written, uh, representation, which is Rep one stroke 091. So JPEG set out that the landscape and visual impact assessment by using the zone of theoretical visibility studies to help identify areas which in which the development will be seen. Um, haven't taken into account those settlements that are going to be completely encircled by the development. Um, so JPEG are suggesting that, um, whilst these are outside the zone of influence and residents wouldn't be able to leave their village without seeing and experiencing solar development.

00:27:20:15 - 00:27:45:29

Um, so JPEG is suggesting the traditional approach of identifying landscaping impacts isn't appropriate for the particular nature of the scheme, given its unusual layout. And they're suggesting that a slightly more nuanced and unusual approach to this matter would be appropriate. Um, and so this especially have you you've presumably seen that the comments from from JPEG. Have you got any thoughts about about what's said there?

00:27:48:11 - 00:28:19:28

Uh thank you ma'am. So yeah, I get I get the issue they're raising. Um, the difficulty is in providing coherent assessment. Um, because, you know, if you applied that approach, any people anywhere

might travel through a development. Um, how do we attribute the effects to the people living in a particular village? That's quite difficult to do. So the assessment does divide things up. It necessarily has to provide something that can be written and understood.

00:28:20:00 - 00:28:50:04

That there isn't kind of a bit all encompassing. Um, that said, I mean, a significant effect are identified on people travelling around and about villages. It can be readily understood that living in the villages, you can't see it. But then when you go out and travel about, you will see it. Those effects are clearly assessed, identified as significant. Um, we all know they're the same people. You know they're the same people or the people making this decision know that it's the same people.

00:28:50:06 - 00:29:20:12

So yes, the assessment is on visual receptors, um, which means people, but it means people in a particular place doing a particular thing as opposed to anything that that one person might do. Um, so it's. Yes, it's covered. Um, we know that the people travelling through the landscape are the people who live in the villages. All right. Thank you. And we will come on to the point about, um, cumulative effects a little later. Um, I don't know whether Mr.

00:29:20:14 - 00:29:28:15

Northcote, whether you've got any any particular response about the the methodology that's been used and your critique of it. Um.

00:29:31:09 - 00:30:11:17

Thank you. Madam. Um, I don't have the benefit of being a landscape professional. Um, so it's more of a layman's, um, approach to this. Um, but I think it very much goes back to the, uh, the topic that was brought up at the first issue, hearing about sort of sequential views and all this, this element about how the landscape in totality is considered. Um, and I think it is helpful, actually, to have a bit of an understanding how is the landscape around it evolved? I talked yesterday in the compulsory acquisition about the major, um, estates that used to exist.

00:30:12:05 - 00:30:54:15

The quadrant that we're talking about was largely known as the Duke Rees. It was huge. great estates. Um, and that over time it was Sherwood Forest. And then it's led to a patchwork of arable fields. And we've got this patchwork quilt type of landscape. And part of the problem, as communities see it, is we're going to go from a patchwork quilt type of wide environment to one that becomes very uniform. You can have all these pockets of, uh, solar, quite an industrialized type of landscape, but it's losing the overall mixed bag of character to one that's much more uniform.

00:30:54:18 - 00:31:29:14

And the difficulty for some of the settlements, they might not be picked up by a viewpoint because they're sitting in the middle. Um, if you remember back at the start, I just first of all, the scheme was a doughnut, and then it had a big bite taken out of it, but it's still a sort of big C semi-circle how you want to describe it. And because of the way other aspects work and things like bridges, etc., there are some settlements that you cannot leave without going through this scheme every day.

00:31:29:24 - 00:32:08:27

And this in combination with others. And, and I think we're still struggling to understand and and I don't have any bright ideas. There's no methodology for assessing this. I think what we're wanting, the examining authority to understand and give consideration to is that beyond the normal standard methodology, um, in the guidance, there are some unusual factors with this scheme and its shape and its size, and how it sort of embeds settlements within it is a is an additional factor that needs to be given some consideration.

00:32:09:01 - 00:32:29:24

I accept the methodology doesn't allow you. It gives you no real matrix in simple terms for assessing that. So I think what we're really asking is for the examining authority to understand that and to try and give some consideration to that beyond the standard methodology of that.

00:32:29:28 - 00:32:52:14

That's understood. Thank you. And we will come back on to to look at cumulative effects on the agenda. And we're going to be talking about the historic the nature of the historic landscape, actually in the the, um, cultural Heritage and archaeology section as well. Thank you. Um, Mrs. Hopkins, and I'll come to you. Mr.. In a moment, Mr. graves, I can see you've got a virtual hand up, and I'm just going to to come to Mrs. Hopkins in the room. What would you like to say? Thank you.

00:32:52:16 - 00:33:25:14

Elizabeth Hopkins, Carlton on Trent Parish council. Um, we are one of those villages that are going to be surrounded. We're looking to Newark and Sherwood. They've talked about the effect, um, on the Ossington Road that's on a slope. We are actually looking into that. So on going to the applicants uh z TV map, it shows that the properties to the west of our village will be looking into that.

00:33:25:16 - 00:33:40:15

So when Mrs. Fischer refers to, um, it's not impacting directly onto the people and their houses and the properties. That isn't correct. And their own Z TV demonstrates that. Thank you.

00:33:40:26 - 00:33:47:28

Thank you, Mrs. Hopkins. Before I go to Mrs. Fisher for comment, I'm going to to go to, uh, Mr. Groves online. What would you like to say?

00:33:53:00 - 00:34:28:28

Thank you. Ma'am. Sorry. Camera wouldn't turn on. Um, now, just just to echo the points made by JPEG that, um, accept the inevitability of and constraints of, uh, the methodology. Uh, and in terms of my client is an example of one very specific location where the impact on landscape and visual effect from their property is massive and significant. And that doesn't get picked up in global assessments, but needs to be taken into account.

00:34:29:00 - 00:34:41:21

And that's my client's wish to have that specific point and the, the limitations of the of a methodology in terms of those very specific local impacts.

00:34:42:27 - 00:35:06:12

All right. Thank you, Mr. Groves. Um, and before I pass back to Mrs.. Mrs.. Mrs.. Fisher, I would just just acknowledge the fact that the in terms of effects, the landscape and visual assessment does identify a range of significant effects and that that would be associated with the development. So, so that's that's the context that we're dealing with. But this is do you have any responses to the the points that have been made.

00:35:10:17 - 00:35:13:15

Thank you ma'am. Yes. So in.

