

██████████  
██████████  
████████████████████

**Project 02-12-26 01:48 pm**

Created on: 2026-02-12 11:08:19

Project Length: 01:49:24

Account Holder: ██████████

File Name: Steeple\_ISH2\_120226\_PT4-MP3.mp4

File Length: 01:49:24

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:11:22 - 00:00:36:02

Even in time for this issue specific hearing to resume. Um. Just before we move on to talking about skylarks, there was a there was an individual Saturn at the front who had their hand up before the break, and we didn't manage to get to if we can have the roving microphone and to allow a person to ask their, um, make their point.

00:00:45:21 - 00:01:10:21

Yeah. Louis Bartel, uh, tenant farmer with my father. Um, I just wanted to say, uh, as feet on the ground, we've got as you're going to discuss, Skylarks, lapwings, buzzards, red kites, hares, foxes, badgers. Um, the. I didn't get your name. Ecology, gentlemen. Um.

00:01:11:08 - 00:01:12:12

It's Jim Gillespie.

00:01:12:20 - 00:01:14:10

Uh, Jim, uh.

00:01:16:11 - 00:01:25:27

You say that this isn't going to have an issue on the impact of the wildlife, which I say it's going to have a massive impact. Um.

00:01:28:18 - 00:01:31:29

Oh, yeah. Sorry. Uh.

00:01:38:24 - 00:02:10:25

Yeah. This huge area, uh, solar panels. You've got your fencing. Granted, you've got your 400, uh, gates that you say, and probably a little bit of scrubby grassland that's not going to take isn't going to be anywhere near what is there at the moment. I would invite you to come out with me on the tractor for the day. Come around the fields when we're out in the fields, because I've got umpteen photos, videos on my phone of all sorts deers, badgers, you name it.

00:02:11:09 - 00:02:48:04

Uh, as Karen made a point, trying to upload it is an absolute faff. Um. I've tried. It's a nightmare. Um, I just want to ask you to make a point about the Badgers. Because they are protected species. We have a lot of badgers. It down by the railway line at ours. And then I'd like to put a point to Will as well. Um, that. Can he clarify what the bio net gain area is? Because we've got on the maps, there's things about 160 acres down for bio net gain, and we've still not had an answer on if the project goes ahead.

00:02:48:06 - 00:03:20:03

Yes, I know that we're going to be losing 80 acres of land to solar panels, but this 160 acres. I don't know at the moment how it looks, how I'm going to farm that or what is expected of that land. Um, and then just another note at the beginning. A point was made on the classification of the land, and that's not been done yet or the grading of the land. And I just think, why hasn't that been done before all of this came about.

00:03:22:04 - 00:03:54:19

Thank you for that. And just just to we've got a separate item on badges after Skylark. So we'll leave that for there. And I'll bring you in on that point. I think that would be better rather than the applicant responding now. And your point about the mitigation, we've got an item after discussing badges on mitigation. So we'll discuss that. And again I will I will bring you in. So I think that's just left on those questions is the grading. Um one if you can just provide a quick response to that. Thank you, Sir Patrick Robinson for the applicant.

00:03:54:21 - 00:04:17:07

I can ask Mr. Bridge to do so. He appreciate my staff have made an offer me the room when that point was covered this morning on that. But so I've just been able to just quickly go back over the AOC grading of the areas not yet assessed, cable routes and ecological areas and effectively, why that's the case.

00:04:19:25 - 00:04:56:05

Thank you sir. Bridget, for the applicant, I can't find the exact measurement here, but just to to in broad terms, to reiterate the areas that are proposed for panels, substation beds, cabling has been assessed and we have so I 600 hectares I can't remember. I find it in due course, but that AOC grading has been undertaken and is reported in the application. The areas that have not been surveyed yet, and what I mentioned earlier about agreement has been reached with Natural England to survey before consent is mitigation areas enhancement areas.

00:04:56:07 - 00:05:12:25

We didn't survey those um initially because um lead cropping different rotations or scrubland, uh, as you say the very outset, it is not a permanent loss of BMD. So we didn't establish those. They are farming practices and planting of um

00:05:14:17 - 00:05:32:14

plants and woodland, etc. that can happen without planning permission by any farmer at any time in any case. Um, so that hasn't been done in Natural England to ask for that. And we've committed to do

that post consent. So those are the only areas that haven't been surveyed. The vast majority of the site has been and is set out in the documentation.

00:05:34:24 - 00:05:47:12

Thank you for that. I think if there's any further queries, because the applicant did touch upon that a bit earlier, then by all means just it's okay to approach the applicant. Maybe you can explain just outside of this now.

00:05:47:27 - 00:06:09:03

Yeah. So are we waiting for? Um, the approval to go ahead for the solar panels before we know what is going to be done with the PNG land? Uh, and we know as a business going forward how we're going to plan to work around that or what we need to do with that land.

00:06:14:14 - 00:06:18:23

Do you want to respond to that now, or do you want to wait for the mitigation especially?

00:06:21:19 - 00:06:49:10

As we touched upon. Sorry. So what we're discussing as we discussed yesterday in the CAA hearing discussions with uh, tenant farmers and uh, ongoing and the nature. We have obviously an option and then potentially lease. Um, we are not the holder of that tenancy. Um, so the details of how the tenancy can be

00:06:51:00 - 00:07:15:27

changed or moving forward is something that we are involved in, but we are not the the tendency holder, so we are not in. It is down to a conversation between the landowner and the tenant. How that is a changed or moved adapted moving forward, but that will be reported in the ongoing discussions on the land rights Tracker and in the those that nature.

00:07:17:07 - 00:07:30:19

Okay. Thank you for that response. So because that's a land rights issue and it was discussed in court here, and then I'd ask you to, you know, discuss that separately. I think you're an effective person anyway. Is that correct, Mr. Bartle? That you're you're.

00:07:30:25 - 00:07:31:14

Yes we are.

00:07:31:16 - 00:07:39:04

Yeah, yeah. So if I can ask you to to maybe discuss that outside of this agenda item, that would, that would probably be a better way forward.

00:07:39:06 - 00:07:50:14

Yeah. That's okay. It's just I was looking for a bit of clarification because we've asked our landlord and land agent the same question, and they didn't have any idea what was going to happen with that land.

00:07:51:07 - 00:08:25:24

Okay. That's fine. Yeah. I'll ask you just to take that one outside of this particular agenda item. Okay. We'll we'll move on now to discuss skylarks. And because we're aware of a number of concerns raised by parties on this matter and particularly the extent of the mitigation that's proposed and which we would like to explore in more detail. Um, I'll firstly turn to Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, because of the comments that you've raised in your relevant representation and local impact report relating to the effects on skylarks.

00:08:25:26 - 00:08:32:03

So could you just update as to what your current position is with regards to skylarks?

00:08:37:27 - 00:09:15:22

Sticking points at Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, yes. As as I advised Previously um archaeologist has um considered the considered the report response from the applicant. Um and I think I believe now has no further, uh, concerns that they wish to raise further to, uh, further that uh, that response. Um, so at this point in time, we, we don't have any particular further issues to, to raise any longer with this particular issue.

00:09:16:17 - 00:09:17:10

Thank you sir.

00:09:19:03 - 00:09:38:10

Thank you very much. I'll turn to fields for farming because it's touching. I think you were were about to touch upon this before, and I said to, um, you know, to wait for this point. So I'll bring you back in at this point. Now, if we can bring the roving microphone to, um, the concerns on on skylarks.

00:10:00:20 - 00:10:32:26

There is an acknowledgement that the Skylark population will be significantly adversely affected. Um, the, the the uh ecology reports talk about up to 55%. Um, and um, just listening to, um, what the Bartel family have been saying here about the, the land that they tenant farm includes the Western mitigation biodiversity areas.

00:10:32:28 - 00:11:08:10

As far as I understand, my reading off the top of my head, and I'm frantically now trying to just find the places was that those fields were to be. Uh, it does say I've actually written a note. Here are the mitigation areas still to be farmed. I'd actually already made that note because it wasn't entirely cleared. But then in other parts of the documents, it seems to suggest that, um, a that's where a lot of the mitigation for skylarks will be coming from.

00:11:08:12 - 00:11:39:16

And it talks about the nine fields that will be, um, enhanced for Skylark plots. Um, one of my questions in my recent comments was had, um, the developers took on bold board the Notts Wildlife Trust, um, queries about the use of beetle banks and various other, um, suggestions that they had made. And I can't see anything to say that the developers have to come on board.

00:11:39:18 - 00:12:11:22

Notts Wildlife Trust recommendations. Um, and you know, I'm kind of wondering, will there be what ongoing work will there be will there be in liaison with local wildlife specialists when it comes to the actual nitty gritty of implementing the biodiversity net gain? Um, uh, skylarks are mentioned in particular, but also feel for linnets. Other birds at risk are going to be hugely impacted.

00:12:11:24 - 00:12:48:03

But yes, like you mentioned, they will be caught up in the benefit when you focus on other things. I understand that. Um, yeah. So I haven't really got anything more to say. I mean, I wish I had access to be able to show you an amazing photograph that one of our local residents took not long ago of a huge flock of linnets sitting on overhead cables. I've circulated that around my RSPB and fellow bird watching people, and they all say they have never, ever seen such a huge flock of Linnet on.

00:12:48:19 - 00:13:04:27

I think that they're on telegraph poles directly over the battle fields just below high House. No one had ever seen such a huge flock. Um, and that just gives you an idea of what is there that hasn't been captured and recognised. Um.

