

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

Project 02-12-26 03:47 pm

Created on: 2026-02-12 15:47:19

Project Length: 01:35:36

Account Holder: ██████████

File Name: Steeple_ISH2_120226_PT5-MP3.mp4

File Length: 01:35:36

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:00:02 - 00:00:30:03

It's 2:00 and I'm resuming. Issue specific hearing two on environmental matters. We were, um, partway through agenda item seven. We've heard from the applicant and, um, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, I've got the point where I will open up for any questions on transport and access to anybody in the room.

00:00:30:05 - 00:01:22:09

So if you would like to put your hand up, I'll go round you all. Um, and we will start with, um, Mrs. Barlow. Thank you. Thanks. Um, Julie Barlow feels for farming. Um, we've put quite a lot in on written submissions on transport, so I won't reiterate it. Um, but again, it's, you know, repeating ourselves in all respects. We know that, um, Notts County Council will endeavour to look after our best interests as part of the traffic management. And when that detail comes to light, um, but we're also cognizant that a lot of the movements will be off the roads, which is good in some respects, but they will be through the fields and the public and the crossing public rights of way that we do use day to day in our general lives for walking as well as working.

00:01:22:12 - 00:01:29:00

And it's how those aspects will be managed because they're off the public highway. Thank you.

00:01:30:24 - 00:02:02:07

Thank you. Um, yes. Go ahead. Um, Mr. Fleming, Bob Fleming feels the farming. Um, I'd like to bring up the question of the, uh, the two main roads, the A6 31 and the A6 20. These are two AA roads on the major highways that will funnel the materials from the north to the south to the site at West Burton. Both roads run through rural areas with some steep hills and are policed by time over distance speed cameras.

00:02:02:17 - 00:02:27:29

Due to weight restrictions, HGTV's are obliged to use these routes that results in longer journey for lighter vehicles. The leaves, vans and light vehicles travelling from the south and from the west through Retford will use the road over Lebanon Hill to reach North Lebanon. Turn left and interstate

in the stable. This is because that route is quicker and there's no speed cameras slowing down the HGVs.

00:02:29:17 - 00:03:00:01

Um, items 13, seven, 11 or workforce trips will be required to access the site via the primary primary accesses into the primary compounds, which will include space for cycle parking, minibus parking, car parking, side offices, wealth fairs, etc. etc. um, and it will be required to route to the proposed development from the north, avoiding the villages to the south. Well, I'm sorry, but that's wishful thinking. Um, and I'll give you an example why we know.

00:03:00:03 - 00:03:38:11

Um, that that that that will be the case. We I run a speed watch the speed watch campaign in our village for nearly 15 years, from about 2001 to 20 1516. So we kept a record of all the speeds of traffic coming through the village. But we also knew how many cars were coming through the village. Cars, bands, TVs were coming through the village. Um, one of the things that struck me when we were doing this was when I came to the village, there was no bus service that actually went through the steeple, and I took my daughter to North Leverton to catch the Retford bus every morning.

00:03:38:13 - 00:04:09:16

And then she got the school bus to Doncaster. At the beginning of this century, the direct number 96 bus from Retford to Gainsborough was implemented and finally we had a regular bus service through the village. However, when the 620 and the 603 roads were converted to time over distance speed cameras. Um, about 2010. We noticed that the empty PSV. That's the public service vehicle. Buses, the buses, the double deckers and the single deckers started throwing, started coming through the villages.

00:04:10:04 - 00:04:40:12

So I because I was a PSV driver many years ago, I asked the drivers why they would bring in these empty buses through through the village. And they said, well, it's because the, the time to get along the 620 and the 631, it takes so long now, we're now using the back roads. And so there's the evidence that the, uh, the fact that even the buses, the public service vehicle buses were using our roads, that's from Retford to North Leverton, from north to Stoughton. It was being used as a rat road.

00:04:42:08 - 00:04:42:28

Um.

00:04:49:09 - 00:04:50:24

Then going on to um.