00:35:13:17 - 00:35:14:06

Relation.

00:35:14:08 - 00:35:46:16

To Hopkins point about Cotton on Trent. Um, at no point have I or have I or the Elvia said that those properties wouldn't have an outlook towards the site. Um, I'm fairly sure at one point it was specifically mentioned in the text. I just can't find the reference at the moment, so I'll have to find it that they do have an outlook towards the site. Um, the Elvia itself focuses on impacts on public amenity, so views from streets and footpaths and places where the public can go.

00:35:46:21 - 00:36:12:01

That's what it's supposed to do. And it will have reported for Carlton on Trent that there is very limited visibility from the streets. But that's not the same as limited visibility from the houses. Um, the impact of views from houses and this addresses Mr. Cross Point as well, is covered in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment, which is provided in an appendix and does cover the property in question in detail.

00:36:13:27 - 00:36:14:23

Thank you.

00:36:17:03 - 00:36:18:10

I'm going to.

00:36:20:19 - 00:36:34:23

Leave the assessment of landscape and visual effects and move on to the next item, which is the approach to assessing cumulative landscape effects, which we are we are sort of moving into. Um, from, from the comments that have been made. Um.

00:36:37:13 - 00:36:43:05

I was going to spend a moment reviewing where we've, we've got to, um,

00:36:45:03 - 00:37:04:23

in terms of the, the discussion that we had at issue specific hearing one and then the, the written submissions we've had since then. I'm just noting, though, that the council and the applicant seem to have had productive discussion. So is there anything around the approach to assessing cumulative effects that's been discussed and agreed that would be helpful to start us off with?

00:37:07:09 - 00:37:38:29

Whoever wants to to to say perhaps. Perhaps. Mrs. Bohlen, do you want to say where you understand things are in terms of that, that methodology and where the the point that you've reached with the applicant? Yeah. Of course. Yeah. So as you say, we have had productive discussions and cumulative formed one of these points of discussion. So I think there's two points with reference to cumulative going forward. The first point was that we raised the question of movement of people through the landscape, particularly between Great North Road and One Earth at that northern end.

00:37:39:01 - 00:38:09:03

So this sequential experience so not kind of um, in, in combination affects, so to speak. It's it's the, it's the, the thought process of leaving one, moving through the landscape and experiencing this, the solar array as you move from one location to another. So the applicant agreed in the meeting to address those specific sequential effects. Miss Fisher sent me a snapshot of an O.S.

00:38:09:05 - 00:38:47:10

map where we've identified a public right of way route and a and a road route. And that's the additional piece of work that I think is have been sent through to me, actually. But I haven't had a chance to review yet which addresses that point. So I think in terms of those sort of sequential viewpoints from the council's perspective that addresses that. The second point is this point about the sort of strategic level, cumulative impact of the development on the wider character areas, which we discussed before and has been discussed at One Earth and other, uh, solar developments proceeding.

00:38:47:12 - 00:39:21:08

And Newark and Sherwood District Council sort of set their position out at one Earth, particularly with reference to the technical Memorandum seven, which was submitted by air on behalf of Newark and Sherwood, where they say, well, whilst we must consider the effect of one Earth scheme, we'll have in addition to other schemes rather than all the schemes together. When considering cumulative landscape character effects, we judge that they will result in adverse effects predominantly through an extensive change in land use, and they refer back to other, um, to other pieces of work and citations.

00:39:21:10 - 00:39:58:02

I won't go into that. And then that was reiterated in the, the, the verbal hearings. The position that we we've reached is that I think NSCDC we don't think it's productive to necessarily draw this information out through the Elvia or technical documents, but rather is a matter to be raised as a sort of separate, separate technical file note almost, which is our intention, because the reality is that the cumulative guidance doesn't address the question about this regional and strategic impact.

00:39:58:04 - 00:40:38:16

Now there's advice notes and there's lots of discussion generally within the profession about this idea of combined. You know, if you have four solar parks, what's the effect of your additional solar park? But also what's the effect of your additional solar park on those four as a whole in that in that locality? So I think for your for the purposes of you being able to sort of take that information in, in a separate, um, rather than it diluting other technical information before it.

00:40:38:18 - 00:41:13:04

What we've agreed is that we'll provide our sort of considerations and we'll set that out in a separate note. Similarly, then was done for one Earth. So that follows. That means that NSCDC follow this line that they've sort of set that they are concerned about the strategic and regional level of impact of the solar array through Lincolnshire and into a Nottinghamshire, but it doesn't dilute or contrive the information that's set out in the Elvia, which follows guidance which is available at the moment.

00:41:13:06 - 00:41:45:03

If you also consider that's the appropriate way to receive that information. It sounds like that could be very helpful indeed, because it struck me that there was a bit of an impasse between the parties on this, and we needed to. And that's one of the purposes of the discussion today. Try and find a way forward. So, um, okay. Uh, so in terms of the Elvia and just just take the step by step, I suppose, um, and the, um, the cumulative assessment methodology.

00:41:45:05 - 00:42:11:17

So we talked about issue specific hearing one and in submissions following that about the applicants approach. And in that it's um, inherently cumulative. Um, uh, it's and in and in terms of the guidance that we have, which is the pin's guidance relating to cumulative effects. And the, um, the Landscape Institute guidance. Is the council content that that's been followed?

00:42:13:18 - 00:42:52:04

Yes, it's been followed in terms of the additional work that we've asked them to do. I think there's maybe some further discussion about the schemes which are included, which is really for Simon. And then I think probably for Fisher to explain the approach that they've taken in terms of following our discussions, in terms of the additional cumulative work that that the applicant has done. If that's okay, ma'am. Yeah. All right. Um, it would be helpful to understand if, if there's any concerns about whether or not the Pins guidance in relation to cumulative developments and how that establishes the baseline baseline.

00:42:52:10 - 00:42:55:03

What Mr. Bates, do you wanted to help on that particular street?

00:42:56:12 - 00:43:29:00

Simon Betts New district council. So yes, just to expand upon some of the discussions we've been having, I suppose at a more general level, what we have talked about is the technical Technical Appendix document, a 2.1, which looks at the cumulative assessment stages one and two. So that really is set out to follow the pin's guidance and in fact the stages of the assessment. I think where we're at is that we I think previously it's fair to say we agreed the long list of developments anyway.