00:13:09:16 - 00:13:25:17

Just thinking on on that point. And if you could send that, we would quite like to see that. So, um, if we will add that as an action point, um, for you to submit the photograph for the deadline for. Um, yeah, I think we would find that very, very useful.

00:13:27:16 - 00:13:32:07

That's another hand. That was Mr. Bell. Uh, James Barlow.

00:13:32:10 - 00:14:07:04

Who was farming. Uh, just a statement, really. Um, skylarks are hugely territorial. Uh, they guard an area of about two hectares. Um, so in which case mitigation. If there are already skylarks on that area, the mitigation or the skylarks will not move into that area because they are territorial. So actually moving skylarks away from the proposed development area doesn't say you can only now move to mitigation because of it already has presence, then they will not move to that area.

00:14:07:06 - 00:14:10:10

So the mitigation is not mitigation at all. Thank you.

00:14:17:25 - 00:14:27:29

Anybody else wants to make any points on skylights? Before I ask the applicant to respond to the comments that have been raised? And then I've asked my some of my questions that I've got.

00:14:29:22 - 00:15:02:23

No. Okay. So I'll turn to the applicant to respond to the points you've raised on the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust? That was actually one of the questions I had. So I'll tie that in really. And it was because I noticed your responses to the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, particularly in the measures for skylarks. You've stated on a number of occasions whether or not whether such measures are not already included in the outline length. You've stated the feasibility of the suggested measures for Skylark will be considered in the round during preparation of the final length.

00:15:03:02 - 00:15:07:12

So in response, how could you also explain how you would undertake that?

00:15:19:00 - 00:15:21:18

James Gillespie for the applicant. Thank you.

00:15:22:17 - 00:15:23:06

Um.

00:15:29:01 - 00:15:35:08

I addressed the. methods of mitigation. So what mitigation includes.

00:15:36:06 - 00:15:38:01

This is um.

00:15:38:25 - 00:15:40:12

Set out in.

00:15:41:29 - 00:15:42:14

The.

00:15:43:18 - 00:15:48:19

Skull and mitigation strategy which document Ape 115.

00:15:52:14 - 00:16:03:13

In the uh, we set out at the the basis of the mitigation is to continue with arable farming and the mitigation areas.

00:16:07:13 - 00:16:14:09

And to incorporate into the a certain density of skylight plots,

00:16:16:02 - 00:16:20:17

which are uncut areas of of a certain minimum size.

00:16:23:13 - 00:16:27:15

Now what this does is it provides.

00:16:30:15 - 00:16:52:06

An increase in quality of habitat, as well as increased opportunities generally for skylight as well as other ground nesting birds. And so to answer the question, how will it be found? It will be vulnerable. Um, the answer, the question how do we

00:16:54:03 - 00:17:34:26

accommodate the skylights within that? Well, as you know, they use arable land anyway. And by incorporating the skylight plots, there's a well documented by RSPB and others to promote the skylight plot use. It will encourage more skill values. The quality of habitat goes up. And by incorporating beetle banks and broader, um foraging, permanent grassland foraging around the edges of the of the fields, which are quite those hedge bottoms are quite narrow at the moment, and we're looking to increase them to 10 or 12m.

00:17:35:27 - 00:17:53:02

We also increase the amount of foraging habitat that's immediately available to any skylarks that use those fields. By increasing the following habitat and the quality of opportunity.

00:17:55:00 - 00:18:14:19

We move from a situation in winter crops, for instance, where you will often looking at one brood per year to the opportunity to support multiple builds a year and greater chick survival within the brood as well.

00:18:16:08 - 00:18:16:27

So.

00:18:20:00 - 00:18:25:21

It's not just about the numbers of territories that are.

00:18:27:22 - 00:18:41:13

Restored or created. It's also about the success of the breeding, which means that there's a good chance that the absolute numbers would actually go up, rather than just counting territories.

00:18:43:07 - 00:18:54:09

So that would be my response in respect of how the mitigation areas are going to be managed and why that is so.

00:18:57:09 - 00:19:04:28

Excuse me. Um, with regard to territoriality, the research,

00:19:06:26 - 00:19:11:24

there's a lot of research into the density of skylarks. Um.

00:19:14:13 - 00:19:17:01

In arable land. And

00:19:18:28 - 00:19:53:14

generally speaking, in fact, I think most of the research points to arable fields managed for skylarks, supporting a greater density of skylarks. So if you provide the correct habitat or optimal habitat, then in in very layman's terms, they will live more. They will live more cheek by jowl because they've got what they need, and they're not squabbling over it quite so much.

00:19:54:10 - 00:20:10:21

And in addition to the beetle banks and so forth, the habitat improvements on the main development side will also give rise to much more forage and habitat for skylarks.

00:20:14:26 - 00:20:21:24

So the overall ability of the local landscape to support more skylarks This put in place.

00:20:24:10 - 00:20:42:06

So that's habitat quality. What are we going to do? And mitigation, um, with regard to the comments of Notts Wildlife Trust in their statement of common Ground. We've been discussing with them.

00:20:45:17 - 00:20:46:04

Um.

00:20:49:22 - 00:20:56:08

The measures that we're putting in place and also the requirement to monitor.

00:20:59:21 - 00:21:00:23

The success.

00:21:04:14 - 00:21:19:17

I believe that in the last few days, we've had a response to from the Wildlife Trust changing their response from red to amber in the statement of common ground

00:21:21:15 - 00:21:28:29

on the understanding that appropriate. Appropriate monitoring is put in place with appropriate.

00:21:31:11 - 00:21:38:09

Provision made for. Review of methods. The farming

00:21:40:09 - 00:21:42:29

also puts in place at certain trigger points.

00:21:44:23 - 00:21:51:13

That's actually set out in the landscape and ecology management plan.

00:21:59:15 - 00:22:03:18

Yeah sorry it's feature 11.

00:22:06:05 - 00:22:08:29

Within the unscripted ecology management plan.

00:22:13:17 - 00:22:24:23

Okay. So you're satisfied that the length of the outline lamp, as it is currently worded, has um, taken on board all of the measures that Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.

00:22:24:25 - 00:22:25:11

Has.

00:22:25:27 - 00:22:45:19

Stated with um in respect of Skylark and other measures within their response. And my main point of that is to ensure that none of the comments which which appear very constructive comments are not lost in the process. When you get to it. Can you reassure me that that would that wouldn't happen?

00:22:50:29 - 00:22:58:05

I would say that that's the intent. Um, and by extension, I can reassure you that it will happen.

00:22:59:22 - 00:23:03:10

And there's no further updates to the document required for that to happen.

00:23:10:01 - 00:23:20:09

No time to come around to requiring updates for that to happen. The intent is that it will happen as laid out in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.

00:23:30:04 - 00:23:30:19

Thank you.

00:23:30:24 - 00:23:38:05

I'll take one one more question from the room, and then I will go on to asking some questions on Skylark. I think yours, Mr.. Mr. Barlow.

00:23:38:18 - 00:23:56:24

Thank you. I'd just like to point out that the starting point for the enhanced habitat for skylarks is already there. Much of the land has already been farmed as an enhanced habitat for skylarks. That's why that's why they're present. So saying that we're going to have an enhanced.

00:23:57:03 - 00:23:57:18

Habitat.

00:23:57:20 - 00:24:22:11

For skylarks is only where we are today. So we are still losing an area of enhanced because of the land is being farmed under some of the Natural England, um, higher stewardship level, which is there for the environment and for birds and bees, etc. so you're not actually enhancing anything. You just maintaining something on a lower scale than what it is today. Thank you.

00:24:25:26 - 00:24:28:20

I want to provide a quick response to that. Mr. Gillespie.

00:24:32:21 - 00:24:35:06

Yes, certainly. The, um.

00:24:40:11 - 00:24:42:09

The effect of the skyline of glass

00:24:43:27 - 00:25:08:18

is a step on from that enhancement that you get with higher level stewardship. It's specifically targeted at ground nesting birds. And I would say, therefore, the with the intent of the scarlet fox is to compensate for the loss of skylark territories from the main development of the site. So that's its purpose. And

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

And that's why the proposal is to go a step further with the Scarlet plot, and to also incorporate a greater extent of foraging habitat to support. And.

00:25:28:05 - 00:25:31:23

More skylarks, as many as possible. And

00:25:33:20 - 00:25:36:08

and that's probably all I can say. So.

00:25:38:11 - 00:25:43:15

Thank you for that. I'm sorry. One quick point. Yeah.

00:25:44:06 - 00:26:07:27

A quick point. I beg your pardon? So just to clarify, so what you're actually saying is if the development did not go ahead, we would not be losing arable land, which is perfectly good Skylark territory. And all you are doing is saying, well, we'll try and compensate for that by improving the little bit of ground that we've got left that might be suitable for skylarks. That's actually what you're saying. Yeah.

00:26:18:24 - 00:26:49:00

Well, you said I come back to what you said. What you said was. Surely you said we are mitigating the loss of the arable land which is available for skylarks, by improving the small amount of land that we are setting aside to make available for skylarks. So the total loss of the area is being mitigated, hopefully, hopefully being mitigated by an improvement on a small area that you've you've got.

00:26:49:02 - 00:27:21:03

I mean, I don't understand it any other way. Then you're taking away 80% of the territory and you're trying to mitigate a small amount of the territory and saying that that will be equivalent, because that's that's my understanding of maybe I'm stupid. Maybe I don't understand simple words. But that was how I read what you were saying. That what we're saying is we're going to take away all of this space. A lot of which is Skylark territory. And we're going to put this little bit of space in here, and it's going to be better Skylark territory. And I'm not sure how I see that as being a net benefit.