00:04:53:12 - 00:05:25:20

The question of the roads of North Laverton in Main Street in South Carolina. Now this junction, in fact, North Lebanon is not actually mentioned in the traffic analysis and the transport analysis, but it's an extremely busy junction due to its proximity to North Laverton Post office and shop on Main Street. It's the only shop in the area and serves both North and South Laverton at the staple and passing traffic. Due to the due to the width of the main street approximately five metres wide.

00:05:25:22 - 00:05:58:21

Cars and leaves using the shop tend to park on both sides of the road. The junction becomes a pinch point, especially if Main Street is blocked by parked cars and and like Jeeves. Now this this is constant. This is constant from about 7:30 in the morning until seven in the evening. That will be a route that all the light vehicles will take. They will not go. They will not go. Two sides of the triangle where they can go one side of a triangle and get to the to where the the their workplaces.

00:06:02:13 - 00:06:34:28

Um, again. It's noted at 616. It should be noted that all workforce movements will follow the restricted construction, traffic routing, avoiding certain staple node and fence and villages. Workers will join the designated routes based on their place of origin, and only approach the site from the north only. This restricted routing will be forced by a DCO requirement. Again, this is wishful thinking. Who's going to who's going to? Who's going to actually police and enforce this DCO.

00:06:35:11 - 00:07:09:12

Um, I don't think there will be any there'll be any enforcement. Even when we had the speed which the speed watch um, um, campaign in our village, we got very little help from the police and certainly nothing from the local authority. And the final comment I want to make is that. Item 13 six. 15 to 17. That's the junction of Stoughton Road and Gainsborough Road. That's the junction in Stanley Staple. It's the only major T junction in Stirton where Gainsborough Road meets the weekly road.

00:07:09:14 - 00:07:25:28

Each year there are a number of accidents at this junction caused by traffic entering the village from the Gainsborough direction, who fail to stop and either run into the bus shelter or crash into neighbourhood gardens. We've actually got evidence. We've got it on film, so it's not hearsay.

00:07:27:29 - 00:07:59:12

Most of the cars that come down and and fail to stop at the junction, they tend to go across the road. Most of them bang upon the pavement or run into the hedgerows into the bus stop. But they're going this fairly slow speed collisions. We reckon there's ten, maybe 15 a year happens at this junction, but you can't. There's no record of it apart from the odd ones that we've got. Which is very, very serious where the cars have actually come into. Phil's in vintage Phil's garden, for example, and have to be towed out because they've gone so far in.

00:07:59:14 - 00:08:31:00

Most of these vehicles drive off quickly because they don't want to lose their insurance. They don't want to be stopped by the police. The problem is this is the junction where the proposal is that 50% of the HGVs bringing panels and building materials into the village envelope turn right into weekly road for the short journey to the proposed storage facility, the secondary compound B, and that I've mentioned here, the number of accidents of this junction are underreported as many are non injury and the drivers concerned leave the area as soon as possible to avoid any police action.

00:08:31:13 - 00:09:02:14

This is also the junction identified by the former's Community Speed watch team, as well as recording the highest number of vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit of 30 miles an hour by at least 15mph. That's over Five miles per hour. This is because they come through the village when they get

to this particular junction, and they've got Gainsborough Road ahead of them. They put the foot down and they zoom out and the 30, the 30 limit goes out almost to the quarry entrance now.

00:09:02:22 - 00:09:34:13

But this is where we're recording. And then one occasion we actually recorded 100 vehicles in a couple of hours. And this was because we didn't report it, because there was no point, because there never is any point not. There was never any action taken against these drivers, but they put the foot down as soon as they got, and they forgot that they were still in the 30 mile an hour limit. And when they were coming into the village, they'd come past the 30 miles an hour at the side, they'd take no notice. And at the last minute, oh my goodness me, they'd jam on, they just jam on the brakes.

00:09:35:04 - 00:10:03:24

Um, I noticed in the, um, in the, uh, submission by RTÉ's that there's, uh, ATC automatic traffic cameras on these, uh, Uncertain junctions around the look around the area. What I'd like to know is where the vehicle speeds recorded by these automatic traffic cameras or not. Um, I do know that I know from personal experiences that we run the Speed Watch campaign for the best part of 15 years.