00:43:29:06 - 00:44:00:05

Um, I think we're now in a position having interrogated that document, which has been updated, and I think that was submitted. Deadline two. Um, we're in a position whereby, uh, the shortlist in effect is agreed as well. So the schemes are being captured. Um, so I think that's been a helpful exercise, but then it just comes down to, um, I suppose our position on whether we agree, um, with, with that cumulative assessment and the conclusions. The conclusions of that cumulative assessment.

00:44:00:07 - 00:44:22:19

And that's probably where, um, we're a different position and we'll probably maintain a different position based upon some of the issues that we've already talked about so far. But in terms of adherence to Pin's guidance, the approach has been followed. The discussions have been had our ability to interrogate and question that. Um, I think we are we are intent at this point in time.

00:44:27:26 - 00:44:46:11

So I guess what I'm keen to understand is, is, is those points of disagreement. So if there's a, um, if there's any concerns about the, the, um, the baseline assessment for landscape and visual impact assessment, it'd be helpful if we could understand what what what they are at this point.

00:44:57:02 - 00:45:41:26

Simon Betts, new control District council. Um, I don't think there's disagreement of baseline. Um, we have had a bit of discussion around, um, what schemes are carried into, uh, future baseline and thinking about the Pins guidance again, that's, um. Um, as I understand it, refers to the ability to to consider those schemes based upon certainty of those coming forward. But I think what we have, what we have, um, or where we have got to and as a result of recent discussions, I think we're now in a position where we're happy that schemes have been assessed, albeit that it might be in different component parts of the assessment itself.

00:45:41:28 - 00:46:12:18

So whether it's based on or whether it's cumulative, I think we're content from following the very sort of specific discussions that we've had that those schemes are being captured in some form. But ultimately it then comes down to sort of wider strategic issue, which is, as we talked about at the last. Issue specific hearing, it's about saying, okay, so there's there's there's one, um, solar farm scheme ahead of us, which is one Earth. We've got Great North Road, which is tabled as well.

00:46:12:28 - 00:46:55:06

Um, and it's that, that more significant change in land use, uh, which segments the district running from Newark all the way to the sort of top northern end of the district. That in itself is a, uh, I'm being sort of loose in the terms that I would use, but taking it from a sort of more general planner level, it's a significant change. There's no there's no way of getting away from that. So it's the extent of that changing, I suppose, an overall character from open or rural tranquil areas to that more industrialized, um, character and the experience of that as you move from one end of the district to the next.

00:46:55:08 - 00:47:29:04

Which is why if you have two large scale projects together like that, it's very difficult to conclude that, you know, those just the combined effects of those projects alone. Is is is is not significant. And then if you start to capture the schemes that are either consented or come forward at a local level, um, that sort of exacerbates the concern that we have. So I suppose that's that's the position we're at. But I don't think we're going to move away from that position as a result of further discussions.

00:47:29:06 - 00:47:57:09

But I think the discussions that have taken place have been helpful to qualify that. There's no further queries in terms of the approach to considering those different schemes that might need to be captured in cumulative, but ultimately, yeah, that's that's the position that we're at. Uh, but as my colleague

Mrs. Pedler referred to, I think the technical note that we're Proposing that we set out or hopefully, um, pretty capture what I'm what I'm trying to describe.

00:47:57:13 - 00:47:57:28

That'd be very.

00:47:58:00 - 00:47:58:15

Helpful.

00:47:58:17 - 00:48:27:17

That would be helpful. Yeah, obviously. Um, it's helpful. The discussions that have taken place have been very helpful. And, um, if that could be articulated a little bit more detail, particularly, you've mentioned that, um, there may be concerns about the future baseline that's been used for the Elvia. Um, it'd be very helpful to know which schemes that are of of and that the disagreement relates to. So, um, uh, if I could ask you. Yes, sure.

00:48:28:00 - 00:49:07:07

Just just to be clear and to be fair, on the, on the future baseline, um, is is probably accurate to say we were concerned about that. But I think as a result of the discussion that has been, um, had that we're now we're now happy that the assessment has been captured. It's just in a different part of the assessment rather rather than cumulative. So, um, but to, to try and be clear that the concern, I suppose that we, that we had was that if a scheme was being, uh, assumed as a future baseline, then its effect, um, you reach the interpretation and conclusion, it already exists.

00:49:07:19 - 00:49:37:01

And my point was, well, okay, it's been consented if it doesn't already exist. And therefore the, uh, the impacts and the effects haven't yet been experienced on the environment. So that that was the sort of point that we were making in those discussions. But as I say, I think we're we're still happy that the schemes are being considered and assessed. Um, it's just whether that's within the baseline assessment or whether that's captured within the cumulative assessment. Okay. But we're I think we're content in that regard.

00:49:37:03 - 00:50:00:00

Thank you. And and that's I suppose that's the point in the guidance isn't it. It's um, uh, it's those schemes where the effects are fully determined that are rightly part of the future baseline. And I think the point you're making is they're not necessarily. You're not necessarily in that place. Okay. Um, it's Hopkins, and then, um, uh, Mister Northcott. Northcote.

00:50:00:24 - 00:50:38:29

Elizabeth. Hopkins county on Trent parish council. Um, I realized that there is the guidance out there, and that's what everybody's in the process of using. Um, the guidance when it was constructed, I don't believe ever envisaged a project of this size. Guidance evolves. I can imagine that following on from one Earth, then this one guidance will again evolve. And I think this is what Mr. Betts is referring to. The applicant has fulfilled the requirements, maybe regarding the Pins guidance, but we are looking at something that's completely different to anything that's gone before.

00:50:39:01 - 00:51:11:07

And I'd like to think that they would consider how the guidance might be evolved and maybe even be the, the forerunners and go a little bit above and beyond and protect the people that are going to be living within this, which then flips back to when we referred to the methodology. Was the methodology the correct one, and will that again be seen to be evolve in the future? So it's just it's going a bit above and beyond because you are different. You are being very different to anything that's gone before.

00:51:11:09 - 00:51:15:01

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Northcote, what would you like to say?

00:51:16:09 - 00:51:46:22

Thank you, Madam Anthony Northcote, on behalf of JPEG. Um, it comes back to I think the issue that we brought up previously is about concentration. Um, you remember we talked about the written ministerial statement, um, on on solar, which talks about concentration. Uh, sort of separately to cumulative effects. Uh, now, obviously, I am aware it is suggested in the draft NPF that, you know, that written ministerial statement may be withdrawn, but it it remains in force.