00:27:21:05 - 00:27:23:13

That's all. I beg your pardon.

00:27:25:22 - 00:27:30:01

I'll ask you to briefly respond on on that point.

00:27:32:24 - 00:27:56:26

Our assessment isn't that skylarks will benefit from this scheme. Our assessment is that there will be a residual impact. So once everything's taken into account, that is significant at the local level and in an accumulative sense, um, local to district.

00:27:58:15 - 00:28:05:13

Um, that's quite a clear, uh, conclusion. So.

00:28:07:18 - 00:28:22:10

Scarlet will be lost. And as many as we can put back will be provided for. Uh, and our assessment of the significance of that is, is a significant is significant at the local level.

00:28:25:02 - 00:28:25:17

Okay.

00:28:25:19 - 00:28:26:09

I understand.

00:28:26:12 - 00:29:01:25

Yeah. Okay. Right. Just turn on to to to my questions now. Um, and your response to, um, our first written question. It was 5.03, and it refers to a conservative estimate of the 54 to 64% as compensation for displacement, strikes and appropriate balance between mitigating the impact raised and continuing to provide for an efficient use of land. Yet, the Environmental Statement chapter and the Skylark Mitigation Strategy refers to it as mitigation.

00:29:02:12 - 00:29:09:06

Just for clarity, can you confirm whether the message is for Skylark or mitigation or compensation?

00:29:17:18 - 00:29:24:14

Yeah. Um, when you factor in the.

00:29:27:05 - 00:29:38:27

Skylarks on the land that is not within the two biodiversity areas, which has also got potential for, um,

00:29:40:21 - 00:29:49:09

this kind of like territory formation. Then I think you've actually got a mixture of mitigation and compensation.

00:29:52:20 - 00:29:53:05

And I.

00:29:53:07 - 00:29:53:22

Would say.

00:29:53:24 - 00:29:56:24

It is probably compensation. Yes. You're right.

00:29:57:12 - 00:30:08:15

Okay. So it's just so we're referring to the right terminology in terms of iteration. So it's mainly compensation. Okay. Thank you very much.

00:30:11:08 - 00:30:50:29

Also, as part of our first written questions, we asked why a higher figure of mitigation than the approximate 55% of its 64% of the territories likely to be displaced had not been proposed. And the consideration that you've given to try and increase that percentage. Um, and your response to that question, you've explained the factors that's led to the percentage figures that you've come up with, which includes finding suitable fields and trying to balance between mitigating the impact raised and continuing to provide an efficient use of land.

00:30:51:22 - 00:31:03:15

But could you clarify simply why further field, in addition to those that you have identified in your Skylark mitigation strategy has not been considered to provide mitigation.

00:31:12:00 - 00:31:39:02

This may be a question partly for Mr. Pritchard, but from an ecological perspective, um, and this may answer your question. And there is no policy requirement to provide compensation like like a skylark or for any section on section 41, habitat or species, which possibly on habitats species are a

00:31:40:27 - 00:31:53:26

consideration for determining authorities. Um, but it doesn't lead automatically to an assumption that a 100% replacement would be

00:31:55:15 - 00:32:05:06

required. So That's if you like. That's the far end. So then it comes down to,

00:32:06:23 - 00:32:29:03

as we said, efficient use of land now 70. Well, when you factor in the other elements, we've calculated that depending on which are the years worth of survey, because we did two years worth of survey for skylarks, and the second year, which wasn't limited to footpaths, to go back to an earlier point, um,

00:32:30:27 - 00:32:48:11

it's between the low 60s and 70% potentially replacement. Um, it's probably worth me pointing to recent local, um, schemes where

00:32:50:05 - 00:33:25:11

a lower provision. These are inset schemes locally where a lower provision for skylight has been made and in some cases no specific numbers provided, though in those cases the ancepts focused purely on habitat quality, which was the point I was making earlier. So I think that the the requirement

to provide any more, um, isn't really that it's a desire for some people, but I don't think there's a basis for it.

00:33:27:07 - 00:33:34:13

And you wouldn't say that the general mitigation policies in the environment and in the NPS wouldn't cover that.

00:33:36:27 - 00:33:38:03

I don't think they do.

00:33:49:27 - 00:33:53:16

Is there based on the discussion in the previous?

00:33:55:19 - 00:34:25:19

Item on agriculture. Is there a balance to be struck that if you were to take more fields, would that also have a knock on effect in terms of using a more agricultural land that would adversely affect. I'm trying to see here. The point of the question is, is there a link between the more fields that you use for Skylark mitigation, then does that have any adverse effect on other topics such as loss of BMV land, for example?

00:34:30:23 - 00:35:09:02

Um, for the applicant? Um, just picking up on the point that Mr. Gillespie said about the starting point and the the fact there is no policy basis for this. It is, from an applicant's perspective, a balance of how much land is, um, utilized for scallop mitigation or compensation. And as Mr. Gillespie said on the difference of different years, there are many other examples where much lower mitigation is put in place.

00:35:09:04 - 00:35:41:24

So it does come down to that balance of delivering a project and of this nature and the agreements that can be sought for that on BMV. Um, I don't think this would have an impact necessarily, because it's still arable farming. Um, and therefore similar to other types of the scrub, etc.. The land is still available for farming. Um, but it would potentially have other impacts. But but the application side is the application side.

00:35:41:26 - 00:35:54:18

We have used it and balanced the use of that land in the most efficient way we can to deliver not only green energy, but also the impacts on other other forms of of nature and wildlife as well.

00:36:00:10 - 00:36:05:05

Thank you. And my final question for skylarks is really about, um,

00:36:06:27 - 00:36:47:25

the mitigation strategy. Um, and you say that the 55 to 64% is a conservative figure and the true figure could be higher. Um, but noting that that is a prediction that's based on, um, evidence led projections. Um, could you provide further details of how you propose to monitor the proposed Skylark mitigation strategy, which is set out in section four of that document? Um, to ensure that the anticipated increase

in the skylight nesting densities, um, which you've got 58 territories is what you've stated would be delivered to the percentage figures quoted.

00:36:52:18 - 00:36:56:09

The percentage figures quoted are the range

00:36:58:09 - 00:37:19:06

and the range because, first of all, the seller. Over two years we had two different levels of territory. Now that in itself shows you that Skylark numbers fluctuate naturally year on year.

00:37:21:02 - 00:37:31:01

So we would never put forward a specific tipping point as a as a flat fraction.

00:37:32:19 - 00:37:36:22

I think in the Olymp at the moment there is a

00:37:38:10 - 00:37:43:12

we said to within 10%. Um.

00:37:49:13 - 00:38:05:07

What should happen is that the objectives for the monitoring need to be. Will need to be agreed in terms that are meaningful to inform further action and the monitoring

00:38:06:28 - 00:38:15:14

schedule put in place, which is surveying counting on a periodic basis.

00:38:18:27 - 00:38:19:21

Once.

00:38:22:09 - 00:38:27:26

The other thing that would would need to be factored in would be the.

00:38:30:04 - 00:38:33:14

The prevailing population trend as well.

00:38:36:04 - 00:38:49:16

The effects of extremely bad weather in one year could have a big effect on how many territories you could possibly Let's see. Occupied. Um, there could be.

00:38:51:22 - 00:39:01:11

A huge outbreak of bird flu that affects skylark populations. There could be bad weather elsewhere in the country. Um, so I think that the

00:39:03:00 - 00:39:49:08

monitoring needs to be reined in such a way that it allows for some consideration of that. And then if we are seeing a trend of under occupation less than expected, and I would say we'd be looking for trends rather than every year looking again. Have we got enough or we must do something. It will take time. It will take a little time to bed. In the other way of doing, uh, the other way of monitoring it is to say, have we put in all the territories that we were supposed to put in, all the, sorry, all the scarlet plots that we were supposed to put in, and now we're doing the other measures on the rest of the site to encourage skylarks to form territories.

00:39:49:10 - 00:40:16:16

So you take the numbers of skylarks out of it, and you just look at physically what has been done. And then you could you could say it's then up to the sky on it, because we can't control what they actually do. We can only provide for them and we can only project that if we do, if we put in place certain measures based on the evidence of quite a lot of research. And those are the numbers we would reasonably expect.

00:40:18:02 - 00:40:19:18

Does that answer your question?

00:40:20:08 - 00:40:25:20

Yes. So so effectively my based on what you need, you're going to need some

00:40:27:17 - 00:40:34:09

flexibility in your monitoring plans going forward, is what you're saying in terms of, um,

00:40:35:27 - 00:41:16:16

accounting for unexpected events in terms of population drop. I think what I'm sort of trying to do. Is there anything? Are there any extra measures that you could put in that? Because obviously you've got the land already, you've got the tomb, you've got the eastern and western mitigation areas and the land already set that you're proposing to set aside for that. I think what I'm trying to get at is what scope have you got within the mitigation strategies that you're proposing to increase that those predicted, um, percentages above, about above what you've got if in case you can't hit those numbers.

00:41:20:26 - 00:41:23:24

Where is that? Is there anything you can outline at this stage?

00:41:28:00 - 00:41:29:00

Let's go and.

00:41:29:02 - 00:41:29:17

Give.

00:41:29:19 - 00:41:32:16

It a proper thought. But, um.

00:41:35:20 - 00:41:37:15

Depending on where we set the numbers.

00:41:40:13 - 00:41:56:21

We have, as well as the just the landowners in the mitigation in the mitigation zones. We've got land on the site as well, which we've been quite conservative with. We started by not factoring it in at all. Um.