00:10:05:10 - 00:10:35:23

We never got any. I can only think of 1 or 2 occasions where the police actually prosecuted anybody as a result of our evidence. And in fact, the reason why the Speed Watch campaign was, was curtailed and in fact, finally finished was we had the, um, the, the what was it called, the crime commission, the crime of the traffic or the crime and traffic commissioner. Um, and he came to the village with a senior police officer, and we had all of the local, all the local villagers, we were represented.

00:10:35:25 - 00:11:06:02

And we were told that, uh, because of the amount of work that we were creating for the police, that they were not going to take any action against any vehicle. We were not to report any vehicle speeding. Um, unless they were doing over 44 miles an hour. So I said to the the crime commissioner, his name was Paddy somebody. I said, do you mean to tell me, Paddy, that we've now got a speed limit of 44 miles an hour? It's the state board. Oh, no, don't. Don't be silly.

00:11:06:04 - 00:11:38:20

Don't be silly. And I said, well, as far as we've been doing this long enough, I said, I've had enough. I said, I set this whole thing up. And walking away from it, I got up and walked out. There must have been 40 or 50 people in that. In that room, 50% of the people walked out with us because they knew that nothing was going to get done. And we and we stopped the damn good scheme, because when we started, we were getting something like 20, 30 vehicles an hour, speeding, even though they knew we were there. We were there for 15 years. They knew we were there. We still caught 14 or 15, maybe more every hour.

00:11:38:27 - 00:12:10:07

When we finally packed in. We were recorded 2 or 3 Cars speeding per hour. That was us in the village looking after our village, because we certainly weren't looked after by Nottinghamshire Police. We certainly weren't looked after by Bassetlaw District Council. We had to do it by ourselves. And unfortunately, that's why us amateurs are sat here now, because nobody's going to help us. You know

what? We're just ordinary people. And yet this and these are our experiences. This is what happens in our village.

00:12:10:18 - 00:12:26:13

And God help us when this if this scheme goes ahead, God help us all, because it's going to be absolute murder. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Fleming. Anybody else who wants to comment on, um, traffic and transport?

00:12:28:16 - 00:12:30:01

Um, yes. Go ahead. Mr..

00:12:31:25 - 00:13:04:23

These people, parish council, I just wanted to add that the quarry, um, is due to start producing in May and ramping up by June July to 100 wagons in and 100 wagons out per day on the Gainesville Road. This is all cumulative impact, really. Um, with. I'm on the liaison committee and I spoke we spoke at our last meeting a couple of months ago, and we talked about extending the third limit to our reporting limit.

00:13:05:03 - 00:13:37:07

Um, and possibly, uh, interactive speed sign, working alongside the fusion to look at a long term traffic management plan fit for purpose in this modern day with increased traffic speeds and volumes. And, uh, they got back to us and said that the quarry junction is built to spec. Bear in mind, we're trying to get eight wheel wagons full of 44 tons or thereabouts, from zero to road speed.

00:13:37:23 - 00:13:44:12

Meeting the meeting the Gainesville road at 90 degrees. It's a big ask. Thank you.

00:13:44:28 - 00:13:46:01

Thank you, Mr. Willard.

00:13:49:25 - 00:14:27:09

Thank you, Mr. Fleming. Bob Fleming fields for farming. Um, as as Phillips just said, um, well, we were both on the committee for the old parish council, and we were on the. We still are on the committee for the, uh, for the quarry. When the quarry went through its initial discussions with the county council and everybody else, it was agreed that no traffic would turn left out of the quarry into the steeple. Going south, all traffic had to turn right onto Gainesville Road, go down to Bowl Roundabout and off in that direction.

00:14:27:24 - 00:14:59:08

However, like so many of the conditions that were imposed on on the when the quarry was approved, when the junction was built, the junction was built so vehicles could turn, HGVs could turn left out of the quarry entrance into the steeple. That's just one of the examples where we as ordinary people said we want this to happen. This is the safest way of doing this. When it actually came to be, when it was actually constructed, it was constructed completely differently of how it should have been.