00:51:46:24 - 00:52:17:19

You know, as of today, I think the concern, um, with assessment of cumulative landscape effects. You know, we've addressed this to to an extent in our written representation, which was rep um, one hyphen 093 when we put some plans in that showed all the other consented schemes. Um, and we have detailed this in our response to the first set of questions from the examining authority, which is rep at two high for 130.

00:52:18:01 - 00:52:58:14

Um, I think for us it's about the overall scale of change, the overall impact on the landscape experience, that sort of strategic impact as a consumer of talked about, um, and particular that the concentration that comes from a whole variety of schemes, which, um, yes. You've got one other end tip, the one Earth solar proposal. Um, but if you look at more local schemes that have been consented, they are all to an extent concentrated very much in the south east corner.

00:52:58:19 - 00:53:29:12

So you've got a huge sort of clustering type of impact, you know, around Stanthorpe, um, to all the best schemes. You know, another solar farm to all the solar farms, all within a very short space of time. And I think where we're struggling a bit is the standard methodology for assessing sort of cumulative effects, doesn't really perhaps anticipate such a clustering or a concentration of everything together.

00:53:29:14 - 00:54:04:03

And it's how you capture that overall scale and degree of change for such a long period of time, um, from one project to another. Um, and you'll have seen in the report from, you know, the Callum seller scheme. The inspector, um, struggled with the assessment of the facts. So they're very much, you know with some of it it was well that's for for great North road to, to to now consider when it comes forward sort of cumulative effect. And I think the difficulty um again is where you might put it correctly in the methodology.

00:54:04:05 - 00:54:34:23

And forgive me, I'm not an expert on the methodology. Um, but in essence, you've got a lot of permitted schemes. They're not there today, but they will be coming along, um, you know, sort of all at the same time. Um, but where how you put them into that baseline. I'm not an expert on that, you know, sort of a bit beyond me. But I think it's that concentration of schemes together that that is struggling with the methodology to understand.

00:54:34:25 - 00:54:45:18

So again, right, I think what would we be saying is the examining authority will be very alive to that issue. And we're just asking you to give that appropriate degree of consideration. Yes.

00:54:45:20 - 00:55:06:04

Thank you, Mr. Northcote. And that's helpful. And what we're just trying to to, to understand is, is whether the approach that's been taken is, is, is appropriate in the context of the, the policy and guidance. Um, Mrs. Fisher, is there anything that you'd like to say in response to, to what we've heard from you and Sherwood and from other interested parties?

00:55:08:11 - 00:55:44:19

Uh, yeah, just a couple of quick points, if I may. So firstly, just there was one bit kind of got missed out of the various discussions we've had with Newark and Sherwood, which is that in relation to the future baseline, we have provided them with a technical note which effectively goes, well, what if we take the consented projects out of the future baseline? What how would the LBA change? Um, so they're in receipt of that if they agree, if we agreed between us, it should be submitted will submit it if they agree that actually it's a bit of a distraction, we won't.

00:55:44:25 - 00:56:14:05

Yeah. So we'll see where we go with it. It would be helpful, but it's been done. The outcome of that discussion. Yes. Thank you. So that's one thing. And then the other is in terms of the regional, um, impacts. Um, we'll wait to see the note and respond to that in time. Um, you know, yes. It's not a matter for assessment. I think we've all covered that. It's not. But that doesn't mean to say that we can't set out a view on that. Um, right. Hope that's helpful. Thank you.

00:56:17:15 - 00:56:19:00

Okay. Um.

00:56:22:27 - 00:56:33:19

So I'm just just scanning through my notes. Um, the next point I was going to talk about was, um, the the changes to landscape character, the strategic strategic scale, which you've.

00:56:33:28 - 00:56:34:17

Referred.

00:56:34:19 - 00:56:43:01

To. Um, I did have one query, um, which just comes out of the Elvia chapter. Um.

00:56:45:07 - 00:57:04:14

So it's section 7.9.1. Um, this refers to the, um, the shortlisted projects. Um, and included in the cumulative assessment. Um, and just to paraphrase that the reference to one Earth solar farm in that

00:57:06:11 - 00:57:37:21

that section. Um, it talks about the fact that as one Earth is located approximately four kilometres to the north east of the development, there'd be limited intervention to put my teeth back in into visibility between these projects due to areas of higher ground that would screen views and therefore the B overall, there'd be negligible changes. And I just wanted to ask the question. Um, that lack of direct into visibility.

00:57:38:06 - 00:57:54:25

um, doesn't address the fact that there'd be perhaps changes to landscape character by virtue of the two schemes being seen in the same sort of landscape context. Um, do you have any, any any comments on on that point, please, Mrs. Fisher?

00:57:58:13 - 00:58:02:12

Tweak it. Figure 7.8 on screen, please.

00:58:19:06 - 00:58:53:00

Okay, so not especially clear on screen, but hopefully it helps. Now in the specific con this this figure is about visual effects, but it does helpfully show the context between one Earth and the edge of the of Great North Road development. So you can see on the figure. The sort of north east edge of the Great North Node development is bounded by the A1 on the bottom left corner, and you can see one at the top right corner, Tuxford Road and Edmonton in between.

00:58:53:26 - 00:59:30:22

Um, now specifically in this local area, what we can see is there's a particularly limited visibility of Great North Road. This the proposed development is within two kilometres of the site. There's a dramatic drop in the ZT V because the land drops and there's successive layers of vegetation along those various road and rail corridors and along the river. So and it's part it's it's more because of that dramatic lack of visibility of the proposed development affecting that area than it is to do with visibility of one Earth that impacts a negligible.

00:59:30:24 - 01:00:01:21

It's more that the proposed development itself has negligible effects in this area. okay? And therefore adding one thing to that equation doesn't make the development have more effects. It's still negligible. That's the point I'm trying to trying to make. Not very well is around landscape effects. Not not visual effects. It's changes to landscape character. But if you can't see the development. Okay. It isn't affecting the character of of where you are. So if you're in that area of no visibility, you can't see the development.

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

You might know it there. Okay. But that's very small perceptual change. It wouldn't lift up to a non-negligible effect on character. All right. Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Fisher. Any thoughts from from Newark and Sherwood, Mrs. Boland, on on on that point. Any any other considerations?

01:00:25:05 - 01:00:26:11

Yeah. Just questioning.

01:00:26:13 - 01:00:26:28

That.

01:00:27:00 - 01:00:27:15

Comment.

01:00:27:17 - 01:00:31:28

Just because you can't see it doesn't mean it has a doesn't have an impact on landscape character.