00:41:58:29 - 00:42:37:07

Notts County Council actually asked about what if you play the what if you did factor it in. So we did factor it in um using various assumed densities from published work, uh, on different types of habitat. But even there, we've been quite conservative about how many fields we've, we've chosen. So my sense is that actually, I don't think when we're looking at er environmental assessment, we have to be careful not to be too, um, too ambitious about what? What we're promising to deliver.

00:42:37:16 - 00:42:44:28

We can't over promise, but at the same time, we need to be realistic. And I think sitting here now, though.

00:42:48:04 - 00:43:04:10

There is scope within within the remainder of the site to, um, to give us that, that buffer. But it will depend on where we set the triggers in the first place.

00:43:06:27 - 00:43:34:19

I appreciate that response. For the time being, I think it will be fair if we add as an action point for you to to just, um, explain to us, I would say probably the way we could work this action point is, what contingency plans do you have if the percentage figures are not delivered for whatever reason? And is the the provision that you could incorporate for further mitigation or enhancement to be delivered? That's.

00:43:37:12 - 00:43:39:08

Not a bad summary of it.

00:43:39:11 - 00:43:40:20

I think that's a fair summary.

00:43:45:14 - 00:43:52:06

That's all the questions I have on Skylark. Is there is there anybody who wants to make any more points with Mrs. Barlow and Miss Hodgson? And then we all.

00:43:52:26 - 00:44:14:07

So sorry, Julie Barlow for yourself. And this might be an irrelevant question, but we've recently had agreement that the high man to Norton time on a power line projects would be incorporated in cumulative impact. Was that taken into account when these assessments were done? I'm thinking flight paths and things for for birds.

00:44:16:12 - 00:44:22:23

I'll ask you to hold that thought. I will ask you to respond to that. I just wanted to. Miss Hodgson. Did you have your hand up?

00:44:27:24 - 00:44:33:07

If you could just wait for the microphone to come so everybody can hear on the recording. sorry.

00:44:40:23 - 00:45:13:29

Um, yeah. Just common sense is kind of telling me that, um, what we've not talked about is during the construction phase, which is going to be to possibly longer two years plus, um, as soon as lots, lots and trucks and heavy plants and, um, machinery and piling and noise starts occurring over the open fields, any skylarks and other species are going to be displaced.

00:45:14:07 - 00:45:50:19

Um, if they are able to kind of hang around on just about feed and survive, they're certainly not going to breed. And so there's going to be significant loss over that to possibly three year period. So, you know, how are you going to mitigate against that. And so you might well be able to create lots of nice skylark plots, um, after the build. But you will already have decimated the population. So how are you going to, um, account for that loss that's going to occur, um, in the build period?

00:45:56:02 - 00:46:07:07

I'll turn to the applicant to respond to those two points, starting first with the cumulative with potential cumulative effects with the hi ma'am to Humber North Hulbert project.

00:46:09:21 - 00:46:15:02

Yes. The high mountains on the um 400 kilovolt

00:46:16:21 - 00:46:24:00

transmission line was, uh, considered in the cumulative assessment. Um.

00:46:26:11 - 00:46:34:21

At the time that we undertook the cumulative assessment information about it was limited to.

00:46:36:24 - 00:46:57:15

Was published scoping purposes and so no impact assessment had actually been done at that time. Nonetheless, um, we did consider what you might reasonably expect to see. Um,

00:46:59:08 - 00:47:03:12

because it did identify the potential for an overhead transmission line.

00:47:05:27 - 00:47:06:16

Um.

00:47:08:20 - 00:47:30:13

The, the breeding bird surveys in the western part of the site that coincide with the route corridor we found from our surveys, actually supported a relatively limited range of breeding birds, mainly field edge and ground nesting passerines. So there will be um.

00:47:34:20 - 00:47:49:06

And the, the chances of a significant level of collision which was mentioned with the lines for passerines that sort of small perching birds by and large and.

00:47:51:12 - 00:48:00:18

Due to displacement um is actually quite low because of the way that they fly. Um,

00:48:02:12 - 00:48:04:26

so on the basis of available information

00:48:06:14 - 00:48:09:01

and assuming the implementation of standard

00:48:10:28 - 00:48:21:18

mitigation by the overhead power line proposal, a significant cumulative effect on breeding birds, it's not considered likely.

00:48:37:00 - 00:48:43:13

You just have to give you a moment, please. I'll just briefly summarize the cumulative effect, if that's helpful. Yeah. Okay.

00:48:51:03 - 00:48:51:19

Okay.

00:48:51:21 - 00:49:18:07

So we also carried out non-breeding bird surveys or wintering bird surveys if you like, of uh, of the of that area of the site. And we recorded three waterbirds that were specifically at risk of collision, either behavior or nature. And these were botanical lesser blackbuck. And so three species have gone.

00:49:21:08 - 00:49:23:29

But in terms of cumulative effects,

00:49:25:23 - 00:49:33:02

the stable development is very likely to give rise to a significant adverse effect on gull species. So cumulatively.

00:49:35:09 - 00:49:53:03

It follows that whatever risk transpires from the overhead line, development wouldn't combine with the staple development to increase the risk presented by the overhead power line itself.

00:50:01:18 - 00:50:06:28

High flying non-breeding birds such as field fair Starling

00:50:08:14 - 00:50:15:00

are likely to be at high risk. May be at higher risk of collision because of the flight height at certain times.

00:50:17:02 - 00:50:27:23

But an appreciable adverse effect on these species from the proposed development are Again, as with goals, doesn't really exist. So a cumulative effect.

00:50:29:27 - 00:50:36:17

The stable development and the Nim development is unlikely to arise.

00:50:41:21 - 00:50:49:28

There is also the issue of predation of small birds by perching corvids and certain raptors,

00:50:51:20 - 00:50:56:21

which was identified in the cumulative effects assessment.

00:51:09:09 - 00:51:14:26

That had been scoped into the oh um, the overhead line.

00:51:16:12 - 00:51:20:06

Submissions only for designated sites. So

00:51:21:22 - 00:51:25:05

on that basis, it was unlikely to give rise to a cumulative effect.

00:51:28:03 - 00:51:36:25

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, and there was the second point from Mr. Hudson, particularly, how are you going to account for the loss during build stage?

00:51:39:12 - 00:52:00:11

The impact assessment, um, recognizes there will be a temporary loss. And during the construction phase, the construction phase won't take place all at once. Everywhere. So there will be a certain amount of natural phasing. Um.

00:52:02:16 - 00:52:07:13

And as things and as development moves on the.

00:52:10:27 - 00:52:11:16

Um.

00:52:14:18 - 00:52:17:25

The impact on hedgerow nesting birds, for instance

00:52:19:13 - 00:52:24:18

from disturbance will or die down.

00:52:26:17 - 00:52:34:04

So I think I would say that that impact would be quite temporary. You've got skylarks.

00:52:39:29 - 00:52:54:06

I need to check if that's okay, and come back to you about how soon the measures are going to be put in place, because I can't remember. So the measures to improve the lot of skylarks.

00:52:56:04 - 00:53:05:05

I'm not clear in my mind right now. Can't remember whether they are, whether they would be put in place from the outset or once the site is built.

00:53:08:12 - 00:53:20:23

Okay, we'll have that as an action point for the applicant to confirm. How soon will measures be put in place, um, in whether it be at the outset or what was the final thing you said at the outset or.

00:53:20:28 - 00:53:24:12

The outset, or once the development was in.

00:53:24:14 - 00:53:28:12

Place or wanting to have it in place? Okay. Thank you very much.

00:53:32:27 - 00:53:57:23

And we'll move on now from from skylarks. And it's really just to allow fields for farming to explain whether they want to raise any further concerns on other bird species. That's been talked about just there in the response, but whether there was anything you wanted to raise, in addition to the comments that you've already raised in your relevant representations on other bird species,

00:53:59:13 - 00:54:02:12

such as lapwing or meadow pipit.

00:54:14:29 - 00:54:57:29

Um, I think what we would like to point out that, um, a lot of all of these mitigations and the plans for the future, they're unknown because we haven't had large scale solar infrastructure or any infrastructure of this type in this country before. We've only got one now, operational CIP that was approved last year. So if this has not been done before, so we don't actually know what the impacts are on large scale infrastructure in the countryside, where there's an attempt to then maintain wildlife and farming and the other things.

00:54:58:01 - 00:55:14:13

It's an unknown. So I've heard quoted prediction. The predicted evidence tells us this. It's desktop. It's it's theoretical. We don't actually know. So I think that has to be taken account of.

00:55:18:19 - 00:55:30:19

Does anybody else want to raise any concerns under the bird species? I don't see any hand support. I don't see any hands up online. The applicant, the opportunity to respond to that point.

00:55:32:14 - 00:55:35:08

I don't think there's an additional.

00:55:35:10 - 00:55:35:25

Point.

00:55:35:27 - 00:55:36:12

There.

00:55:36:14 - 00:55:36:29

We haven't covered.

00:55:40:05 - 00:55:40:20

Okay.

00:55:40:26 - 00:55:47:01

Thank you. I've noted. I've noted the concerns you've raised, though. I'm just finishing writing that down, Miss Hudson.

00:55:58:20 - 00:56:23:15

Okay. We'll move on now to the effects on Badgers and Lincoln Red's original population. We'll take them separately. Um. Um, I'll. I will go back to the two, um, point was made before. I think it was. Mr. Bartle, you wanted to raise concerns on badges, so I will allow you to do that. Now, if we've got the roving mic, um, for you to make the point that you wanted to raise earlier.

00:56:29:22 - 00:56:42:22

Yeah, I just wanted to make a point, um, about the badges, because, uh, the proposed solar panel area on our tenanted farm, uh, sits within a large badger population.

00:56:46:02 - 00:57:16:07

Yeah, that's quite. Well, that's the applicant to respond in the general term for badgers. And before we do, um, I'm going to ask Nottinghamshire County Council, um, because you did request clarification on badger sets in your local impact reports and relevant representations, and you also requested for proposed mitigations to be mapped on a plan which the applicant responded to. What's your current position in respect of badges? Is it similar to what you've seen before, or is there some old standard concerns?

00:57:18:10 - 00:57:20:25

Stephen Poynter, Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:57:20:27 - 00:57:21:14

Um.

00:57:21:20 - 00:57:43:19

Yes. Further dialogue with our ecologist suggests that there are no other outstanding concerns other than the one I mentioned about, um, watercourses. So, um, I can only say that we are satisfied with the response we've had from the applicant in regard to, uh, to badgers. Sir. Thank you.

00:57:44:10 - 00:57:50:27

Okay. Thank you. Does anybody else want to raise any concerns about badgers before I ask the applicant to respond?

00:57:52:19 - 00:58:32:06

I don't see any hands up. So I will ask the applicant to respond to. And as part of your response, I would also like you to set out the current position in respect to submitting a letter of no impediment to Natural England. um. Um, and also the extent to um, which you're you've amended, I noticed is chapter seven in your deadline three submission in particular you you were updated paragraph 7.8.158. And you could just also briefly, um, explain to us how those amendments have, um, in your opinion, addressed concerns previously raised by parties.

00:58:34:25 - 00:58:35:10

Uh.

00:58:35:18 - 00:58:40:16

James Gillespie, the applicant. Could you just give me those up? I don't know if I can.

00:58:40:18 - 00:59:10:20

It was 7.8.158 of s chapter seven that you updated a deadline three. And it was in response to concerns. So, um, as part of your response. So actually there's in three stages, the response to the concerns was raised by, um, Mr. Bartlett, by um, I'd also like you to just give us an update on the letter of No Impediment to Natural England. And also to just briefly explain how you consider that the update that you did to the. Yes.

00:59:10:22 - 00:59:15:18

Chapter seven, A deadline three, has addressed concerns that have been raised by parties.

00:59:16:10 - 00:59:30:11

Thank you. Um, the with regard to Mr. Butler's, uh, comments and observations. Um.

00:59:35:05 - 00:59:39:26

The intent of the sorry

00:59:41:23 - 00:59:57:22

as far as budget closures are concerned at the moment. Uh, and as as anticipated, they are currently anticipated to involve no closures of main sets.

01:00:01:22 - 01:00:35:04

There is one set that is fairly close to proposed tracks surfacing improvement works, but that will be very temporary. It will be temporary, short term and and involve machineries similar in and its

characteristics. As far as budgets are concerned to maybe a contractor running up pulling up and down which is currently happening.

01:00:35:22 - 01:00:36:11

So.

01:00:40:18 - 01:00:42:28

That's point one. No main set closure.

01:00:45:15 - 01:00:52:09

At 0.2. There will be permanent set closure of two outlier sets.

01:00:55:21 - 01:01:01:03

There will be temporary closure of two additional Outlier sets.

01:01:04:17 - 01:01:09:03

Closure of an outlier set if they're in occupation at the time.

01:01:12:01 - 01:01:31:19

Obviously lead to it, but you're not being able to use that set. But by its nature, it's a set that is used temporarily. Um, and within the territory of the clown, you expect closure of an outlier set to lead to some internal shuffling within the territory,

01:01:33:17 - 01:01:45:06

as distinct from a mean set closure, which could lead to more significant termination of the badges and potentially some wider ramifications.

01:01:47:10 - 01:02:02:05

There are additional measures from fencing, road construction, cable installation for what it looks like up to a further 11 outlier sets, but the.

01:02:04:06 - 01:02:11:06

One of the primary focuses of micro citing those works will be to avoid

01:02:12:25 - 01:02:14:06

further closures.

01:02:19:06 - 01:02:19:21

And.

01:02:21:22 - 01:02:24:05

Does not address the first question.

01:02:25:00 - 01:02:34:01

Yes I think I think it's it's given me your response to that. Yes. Um, so moving on to the letter of no impediment update.

01:02:34:04 - 01:02:37:29

So the letter of no impediment update was submitted on the.

01:02:44:23 - 01:03:01:18

29th of January. Uh, so there wasn't a letter submitted. It was the draft license application to Natural England was submitted on the 29th of January to Natural England. Um,

01:03:03:10 - 01:03:10:07

they it is currently being proposed. So you've currently been, um, processed.

01:03:11:23 - 01:03:12:08

Uh.

01:03:12:19 - 01:03:40:04

And subject to any questions or clarifications that they may have. We would expect that to be back with us as soon as Natural England can, uh, process it. They have a stated 30 working day turnaround, and it could be longer than that. And if they do have any queries, then that may extend that.

01:03:40:15 - 01:03:53:24

Okay. I appreciate I probably worded my question incorrectly because it is the the letter of no impediment is issued by Natural England is the draft license you submit. Just to clarify that. Yeah okay. I've got that.

01:03:55:26 - 01:04:05:13

And then finally. So you said you submitted on the 29th of your draft license on the 29th of November. That's January. Sorry.

01:04:07:24 - 01:04:08:09

Yeah.

01:04:08:11 - 01:04:09:12

Sorry. Thank you.

01:04:09:14 - 01:04:10:03

Yes.

01:04:11:01 - 01:04:21:17

And finally, how the updates that you've done to chapter seven at deadline three has addressed the previous concerns raised by parties.

01:04:23:03 - 01:04:26:05

Would you like me to read out the revised paragraph?

01:04:26:07 - 01:04:35:29

You can do. Yeah. If you can show it on the screen, maybe as well. If we can do that so that people can see what you've what you've, um. You've updated.

01:04:40:02 - 01:04:45:26

It's it's rec 3.009. Yeah. That's it. Yes. It's highlighted in red there.

01:04:47:02 - 01:04:48:05

Paragraph seven.

01:04:49:29 - 01:05:22:14

Paragraph .158. Proposed development is sought to retain offsets within appropriate buffers where possible, with the intention of fully protecting them during construction. However, some budget sets may require closure under licence to protect badgers from possible injury, but the need for this will depend on the detailed design of the proposed development and the status of each set at the time, which will be determined through updated budget survey work.

01:05:28:25 - 01:06:05:27

Thank you very much. Um, I'm going to now move on to everyone who's got anything else I want to say on budgets, I think we'll. I'll, um, turn to Mr. Barlow and then we'll move on to Lincoln. Red. Original population. Well, yeah, we'll take it separately because, um, in fact, what I'll do is I'll. I'll ask the question I was going to ask you anyway because I wanted some more information from you about because I noticed your deadline to submission and you've. You've referred to it. So it's really if you could provide us with some more information on this population, it's important to the area and the concerns that you have on the effects to it.

01:06:06:06 - 01:06:13:07

And whether you consider the applicant has assessed the effects on this population sufficiently.

01:06:16:17 - 01:06:21:25

Okay. Thank you. Um, just sorry. Oh, absolutely.

01:06:21:27 - 01:06:22:12

Yes.

01:06:23:15 - 01:06:24:26

So, uh, this.

01:06:24:28 - 01:06:25:13

Is.

01:06:25:15 - 01:07:00:28

Obviously as a James Barlow, as a neighbouring farmer to the proposed development and a resident of certain. And this is the second significant risk to my livelihood today, the first being the potential for

more runoff from solar panels and flooding to potentially the farm. And now it is to the. To the livestock. Um, the Lincoln Red cattle that we have are listed on the Rare Breed Survival Trust.

01:07:01:21 - 01:07:14:04

At one point, we had 20% of that population worldwide on this farm. So it is a significant population of rare breed Lincoln red cattle.

01:07:16:13 - 01:07:46:22

Badgers. Getting back to badgers. Badgers. Uh, transmit TB. TB is catastrophic to cattle. It could wipe them all out tomorrow. Um, as you're aware. Badgers are also territorial. So any movement of badgers, i.e. two sets temporary and two sets permanently, those badgers, for all I know, could be carrying TB. They'll be looking for a new home.

01:07:46:28 - 01:07:54:26

If that new home happens to be anywhere around our farm, that could be the end of this population of Lincoln Red cattle.

01:07:57:21 - 01:08:33:20

If they don't, uh, choose the habitat around our farm, those badgers which have been displaced could be replaced with badgers from elsewhere. That, again, could be carrying TB. Currently we TB test once a year, so we know we're clean. We can assume the local badgers are clean as we haven't got a TB, but we're opening up an area for other badgers to come into the area and potentially infect the local badgers and infect our cattle.

01:08:34:04 - 01:08:45:24

I'd say, and that happens. That's again the end of our livelihood. I don't believe that they've even looked at this or considered the consequences of moving badgers. Thank you.

01:08:48:24 - 01:09:03:17

So is your concern primarily badges or is there other? In addition to that, is it also physical aspects of the proposed development as well that you're concerned about? So I'm just.

01:09:03:23 - 01:09:34:15

At the minute we're talking about badges, and I'm looking at the life of these cattle and preserving the life of these cattle. That is really what I'm looking at at the minute. Okay. I lose my livelihood. But it's we're looking at a rare breed of cattle that a lineage lineage that is the oldest lineage in the UK. It's a native breed, and it is of any breed of cattle. It's the oldest lineage in the UK. And so if we lose these cattle, it's a significant proportion of them and it hasn't been considered very simply.