01:00:33:16 - 01:00:39:04

Well, that was the point I was trying to get. And if you've got any observations on, on on that any.

01:00:41:23 - 01:00:42:12

Only that.

01:00:42:14 - 01:00:43:05

It can have an.

01:00:43:07 - 01:00:44:02

Impact on landscape.

01:00:44:04 - 01:00:44:24

Character even.

01:00:44:26 - 01:01:16:08

If you can't see it. The sequential additional work that the applicant is going to do is between is in this location. So I think that might give us a little bit more information on this transition between Great North Road and and One Earth. And so I think let's see what comes back from that additional piece of work. But I think this does go to our point about this wider impact on on landscape character.

01:01:16:10 - 01:01:18:24

Yeah. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Northcote.

01:01:20:08 - 01:01:53:04

Thank you madam. Anti Northgate for JPEG. Um, I think the issue um, for, for us here is we accept the topography, um, does limit the visibility between these two schemes. Um, you know, one of those sort of sits in the valley. You've then got a bit of a ridge that comes up. Um, so you haven't got direct into visibility. But I think what is being missed here is the fact that in that gap in between, there are other two other permitted solar schemes. Uh, you've got the East Coast Main Line corridor.

01:01:53:06 - 01:02:24:04

You've got the A1 sitting there. So you've got major infrastructure already, plus additional planned, uh, solar proposals. And again, it's that it's not the fact that you can't see from one to the other the scale of landscape change in that area, um, is significant in our view, because what's happening in between is drawing those two schemes, which are theoretically some distance apart, but closer together in, in sort of the perceptual terms.

01:02:24:06 - 01:02:55:24

If you live in that area, again, you're going to be surrounded by all these various developments. Uh, not forgetting that because you've got things like the East Coast Main Line, you have limited routes that you can take in this area. Only a few level crossings, one bridge. And so if you move around within this area, you're going to always again, as we've talked about sequentially, go through one solar scheme and then another. And it's that I think is the point that you're, you're getting to.

01:02:55:26 - 01:03:16:25

And this is the difficulty with the zones of theoretical visibility. That's just one element of the perception of landscape change. And we wouldn't want that, that, um, more coherent approach to how the overall landscape character is being altered to be lost just in, in sort of because you can't see it.

01:03:17:07 - 01:03:49:05

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Northcote. Yes. Mr. Fisher? Yes. Okay. Just I just wanted to clarify a couple of points. Firstly, I didn't say no impact. I said negligible. And there is a difference. Um, so my point was that we're talking here in relation to the proposed development. Let's set aside the other solar farms at the moment of the perception of knowing it's there, or maybe a very distant glimpse of part of it, the development.

01:03:49:07 - 01:04:26:27

Okay. So the question we're addressing here is does that affect character? So we only got two very small indirect changes to the character. And my assessment is that those changes would be negligible. I didn't say no impact. And there's a difference. Um, a secondly, um, we've returned again to um, discussing these all these solar farms together rather than the proposed development. And nobody's saying that there isn't a notable change to this area as a result of the presence of four solar farms.

01:04:27:23 - 01:04:40:06

Um, yep. Added together. But those aren't the impacts of the proposed development. They're the impacts of all of this development happening over a period of time from Egmont and so forth onwards.

01:04:41:29 - 01:04:43:01

Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

01:04:44:27 - 01:04:45:19

Okay.

01:04:45:21 - 01:04:46:27

Um, I was going to.

01:04:46:29 - 01:04:47:14

Move.

01:04:47:16 - 01:04:50:14

On to, um, to talk about.

01:04:52:21 - 01:04:54:03

Um, again.

01:04:54:05 - 01:04:54:20

Some of the.

01:04:54:26 - 01:04:55:12

Discussion.

01:04:55:14 - 01:04:56:14

We had at.

01:04:56:16 - 01:05:37:25

Issue specific hearing one was around the, um, sequential effects of cumulative sequential effects. And, um, that that discussion has progressed, um, in various ways. And, um, noting the concerns of interested parties and written question 11 .1.1 12 see invited comments from parties about how their concerns could be addressed. And I'm aware, um, JPEG in particular put in a fairly detailed response to that, that question where they set out, um, uh, a suggestion and asked for, um, particular routes to be considered.

01:05:37:27 - 01:06:08:22

Now, rather than, um, try and review that at this point. Um, I, I'm hoping and assuming that this is something the applicant will address in their responses to those written questions. So given the nature of the discussion we've had so far around cumulative effects, I think. I think it would be most helpful to see the applicant's response to that in in writing. Um, noting also that I think, um, Newark and Sherwood have had some productive discussions with the applicant around sequential cumulative effects.

01:06:08:24 - 01:06:28:15

So I don't want to sort of start start going to into that at this point until we've we've seen the the information that is apparently am going to be coming to us. Um, so unless anyone's got any final points on cumulative effects, I'm going to move on to 1.5 and the approach to mitigation and enhancement.

01:06:31:26 - 01:06:49:10

Okay. And just firstly, to clarify with the applicant, I say, um, JPEGs. Uh, response to that written question set out various points and it would be would be helpful if we had a response in writing to that. Um, I think it's the next deadline. We're looking for that. So that would be that would be very helpful. Thank you.

01:06:51:23 - 01:06:53:04

Okay. Um.

01:06:56:27 - 01:07:28:02

In in terms of the approach to mitigation and enhancement in issue specific hearing, one, um, the distinction was made between landscape enhancement and and mitigation measures, um, with reference to the published guidance on this matter. And the applicant provided further details on this in their their written out, which is rep one hyphen 068. And in chapter seven, um, we've got um At table 7.3 and table 7.4.

01:07:29:03 - 01:08:00:18

Um, the embedded mitigation measures and the embedded enhancement measures. Um, so in order to to understand this, this point further, question 11 .1. 11 sought to clarify how the distinction between embedded mitigation measures and embedded enhancement measures had been drawn. And I'd just like to, um, to just explore that a little bit further. Um, so if possible, could we have, uh, rep 2.5? Sorry.

01:08:00:20 - 01:08:10:05

Rep two hyphen 022. That's the Elvia chapter. On the screen, please. Um, page page 26. I think it is.

01:08:15:20 - 01:08:46:12

Brilliant. Thank you. So just just scroll down to, uh, table 7.4. So, so just just trying to take this point a little bit further. So in table 7.4 this sets out that um, woodland hedgerow and tree planting are embedded enhancement measures, noting that as well as providing visual mitigation, the proposed tree and hedgerow planting would help enhance existing landscape, fabric and character and contribute to landscape quality and condition.