01:09:35:10 - 01:09:36:02

Thank you.

01:09:37:06 - 01:10:12:12

Thank you. I'm going to I'm going to turn to the applicant to respond because I've looked through your eyes, chapter seven. And I haven't seen any mention of this, um, of this population in it, so that I also have a similar question. To what extent have you assessed the effects on this population? And

also, can you explain the measures that you have in place, particularly with respect to badgers, and that there would be or there would be a mitigated effect on that particular population and how much that's been considered.

01:10:15:11 - 01:10:27:10

James Gillespie for the applicant, chapter seven, uh, is an ecology chapter. Um, it isn't an agricultural impact assessment.

01:10:29:00 - 01:10:37:02

And I don't mean that some flippant, but it wouldn't normally be within the scope of an ecological impact assessment to consider

01:10:38:21 - 01:10:42:29

agricultural impacts. notwithstanding that.

01:10:46:09 - 01:10:55:12

Um, the. I'm not sure. I don't think we're opening up the area for more badgers.

01:10:59:27 - 01:11:13:28

To come in. And in fact, they're currently clean badges, if you like. Um, and I think it is perfectly I think it would be perfectly reasonable to, um, anticipate that

01:11:15:22 - 01:11:40:16

within the Klan territory, if one outlier was lost or two outliers of two outliers and two temporarily, um, an outlier set loss would not normally give rise to and badges being forced out further beyond their Klan Territory. And.

01:11:43:23 - 01:11:51:19

So I think that as far as measures to, to minimize the risk

01:11:53:11 - 01:12:23:22

from an echo, but looking at it from an ecological perspective, um, the, the, the only way that we can minimise the risk is by minimising the number of closures and then ensuring that we're not looking to close main sets or annexe sets, which are the two kinds of set that you would expect some inevitable shuffling to take place.

01:12:33:19 - 01:12:53:28

So it sounds to me, from what you've just said, and you consider that if. You can minimize the number of sets that this would reduce the risks that have been identified. And you don't consider that one outlier loss would be able to give rise to an effect on on this population.

01:12:56:19 - 01:12:57:04

I.

01:12:59:17 - 01:13:01:12

Think it will be very unlikely.

01:13:08:16 - 01:13:15:06

We've got quite a few hands coming up. I think it's Mr. Fleming first and then we'll go back to Mr. Mr. Bartel.

01:13:21:18 - 01:13:22:05

Thank you.

01:13:22:17 - 01:13:24:15

Bob Fleming Fields for farming.

01:13:24:18 - 01:13:59:05

Um, there's been mention of badgers and the movement of badgers. Whether they will move from one side to another. Two years ago, they started the quarry and started the steeple. I've never seen badgers on my property. In the last 35, 40 years, on Christmas Eve. I've got the proof here. I've got a film here of a badger on my. On my law. Now, I've never seen them in 30 odd years. And yet suddenly, because of the quarry and the closing of the sets down by the quarry, these animals have moved.

01:13:59:07 - 01:14:30:21

I don't know, one two miles, but they're now certainly on my property. And I've just found it. While I was looking at my at my feed camera feed on the 28th of December 2025. There's a badger digging up my front lawn. So they do move and they will move. And Mr. Barlow is quite right to worry about the movement of badgers and infecting his cattle. This is proof that these these, um, these industrial buildings and industrial sites are affecting the wildlife in our area.

01:14:30:23 - 01:14:48:11

We've now got. I've never seen deer in my field. Now we've got bare deer in the field. Never seen them before. There must be a reason why they're moving. And they're moving. Because industry has been brought into the area. And the cattle and the. And the animals and the wildlife are moving out. Thank you.

01:14:57:03 - 01:14:59:27

Yes. Just take the the next point.

01:15:02:01 - 01:15:34:02

Yeah. I had a point to put to Jim that I know that you're the ecology expert, and you said that it's not in the ecology survey report. It will be in the agricultural survey report has rez. Surely they've done an agricultural survey report, seeing as it's all agricultural land that's going to be taken up. Uh, if the agricultural report doesn't have the issue of the Lincoln Reds in either, then Mr. Barlow's point is valid and it hasn't been taken into account.

01:15:34:04 - 01:15:50:12

And I will put forward as well that we had TB oh, about ten years ago, about 10 to 12 years ago. It is devastating. It shook the farm down for nearly a year. It is not something that I'd want anyone to go through as a farmer.

01:15:54:08 - 01:15:59:03

That's the point. Do you want to say anything more, Mr. Barlow? I'll let you have the opportunity.

01:16:00:05 - 01:16:32:16

Okay. Thank you. James Barlow, local resident, farmer. I can only say that what I've heard doesn't reassure me that badgers will not move towards my farm. The other thing of note, which we weren't talking about, we were talking about deer, deer, also a carrier of TB, and also sure that with all this deer fencing, deer will also be displaced and deer a carrier of TB. So that's another risk to our livelihoods and to to this population of rare breed cattle. Nothing you said is assured me it won't happen.

01:16:32:20 - 01:16:43:09

And so to say that it's an outlying population. An outlying population on one area is an in-line population of another. What is outlying? Thank you.

01:16:45:07 - 01:16:46:09

Okay, I think.

01:16:48:19 - 01:17:21:03

What I will ask is, are you aware that this has been assessed in any of the other environmental statement chapters? If not, I am going to be putting as an action point for you to provide some more information on this, because I feel that we need some more information on the likely effects to this population and what, if any, mitigation measures are required. So I'll firstly let you respond whether the environmental statement has covered this issue, and if not, then we're going to put an action point for some more information to be submitted.

01:17:22:00 - 01:17:23:16

So Patrick Robinson for the.

01:17:23:18 - 01:17:24:09

Applicant.

01:17:24:11 - 01:17:59:01

Um, entirely happy that you put an action point, not least because what you're interested here is, how are you going to answer this particular question? Um, believe the the Lincoln red thing first came up in the responses from Bismarck. So it wouldn't have been in the ES before that. But I think you'll understand. I think this is what was in our response to that point is, since we, for the reasons Mr. Gillespie has explained, we do not think there will be a significant perturbation of badges.

01:17:59:03 - 01:18:28:08

We're not altering that baseline. Therefore, any effect they may have is not going to affect cattle. But that's all very well. That's saying, well, that's what the reasoning is. You say, well I'd like to see that in one place and you have a proper consideration of it. So we're entirely happy. If that's the way the action point comes up. We will address you on that subject. And obviously the question is do you think that's enough? Do you think there needs to be more. Then yes, we can address that question.

01:18:28:26 - 01:18:55:24

Okay. I think the way that we will leave this, we will as an action point and for deadline for so that we've got the opportunity to read what you've said before. We do read some questions and also for other parties as well, so that there's sufficient time left in the examination to be considered. So we will add an action point regarding further information on the original population. But also other species were mentioned there as well.

01:18:59:23 - 01:19:17:28

So yeah, the assessment and also mitigation or how measures that you have in place across your documents, you consider that they will or will or whether there needs to be more mitigation to reduce the risk that have been identified. I'll take one more point.

01:19:18:00 - 01:19:34:05

This is yeah, it's really just to say that we only brought it up, um, as a result of the last hearing. Because the license was mentioned, we hadn't comprehended that there would be this risk. Prior to the last hearing.

01:19:37:03 - 01:19:54:18

No, we're grateful for that. And that's what this process is. If an examination is for you to raise these concerns on it. So we're grateful that you've raised that in your deadline to submission. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to move on to the adequacy of proposed mitigation measures. Um.

01:19:57:03 - 01:19:59:02

I will, um,

01:20:00:23 - 01:20:09:10

just just one very quick question. If you need to put your microphone on, though, first, I apologize to Mr. Parish Council.

01:20:09:17 - 01:20:32:18

I'm just wondering what sure it is. They are the ones if the application goes ahead. You know, we heard the lady at the back talk about seized up access gates for animals and etc. etc. and overgrown. What is the guarantee of monitoring and conformity on the applicant should it go ahead? Do you understand? What I'm saying.

01:20:32:24 - 01:21:06:03

Is that in respect of biology, biological and ecological mitigation? Yes, we're going to we're going to come on to that. But um, in fact, because we're on that, I'll take that point now. And I think if you can make a note of that, to respond to that, and we'll take from other parties. Um, in terms of mitigation, um, measures, I'm going to turn to the Nottinghamshire County Council first, though, um, because you did raise a number of mitigation measures which the applicant has responded to.

01:21:06:05 - 01:21:14:12

Um, again, if you could just set out your current position with regards to, um, mitigation, um, that would be appreciated.

01:21:19:21 - 01:21:50:15

Thank you, Stephen Point. Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, yeah. We've noted the applicant's response to our, uh, issues regarding, um, monitoring management of, um, the condition of sites. Um, we recognise those matters, uh, have been covered, um, within the outline, uh, environment landscape management plan. Uh, we do expect those to follow through.

01:21:50:21 - 01:22:28:06

Um, through the requirements of the DCO into the final, um, landscape and environment management plan. We, uh, therefore, um, will look to ensuring that, uh, you know, the final DCO, uh, does, does protect that provision and, uh, and ensures that the sites are retained and therefore, um, you know, as before, my ecologist doesn't have any outstanding concerns regarding that aspect.

01:22:28:08 - 01:22:34:00

So, um, that that matter is resolved as well as we're concerned. Thank you sir.

01:22:39:19 - 01:22:42:12

Okay. Thank you very much. Um.

01:22:46:06 - 01:23:03:21

Alternative fields for farming. Who want if they want to raise any concerns, um, I think are you representing fields for farming on this, Mrs. Barlow? Um, because you're, you know, your deadline. One submission has raised a number of concerns about mitigation. I do want to give you the opportunity to to raise those you want once.

01:23:04:04 - 01:23:34:27

We've made written representations. I'm not going to repeat those, but, um, just from what I've heard through this process so far, the DCO is key because that determines the framework for the the project. And then it's down to our local council, Nottinghamshire and Bassetlaw, to then put the meat on those bones and, and hold the developer to account. We've seen and we're very grateful for Notts County Council's involvement in this process.

01:23:34:29 - 01:24:04:28

And we've worked as a village and community well with Notts County over the quarry. Bassetlaw aren't in the room and I do believe they have started to engage with developers in a couple of documents hearing on. But what reassurances are we going to have that they will be actively involved in this process and protect the interests? And the second one is we've already or I've I've certainly seen what's happened, as I call it, over the river.

01:24:05:04 - 01:24:38:20

There have been three solar farms. Um, consented. There are already variations being submitted to the examiner to change the DCO. So with although the DCO may or may not be in place very soon for this week, then that's still not finalized. There's still processes that can be changed. And again, that puts onus on us to to make sure our interests are being protected. What we've then seen again over the river is as soon as one of these projects has been consented, it's being flipped to another developer.

01:24:39:08 - 01:25:09:11

And again, it's making sure I know somebody said that, um, the DCO follows the land or follows the project for want of a better word, as does planning permissions. But anything can be varied by agreement and again, as individuals, as a community. How are we part of that process? Is of if variations are agreed. It's just making sure that, you know, yes, we might think we're in a good place today, but in a six months time we might not be.

01:25:09:23 - 01:25:10:08

Thank you.

01:25:11:29 - 01:25:20:24

Thank you for that. Um, yes. Mr. Gibson. And then, Mr. Barr, you've made a point. You're okay with this one? Okay, fine, fine. Well, Mr..

01:25:20:26 - 01:26:06:15

Gibson, just amplifying that this approach that we are taking and the questions that we are raising is, if you like, driven by bitter experience. Um, we went through the whole process with the quarry, which was a smaller project. Um, the project was flipped from one person to another to another person to another. The last operators are now saying, well, we know we didn't agree to this. We didn't agree to that. We're not going to take stuff out by bartering, wanting to do this. We're not going to do that. So our concern is that the DCO as worded has to absolutely hold water, and that any success is entitled to the people who are actually applying for the thing at the moment have to be bound to that same agreement.

01:26:06:17 - 01:26:28:20

Otherwise it was being routed. so we're wasting our time. Um, I don't think we are. But it does concern us that there is this legacy issue. So if we belabor it a little bit, I apologize, sir, but it's but it's public concern, if you see what I mean, rather than from a point of view of knowledge, of planning process.

01:26:30:01 - 01:27:01:27

Okay. I think we'll, we'll, we'll part the t shirt, Chris, because we are going to be discussing that tomorrow. I think that makes sense. And there will be a detailed discussion on that. Um, but maybe if you just, you know, I don't I don't if you're not here tomorrow, I don't want you to miss out. So I think it would just be useful if Mr. Robinson provide a brief thing on the, on the point on the DCO. And also just, um, to wrap this item up in terms of the just a response on some of the mitigation measures, particularly one what Mr.

01:27:01:29 - 01:27:21:09

Appleyard said about making sure how how the community can be sure that they will actually be adhered to. There. There's two things there. There's a general DCO. Very just briefly, in case the parties aren't present tomorrow. But then also the final one on the on the mitigation.

01:27:21:22 - 01:27:27:24

So the, um, absolutely that the, um, uh,

01:27:29:24 - 01:28:13:08

you would look at the drafting of the DCO, the way in which the controls work, you would look at the detail in these management plans as the standard outline stage, and then how they will mature into detailed plans. You can look at examples of ones that have matured to that stage. Um, the question will they ever be enforced? Um, to the extent it's useful to the room, uh, for a developer looking at this who carries the risk of enforcement? They are taken massively seriously and also by their lawyers who are regularly consulted saying

01:28:14:25 - 01:29:02:26

tell us we are complying with all of this detail. You've managed to get approved. Um, because we can't have any comeback on this. Once we developed, exactly as it's been said by a number of people in the room. The money that is spent in pushing the development forward cannot risk enforcement, so they are taking extremely seriously. The local authority appreciate the concerns have been expressed about Bassetlaw. There has been a greater level of engagement, but frankly, for approving details like this that the developer then has to go and find the authorities and make them agree to it, because it's so important to them to get these to get these approvals signed off.

01:29:03:26 - 01:29:36:21

The level of public consultation involved with it will vary depending on the level of detail that's being talked about. But generally speaking, um, local authority. I'm sure that Nottinghamshire would be able to give us some comment on that reassurance about the level of consultation that's undertaken, um, and the importance of ensuring that that due process and yes, it is yet more process and there are yet more things to read through.

01:29:36:23 - 01:30:09:11

But hopefully as these things move on, it's now material that's been talked about. It shouldn't be new stuff. And then, well, is it actually the detail that that people want to see in there. But I would say again, the liaison then with the developer also becomes important. The developers will want to continue talking to the public and their representatives about what's coming forward and picking up concerns because it's a concern that can be acted upon and available, generally speaking, will act upon it.

01:30:09:23 - 01:30:30:05

Um, if it is opposition again to the principle, there's not much a developer can do but but acknowledge it. Um, I think that that's probably the yeah, I'll try to pick up the public involvement in that as well, sort of throwing a point across to, um, the representative as Mr. pointed. But whether there's anything additional he'd want to say on that.

01:30:32:12 - 01:30:32:27

Yeah.

01:30:32:29 - 01:30:33:14

I can.

01:30:33:16 - 01:30:34:01

Only.

01:30:34:03 - 01:30:34:18

Add.

01:30:34:20 - 01:30:35:05

That.

01:30:35:07 - 01:30:35:22

Um.

01:30:35:24 - 01:30:38:22

Yes, we we do take our responsibility very seriously in terms of discharge.

01:30:38:24 - 01:30:39:09

Of.

01:30:39:11 - 01:31:10:11

Requirements. Uh, we've already started to do that. It is a new area for the council and for Bassetlaw, no doubt. Um, so, you know, we have to get our head around it, the process walk by, we go on that in terms of, uh, including, uh, consulting local people. I think we still have to work through some of that mechanism, but we are, uh, certainly this highlights the need to do that, so I shall be taking that one away. Certainly in terms of building in, uh, appropriate mechanisms to make sure that local people are involved.

01:31:10:13 - 01:31:11:12

So thank you.

01:31:13:23 - 01:31:36:18

Okay. Thank you. And just, just the final response from the applicant regarding the adequacy of the, um, mitigation measures, not necessarily how the how that could be secured, but just a bit of reassurance to some of the comments you just heard about how your documents going forward would secure the measures that you're setting out in all of the mitigation?

01:31:38:28 - 01:31:41:18

James Gillespie for the applicant. Um.

01:31:45:05 - 01:31:49:06

I'll start, if I may, by just reiterating.

01:31:49:18 - 01:31:50:03

Um.

01:31:51:15 - 01:31:56:24

Bassetlaw Council's support for the measures. Um,

01:31:58:18 - 01:32:06:21

And Nottinghamshire County Council's confirmation that they are happy with the measures.

01:32:09:28 - 01:32:10:18

And.

01:32:13:24 - 01:32:18:17

How its security will be through.

01:32:20:10 - 01:32:26:06

Requirement six, which is relating to the landscape and ecology. And.

01:32:29:29 - 01:32:42:01

The Landscape and Ecology Management Plan identifies it's an outline. It identifies 14 features for which.

01:32:44:24 - 01:32:47:11

Bracken. Um.

01:32:49:23 - 01:33:02:24

Management vision targets summary of current state. Current status are At that time, as well as a table for each feature setting out how existing.

01:33:04:27 - 01:33:07:17

Examples of the feature will be enhanced.

01:33:11:21 - 01:33:26:22

How new examples of the feature will be created. How the pair will be managed so the outline management prescriptions.

01:33:30:03 - 01:33:31:25

And the.

01:33:34:03 - 01:33:40:28

Outline methodology for monitoring of the success with.

01:33:44:04 - 01:33:54:23

Parameters for what constitutes success. In some cases those parameters are in fact, in some cases they're not certain and we wouldn't expect them to change too much.

01:33:57:20 - 01:34:05:27

Um, I can run through all those individual features. Ah, but there are 14 of them. Um.

01:34:08:19 - 01:34:15:14

Ranging from species which? Grassland, mixed scrub, ponds, ditches and rivers.

01:34:17:06 - 01:34:30:06

Traditional orchard. The arable land itself. Provision of refugia for amphibians and reptiles. Artificial bark, roosting and bird nesting creatures, and so forth.

01:34:33:25 - 01:34:36:02

And that will be three requirements. That's.

01:34:38:12 - 01:35:01:05

Okay. I think that that's, um, that explains your overall approach to mitigation. So, um, and, and where you've set that out, which I hope is helpful for, for parties. Um, I think that brings us now to the end of item six. Um, so I will now hand over to Mr. Wiltshire to take us through item seven.

01:35:02:27 - 01:35:03:26

Thank you.