01:08:46:29 - 01:09:19:22

Uh, to that that aspect of landscape value. So, um, the question I wanted to raise was, um, how does that recognise the the existing landscape characteristics across the area? Um, noting that some of these areas are characterised by large scale arable field systems providing um, medium and longer distance views. So in that context, obviously woodland planting, tree planting may or may not actually represent an enhancement to that landscape character type, which I like to respond to that is suspicious.

01:09:19:24 - 01:09:20:15

Please.

01:09:21:29 - 01:09:54:22

Um, so the evaluation of these as enhancing in this context is drawn from. Um, I hopefully you'll recall that, um, the Newark and Sherwood District Council landscape character assessment has got three tiers. Um, so all of the the Elvia itself works on the middle tier of the landscape character types, but there are recommendations for looking after the landscape character in the lower level policy zone. Um, documentation.

01:09:54:25 - 01:10:12:07

Now, we haven't described all of that in detail, but in terms of understanding whether something is an enhancement or not and whether planting is even appropriate. For instance, um, we've looked at the policy zone guidance to see what the recommendations are in terms of managing the landscape. So they're described as enhancements in that context.

01:10:12:11 - 01:10:23:19

Understood. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. You can show it. Are you are you content that that's that's the way in which that enhancement measure has been that type of enhancement measure has been addressed in the proposals.

01:10:28:15 - 01:10:37:05

Sarah Boland for Newark and Sherwood District Council. Can we can I take that one away? Because I haven't looked at it in in that detail with regard to this question. I looked.

01:10:37:07 - 01:10:37:22

For means.

01:10:37:24 - 01:10:39:29

Yes, please. Something different. Thank you, thank you.

01:10:46:07 - 01:10:58:01

Okay. I want to move on now to, um, 1.6, which is detailed design control and management. So I'm going to go um.

01:11:00:02 - 01:11:43:18

Back to the development consent order. Um, that we were talking about yesterday, and hopefully the people in the room are able to to address this point. If not, then, um, it may be something to, to take away just looking at, um, chapter five, which is the development description app. Um, hyphen 048. This sets out that following consent and final detail design, a final build plan would be submitted to Newark and Sherwood District Council for approval, and the purpose of this would be to comply with the requirements included in the DCO, and to demonstrate that the final As build scheme remains within the parameters of the Rochdale envelope considered in the EIA.

01:11:44:00 - 01:12:17:24

So at question 1.1.6, um, we sought to clarify the reference to the final build design and how it be secured. So the applicant refers in their response to that question to requirement six in the development Consent order relating to detailed design approval, and the applicant's described how this requirement stipulates that the the details that must be submitted and approved by the LPA before any phase of the authorized development.

01:12:17:26 - 01:12:48:03

Sorry. This requirement stipulates that details must be submitted and approved by the planning authority before any any phase of the authorized development can commence. These details relate to various aspects of the design, and I just wanted to clarify in relation to requirement six. This refers to the fact that no phase of the development may commence until these elements are approved, so that

suggests there may be more than one final build plan. I just wanted to clarify how that how that would work.

01:12:48:05 - 01:12:51:25

Please. I'm not I'm not sure who's able to address that point.

01:12:53:03 - 01:12:54:07

Um, uh.

01:12:54:13 - 01:12:55:09

Matthew Sharp.

01:12:55:11 - 01:12:55:26

On.

01:12:55:28 - 01:12:56:13

Behalf of.

01:12:56:15 - 01:12:57:00

The.

01:12:57:02 - 01:13:28:11

Applicant. So our response to the first written question on this matter was sort of intended to sort of clarify that. Um, yeah. As you say, it's not a single final build plan. The details that are prepared to, um, submit in accordance with requirements six would be the detailed design for each individual phase, and so it would relate to the phase that that submission relates to. So there's not a single drawing that relates to the entire development.

01:13:28:13 - 01:13:35:28

It would be dealt with in a similar way to a reserved matters application for a sort of multi-phase scheme. So that's that's the.

01:13:36:00 - 01:13:54:20

Way there's more than one final build plan in effect. Yes, yes. Okay. I guess that's not entirely clear from just reading reading the the information. So that's that's helpful to understand and clarification. Thank you. I'm not quite sure whether that needs to be captured anywhere. I don't know what your your thoughts are on that.

01:13:55:02 - 01:14:25:21

I think we're happy to take it as an action point. Just to sort of clarify, um, you know, how how requirement six has intended to work on a place by phase basis and potentially to sort of anticipate the next question is then set out how that then relates to, um, the the lamp. Um, because they're sort of, you know, part of the same piece, particularly where that relates to, to, to the landscape. So we'll deal with requirements six alongside the, the detailed length, just because they dovetail together.

01:14:25:23 - 01:14:26:18

That will be helpful.

01:14:26:20 - 01:14:27:05

Thank you.

01:14:27:07 - 01:14:28:05

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Sharpe.

01:14:31:24 - 01:14:35:00

Yes, Mr. Northcote. Um.

01:14:35:23 - 01:15:08:12

I think sorry, Anthony Northcote for jpeg. Um, I think what would be useful for everybody if the scheme would be permitted to know what the actual proposed phasing was in the first place. We've got a list of works and I think it's eight works programmes differently. Um, but in order for people, uh, in subsequent approval, if that's what it's required for details, I think for people's understanding to know how the overall scheme is phased to be delivered.

01:15:08:18 - 01:15:49:00

It's something that we don't actually know at this point in time. You know, it's a very big scheme. We've got a list of works, but nowhere have I seen any details of. We'd anticipate doing this as sort of a first phase. And this is a second phase. And the third phase. And because overall on a phase development with detailed design, you could end up with a scheme that actually is quite significantly different in context. And I appreciate the problem with all exit proposals as you do, you're sitting here dealing with principles with a lot of details to be agreed, you know, later on.

01:15:49:05 - 01:16:04:01

But I think the the applicant obviously has a phasing idea in their mind because that's what they're referring to. I think it would be useful if that's actually captured somewhere. So it's very clear to everybody how that would go forward. Thank you.

01:16:04:03 - 01:16:11:16

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Northcote. And I think there is a phasing plan. So I can't quite remember where it is at this point. But if you could help, help us on that, Mr. Sharp. Thank you.