01:35:03:28 - 01:35:12:03

Um, just to give you a time check, it's 12:45. I'm going to break at 1:00. Um, we'll start this, though. Um.

01:35:12:18 - 01:35:27:06

So to say if if we need a change in personnel to do that, that would only take a moment, but it will be a moment. Um, if you're happy we're doing that while you're introducing the subject. That's. That's all I've done.

01:35:30:09 - 01:36:02:09

But it's going to be a brief introduction. Um, I'm going to initially ask the applicant to update on its discussions with National Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council regarding the adequacy of the transport assessment. The applicant's done with particular regard to construction related traffic. Um, and then I will give Nottinghamshire the opportunity to, to respond to that. Then also, um,

01:36:04:09 - 01:36:11:18

it open for questions from interested parties in the room. Thank you.

01:36:11:28 - 01:36:17:18

Thank you, sir Patrick Robinson for the applicant. Um,

01:36:19:07 - 01:36:39:21

I'm being joined to my right by Karen Evans, who's the, um, traffic engineer from Pegasus, uh, who's been dealing with, uh, this matter. Uh, and we'll ask her to respond directly on that. So I'll just check for getting your papers ready. Um.

01:36:42:04 - 01:36:59:08

But you fully heard from the inspector? Same newspaper. Who's saying that? Reading a bit from the agenda. Uh, updating discussion with Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council on the adequacy of traffic assessment with regard to construction related traffic. Are you in a position to speak on that?

01:37:01:16 - 01:37:42:14

Good afternoon. My name is Karen Evans, and I'm for the applicant of the Selma transport consultant, and I work for Pegasus. So with respect to the first question, um, the applicant had until the 10th of February, um, only had formal communications with National Highways. Um, since October 2025 through the DCO process, until we had the meeting on the 10th of February. Um, the pre consultation letter from National Highways of the 25th of November, which is document RR032, had confirmed the latest position.

01:37:42:20 - 01:38:29:04

Further to the submission of the technical know that we prepared which was submitted on the 17th of October to respond to some of their highway comments from August 2025, and the only outstanding matters with National Highways based on that letter received, which was rep Dash 1017, are as follows. And I've updated this further to the meeting that we had with those with them on the 10th of February. So the only outstanding matter now is on the statement of common ground point n h3, which is respect to junction capacity, which they're the, you know, strategic road network, which is junction 34 of the A1, m.

01:38:29:15 - 01:39:02:09

However, it was a very positive discussion focused on the information that had already been provided. And in summary, we are going to provide some additional notes which have gone into the next draft of the Statement of common ground, so that is being issued, if not already being issued back to National highways. So we will carry on with ongoing discussions on that. Um, and we may be required to provide some further information, but we have already done that.

01:39:05:10 - 01:39:39:12

Um, statement of common ground point and H4. Um, we are now agreed on that point. So this was with regard to abnormal, indivisible, um, loads and the management thereof and continued discussion on those points. Um, so it was agreed could be dealt with later. But the further information that we've got will go into the applications and notifications and will be in accordance with the TMP, which is document app one, two nine.

01:39:39:14 - 01:40:14:10

So at the relevant time when the detail is known of the abnormal indivisible loads. The relevant contractor will be adhering to what is in the TMP, and then you know there will be the final, the final plan for those ales. Um. Statement of Common Ground NH two. There was an outstanding matter with National Highways on that, but what it was was they just wanted to be ensured that they remained a consultation for the finalization of the TMP.

01:40:14:14 - 01:40:48:03

So we gave them that reassurance that therefore we are agreed on that point. Moving on to Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, again, there hadn't been there had only been formal consultations with them since October 2025 until we had a meeting with them on the 10th of February. Um, ahead of this process. Um, basically, we responded to all of the NCC points through the Local Impact Report response, which was rep to dash 050.

01:40:48:17 - 01:41:20:10

Um, we have, you know, been we we were always going to have ongoing discussions with NCC going forwards as appropriate on any points and on the majority of the points. We have agreed and again, a very positive discussion with them that details of, you know, assurances that processes will be outlined in the CMP, um, you know, so that all their points are addressed at the relevant times.

01:41:20:12 - 01:41:50:22

So examples of this is, you know, with points of very detailed design that just aren't known yet. Um, there was road safety audits at some of the site accesses. You know, we aren't at the level of detail to do those yet. Um, in terms of signage, you know, there was there was some various points that were made by NCC and basically we're just going to put some more wording in there to make sure that they have the assurances and that will be set out in the TMP.

01:41:51:01 - 01:42:45:09

And we've both sides of committed to undertake to do that for deadline five, which is the 25 5th of March. And so that's the latest position with NCC. Um, and then the only further communications that there were at all at the time when we submitted our original documents with the application, there was still some server information that needed to be, you know, added in. So there was three technical notes that were submitted at deadline two, which was rep 2-058, which basically included some highway link junctions and prime network data from some traffic servers that were ongoing at the time when this individual submission.

01:42:45:16 - 01:42:58:15

So, um, they are the points to answer your question with what discussions have have gone on and what else has happened since the application submission. Thank you.

01:42:59:01 - 01:43:00:03

Thank you very much.

01:43:02:07 - 01:43:05:25

Um, Mr. Pointer, do you want to add anything to that?

01:43:08:17 - 01:43:39:21

Thank you, sir. Stephen Windsor, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, I might invite my colleague Peter Evans, if he's online. I can't quite see, um, if he'd like to respond directly, but I can concur generally to the positive discussions that are taking place recently. Um, and the, the assurances that our highway colleagues are wanting. So I'll see Peter online now, so I'll hand over to him. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Evans. Peter Evans, representing Knox.

01:43:39:23 - 01:44:10:11

County Council, House development management. Yes. Um, I can confirm. Um, we've been in discussions with the transport consultants since, um, April 24th. Um, we've actually, um, made quite a few different recommendations that need to be included in the transport assessment. Um, and also the outline construction traffic management plan. That's where we expect there's going to be the most or greatest temporary disturbance.

01:44:10:13 - 01:44:44:17

And so we need to look at the controls and components that's included in that to make sure that, you know, disturbance is minimised as far as possible. Um, as I said, we have actually made quite a few different recommendations that need to be included. And, um, we're, you know, trying to establish the best way to approach this, um, Project. You know, if the actual DCO is granted and it goes ahead and I'll say we're committed to ongoing discussions and dialogue with the applicant.

01:44:45:09 - 01:44:46:03

Thank you.

01:44:49:14 - 01:45:00:24

Thank you. Do you just want to give us a little bit more on what controls and disturbances you're talking about? Just so we we got more of an idea.

01:45:03:26 - 01:45:34:24

Yes I think. Well, most of the controls are going to be the disturbance from, you know, the actual deliveries and plant going to the actual sites, uh, to be developed. Um, um, they have actually, we've identified, you know, a key access route from the A1 using the, um, strategic route network as far as possible and the main route network. Um, until you get to the primary sites. Um, and the applicant at the moment has got a series of probably 20 accesses.

01:45:35:06 - 01:46:00:21

Um, and also proposing to use overland haulage groups to try and minimise, um, disturbances. But we've actually not confirmed all the detail of that, as Karen pointed out. Um, we're not at that stage where we've actually assessed, you know, the detailed design of the various accesses and routes across where they're actually bisect with the public highway.

01:46:04:05 - 01:46:11:17

Thank you. Um, can you give us an indication when you think you're going to have confirmed those details?

01:46:14:03 - 01:46:21:25

Well, I think that needs to come from the applicant. Really? Because as I say, we've not actually seen, you know, the detailed designs.

01:46:23:27 - 01:46:26:00

That's a fair comment. Thank you.

01:46:29:15 - 01:47:08:06

Karen Evans. Um, we have provided, um, outline preliminary access plans of all of the 20 access points. So at this time, it shows on it. The geometry is the visibility blurs, the swept path analysis and any vegetation removal. Um, so it does have that level of detail on there at the moment for all of those access points. Um, that is the level that we are at now. But as we proceed through the detailed design of the whole scheme, not just the access points, you know, there will be three dimensional designs done of those.

01:47:08:08 - 01:47:48:22

Um, you know, that's just the process of the procedure. So what we're agreeing with Pete at the moment, Nottinghamshire County Council, Surrey Highways officer, is that we will make sure that any of the points that he has, you know, set out in the um, representations, He has the assurances, and we have the wording in the RCMP that we're not going to not do the due procedure and design them to the relevant guidance, you know, so we are going to go through the full procedure and continue to have those dialogues with us, you know, finer details as the scheme gets designed.

01:47:49:27 - 01:48:01:04

Thank you. And just for clarification, for the room, those preliminary access plans and are within the temp at the moment. Are they that we've got an examination.

01:48:02:01 - 01:48:10:10

Yeah. There in the CMP and also in the transport assessment which formed an appendix of the environmental statement.

01:48:13:13 - 01:48:14:18

Thank you very much.

01:48:20:25 - 01:48:33:04

Um, it's 1258. I appreciate there probably ask some questions, but we do need a break for lunch and we would resume it too. Yeah.

01:48:35:09 - 01:49:00:27

We will resume it too. Um, yes, Mr. Barlow. Uh, just a quick note, if possible. Um, as I've already explained, I am an active farmer, and I do need to go back to the cattle to check the calving, etc. and notice one of the items is about the windmill. And if I get held up for a few minutes, I'm asking if that could just be delayed until I get back. Absolutely. Yes. Thank you. Wish you success. Thank you.

01:49:02:22 - 01:49:10:06

Um, it's 1259. We will resume this, um, issue specific hearing at 2 p.m.. Thank you.