01:16:11:18 - 01:16:51:04

Yeah. That's fine. Matthew Sharp, on behalf of the applicant. So I think there's are two points to deal with here. So chapter five of the s, which we've already referred to, sort of sets out the applicant's approach to the Rochdale envelope. And so essentially setting out the anticipated phasing of the development. Um, there's then requirement three of the draft DCO that was updated at D two. So that that sets out that the phasing of the authorized development needs to be set out, um, in a written scheme, um, before any part of the authorized development can commence.

01:16:51:06 - 01:17:27:17

And so that in combination with the detail design plus the Lemp, as we've sort of talked about, we then set out that detail, um, that has to be in accordance with the assessment. So that Rochdale

envelope approach setting out what's assumed, uh, in terms of that anticipated, uh, phasing, um, you know, give certainty. That the, the phasing that comes through pursuant to requirement three is consistent with those parameters set out within the assessment zone. From our perspective, you know, that's consistent with how any major outline development would be assessed.

01:17:27:19 - 01:17:36:01

And so what we've secured here is consistent with how it would be robustly secured in any scheme of this nature. Thank you.

01:17:36:08 - 01:17:37:27

Thanks, Mr. Sharpe. Thank you.

01:17:39:18 - 01:18:18:15

Okay. I'm going to move on to my my finals of area of, um questions in under this topic, which is in relation to the the intermediate substation design. So the design approach document, which is rep two hyphen 019 at paragraph 81 sets out the substations would comprise a range of outdoor and indoor switching gear and transformers, gantries associated electrical, electrical equipment, control rooms and ancillary buildings, and outdoor electrical equipment would typically be painted gray or uncoated.

01:18:18:17 - 01:18:50:25

Indoor electrical equipment will be housed in metal or composite enclosures, or within permanent buildings, which will be designed to reflect local character, as would ancillary buildings. So yes, there we are. Paragraph 81 just just sets. Sets that out. Thank you. Um, so at question 1.1.7, um, we highlighted the lack of information relating to the design parameters for the four proposed intermediate substations.

01:18:51:02 - 01:19:28:14

Um, and uh, some additional um illustrative material was provided. Um, in response figures, um 5.1952. sorry, 5.19, 5.2 and 5.21. They've been provided showing the dimensions and colors of the ancillary buildings. But at this point, I think there's a concern remaining about the lack of illustrative material relating to the intermediate substations, including how those buildings would be designed to reflect local character as is set out in the design approach document.

01:19:28:22 - 01:19:59:01

So in this regard, and just looking at where the intermediate substations are, um, we've got one of them located, um, uh, on adjacent to Quainton Road just south of that thorn. Um, and we've got viewpoint 30 from the public right of way to the east showing, um, uh, visibility of the substation and to the west. And I it perhaps would be helpful to, to bring that up on the screen, please.

01:19:59:03 - 01:20:13:12

So we're at A.S. hyphen zero 38 and that's, uh, page ten of that document. So A.S. zero 38. So we're talking about viewpoint 30. And see.

01:20:26:04 - 01:20:32:11

These are quite big documents. So they are they are difficult to to load quickly. So just give you a moment to do that.

01:20:48:14 - 01:20:49:21

Is there a problem.

01:20:52:10 - 01:21:02:20

A 30 so is A.S. zero hyphen 038 and it's viewpoint 30. I think it's page ten. I did have look earlier on.

01:21:35:12 - 01:21:36:15

Okay.

01:21:41:05 - 01:21:49:04

I'll just start talking about it while we're waiting for that. Um, so. So basically, um. Uh, there we are. So, um.

01:21:51:14 - 01:22:10:00

So basically we can see, um, the, uh, the intermediate substation as above the, um, solar panels. There is a long, long green box. Um, And as I say, that's that's we're looking at this from the, um, the footpath. Uh, where are we? Uh,

01:22:11:27 - 01:22:44:23

to the east. Um, but the the subway. Sorry. The substation itself would be adjacent to, um, Quainton Road. Um, and I've got a similar concern about, um, another intermediate substation adjacent to Ossington Road, which, um, but the point is the same. It's, um, I'd just like to ask the applicant, um, firstly, how the approach to, um, applying elements of local character to the location and the design of intermediate substations has been taken forward.

01:22:44:29 - 01:22:54:23

Um, and then also a question about how well the, um, this has been represented in viewpoint selection and illustrative material.

01:22:59:12 - 01:23:30:09

Mary Fisher for the applicant. So I think the place to start from with this question is if we. Could you just go up a sheet to the wire line, because it's just a little bit clearer to see the different elements. So on this sheet we've got the same view. We've just split it into a wire line. Um the substation here is shown in orange now. The first thing to understand when you're looking at the visualizations is we've shown the Rochdale envelope.

01:23:30:24 - 01:24:01:15

In practice, the substation wouldn't occupy all of that space. The spaces allowed are all quite a lot larger to allow for micro siting. And that micro siting would, for instance, include elements such as moving it away from the road so that planting can be put in in between the substation buildings and the substation itself and the road. So the areas are all much larger than, and make it look more visible in the visualizations than it would be. Secondly, in this particular view, for instance, where you're seeing it over solar panels.

01:24:01:18 - 01:24:34:12

A lot of the lower level elements that we saw when we were looking at the design approach document. We were looking at views of typical substations. A lot of the lowest stuff will be screened by the solar panels, and that would include the fencing, for instance. So the bits that we're going to be seeing in this view would be the roof of any buildings. Um, and the taller bits that stick up out the top of substations, the various transformers. Um, so I guess the answer in terms of the detailed design is there's plenty of room for it.

01:24:34:14 - 01:24:50:07

Okay. Yeah. Um, there's room for planting. There's room for moving elements around. And then in terms of character, it's really about building materials and detailed design. Um, you can't make a substation look lovely on this dud.

01:24:50:09 - 01:25:17:16

Understood. I suppose I was just concerned about the, um, uh, uh, in terms of their locations, concerns to ensure that in terms of that, that that local character and what's experienced in the local environment is, is managed. And I think what you're saying to me is that, um, what we've got here is the, the bare bones of it, and it will be managed as, as the design progresses, in consultation with the the local council. Is that correct?

01:25:18:07 - 01:25:18:28

You do that one.

01:25:19:20 - 01:25:55:27

And Matthew Sharp, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, yes, that's correct. I suppose just to sort of add to that response. So we obviously have requirement six which secures that detailed design. It also makes explicit reference to um, the concept parameters and design principles. And there's a section on on this work which provides um, further detail in terms of that sort of, you know, the, the Rochdale envelope that that Missus Fisher has referred to. So within that there's, um, you know, specific design principles that relate to components of those works.

01:25:55:29 - 01:26:03:19

So buildings, There's no specified parameters for those, um, you know, heights and dimensions for the substations.

01:26:03:21 - 01:26:24:07

The point is, I understand that. It's just it's just how how this would be experienced in the local environment. And I just highlighted those, those two, two particular substations on the basis that they are adjacent to, um, to local roads and, and would, would be potentially quite, quite apparent. And it's, it's, it's about ensuring that that's minimised. I think that's the that's the point.

01:26:24:09 - 01:26:26:02

Yes. That's understood. Thank you.

01:26:26:07 - 01:26:27:16

Yes Mr. Northcote.

01:26:28:25 - 01:27:00:27

Thank you madam. Anthony Northcote for jpeg. Um, I think the issue with um, the intermediate substations, the necessary infrastructure and um, they have to very often you've got to balance accessibility, being able to get to them with machinery, service them, uh, together with how you screen them for a better term. And I think a useful example is to look actually at the existing, uh, the the national grid station at Stanthorpe.

01:27:01:03 - 01:27:32:11

Now, that mitigates its element by, um, intermediate land in between a small sort of gap of a field together with planting. And I think the one concern that there could be with intermediate substations is if we end up with the position that we've had with the state's best schemes currently under construction, where in order to score feasibility, you have to translate hedgerows, then effectively you've lost the entire hedgerow to start with.

01:27:32:13 - 01:28:07:06

It has to be cut down. So much to translocated and it will take a long time to come about. Um, I think it is fair to say that the areas identified are fairly substantial, and I. I've no reason to consider why you need all of that area so it won't be full of equipment, and we'd accept that. I think we would ask that that care is taken to ensure that the operational requirement is balanced against the appropriate screening and sort of a buffer zone away from the road to reduce that that impact.

01:28:08:09 - 01:28:20:17

Mr.. Thank you, Mr. Northcote. All right. Um, I'm going to draw the discussion on landscape and visual matters to a close, unless there are any final points that anybody would wish to make.

01:28:23:20 - 01:28:25:27

Uh, Mr. Groves, what would you like to say?

01:28:34:24 - 01:29:07:23

Sorry, ma'am. Um, John Groves, representing Mr. and Mrs. Gill and drone defence systems. Um, it's incumbent on me to represent my client's specific interests here. And just to say that, um, we still consider that the landscape impact in that particular circumstances underestimated and that mitigation by an enclosure of hedging around the edge of the property, uh, does not meet that definition of mitigation in normal terms.

01:29:07:25 - 01:29:23:13

And I think in a small way, the those impacts and concerns are reflected in the more global issues that have been placed before you by both JPEG and and Newark and Sherwood. Uh, and that's all I would ask of.

01:29:23:16 - 01:29:37:27

Thank thank you, Mr. Groves. Thank you. Thank you. And just to note that, um, we will be visiting, um, your client's property as part of our, um, access required site visits. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. All right then. Yes, Mrs. Boland.

01:29:38:24 - 01:29:39:09

Sorry.

01:29:39:11 - 01:30:10:27

Thank you, ma'am. Um, Mrs. Boland for Newark District Council. Um, I just wanted to raise one additional point, which was something I'd put under discussion. Items about the. It's either mitigation and enhancement or design control and management and will maybe come through in further discussions with ecology this afternoon. And it's just um, with regard to at decommissioning stage, the intent to remove hedgerows during decommissioning, which we made a point of saying we thought was sort of counter-productive in our discussions with the applicant.

01:30:11:02 - 01:31:00:08

This has been, um, the reason for this has been said that it's where you've got hedgerows which will compromise agricultural lands coming back into agricultural use at decommissioning stage. But with those hedgerows are often associated diverse grasslands or meadowlands that have been um, sown to go along with them. I think it's a point to take away for more interrogation from our side, but I would like to understand actually where that happens, where there are new hedgerows through the middle of fields which compromise agricultural work going forward, and whether really this is the right intent to remove hedgerows at decommissioning stage.

01:31:01:00 - 01:31:05:03

And we think we need to have wider discussions with it. Regard to an ecological right.

01:31:05:05 - 01:31:05:26

Okay. Understood.

01:31:05:28 - 01:31:12:23

So I just wanted to raise it in this forum, but I don't have a definitive answer for it. Yeah. Okay.

01:31:14:24 - 01:31:19:02

Yeah. I hope I'm Mrs. Hopkins and then then go back to the applicant. Thank you.

01:31:19:04 - 01:31:51:18

Elizabeth Hopkins calling on Trent Parish council. Um, just with regard to visual impact, we've talked about, um, mitigating and screening and hedges, which, of course, are in itself a visual impact change. Uh, part of what will be included is fencing. And we've talked about deer fencing. Uh, deer fencing is quite high and has big visual impact. Um, it doesn't have to be deer fencing. It can be shorter two fences, which actually works out cheaper.

01:31:51:27 - 01:32:13:01

I like this bit because Diego like that, but they don't go like that, that they go like that, that, that and they can't jump twice. So two fences, cheaper, lower, less visual impact. And can that be something that you maybe discuss together to see if that is a better overall, um, less visual impact? Thank you.

01:32:13:03 - 01:32:28:04

Thank you, Mrs. Hopkins. And I seem to to you, Mrs. Fisher, are these points that have been considered both both the points by, um and Mrs. Hopkins have these things that, um, can be taken away and discussed.

01:32:31:06 - 01:33:02:18

Uh, Mary Fisher for the applicant. So just turning to Miss Boland's points. Um, we can provide a plan showing which hedges, uh, fall on that list. Shows, I think, what you were after. Um, and then we can have that discussion. But also just a point of clarification. It isn't a commitment to remove the hedges. It's just an assumption in the US that in the worst case, they will be removed by the future landowners, which is a slightly different thing. Okay. Um, and in response to Mrs.

01:33:02:20 - 01:33:17:14

Hopkins, I did see that point about two fences. But I don't know enough about deer to know whether that's right or not. And also, I'm aware the applicant may have other design considerations, for instance, security in terms of wanting high offences. So I can't respond to that.

01:33:17:16 - 01:33:37:10

But we do need to the applicant can can take away to to to think about that would be helpful. Thank you. All right. So um it's now 1133. Um, I'm going to suggest we take a break now and return at, uh, 1155, please. Thank you.