00:14:59:26 - 00:15:30:03

And I agree with Phil, how vehicles are supposed to come out of there fully loaded into that tight little road, and especially with the speed of the traffic. And that normally we've been very lucky so far. There's been no serious accidents. And the problem is you look at all the information. How many killed or seriously injured, like the injured and all the rest of it. But they're all out of date. That was those that that information was for the for the past. It's not for the future. We've got this project on the way. We've got step. We've got everything else coming.

00:15:30:05 - 00:15:32:07

It's going to be an absolute nightmare.

00:15:33:16 - 00:15:34:21

Thank you, Mr. Fleming.

00:15:36:04 - 00:16:20:15

Um, I know the outcome was taking some notes, so there were quite a number of points there that I'll ask them to, um, respond to. Um, shortly. So there was a movement through the fields and public rights of way from construction traffic and how that's going to be managed. Um, there was questions about the A roads and the heavy fees using certain people. Um, a question about the suggested routes to the compounds and further observations about people using stolen people as a rat run.

00:16:20:29 - 00:16:39:29

There was a specific question about the junction in North Laverton, um, and whether that's been mentioned in the traffic assessment. There was a question about, um, the workforce movement, designated routes and how that was going to be policed. Um.

00:16:43:04 - 00:17:01:07

Specific observation about the T-junction in um Stoughton, the steeple and the number of accidents that have been there. And um, lastly, as we heard from two of the participants, um, about the quarry and the traffic coming to and leaving that,

00:17:03:01 - 00:17:08:24

I wonder if the applicant could address those points, please. Thank you. Yeah. Karen.

00:17:08:26 - 00:17:51:06

Evidence for the applicant. Um, Mrs. Barlow's question first. Um, yes. Um. You're right. Part of the proposal is to, you know, take the traffic off the roads before it gets to certain a steeple and then a series of whole roads to be built in the east and, and the western parcel to get to the compounds and then disseminate the, um, the, um, materials to where they need to be. Um, so in the um, outlying construction traffic management plan, there is um, section seven in there, which does have the public rights of way management plan that we've discussed with Nottinghamshire County Council and that public rights of where officers there.

00:17:51:09 - 00:18:46:04

We then did the additional um cams information of usage of the public rights of way on. I think it was a Wednesday and a Saturday. We certainly did a weekday and a weekend to get the users of those. So they've formed the additional submission that we did at deadline two. Um, there isn't large amounts of

traffic that will be going across those on a, on a, you know, a daily basis. It's obviously over the two years. And what we've set out in here is a set set of mitigation measures such as, um, you know, um, banks, people monitoring crossing points, some labs or refuges, if there's any tight areas, um, you know, parallel areas that people can wait on horses or, you know, for um, vehicles to come past.

00:18:46:06 - 00:19:23:02

But the precedent is going to be, you know, it's no more than a ten mile an hour speed limit on there. Um, vehicles will always have to give, give way to users of the road. Um, and, you know, there's a full sort of list of mitigation measures that will be developed and put in place, you know, to make sure that, you know, there isn't clashes and, you know, people can still use those. Obviously, there is going to be some disruption during, you know, the construction period and there will be vehicles. The idea is that the, um, loads go into the primary compounds and get decanted into much smaller vehicles.

00:19:23:04 - 00:19:58:21

So there'd be of a tractor trailer type vehicle. You know, there wouldn't be unless there's indivisible loads where a larger vehicle needs to come, but the majority of it will be on the types of vehicles that would be using, you know, the fields that will be on the whole roads. I was going to say something else then and my brain has just gone it. Sorry and I appreciate that. And I have read all that. Yeah. Um, it's actually sort of the policing of it that can be down to towards the guys as opposed to actually say if that doesn't happen at a point in time.

00:19:59:07 - 00:20:36:26

And, and there is one parcel of land that is solar panels that is the wrong side of the railway line along the weekly road, so that the the compound is one side of the railway line, but the solar array is the other side of the railway line. So therefore, in my head, the only way of accessing because there's a Bec as well, is to bring the panels along weekly road, um, and again pass a number of residential properties and the entrance to our, to our farmyard and we are working on the basis, although it says in the the plan will be of smaller vehicles.

00:20:36:28 - 00:20:51:21

Will it be tractors and trailers, will it be, um tractor units, lorries, HGV's and what number? Because there is quite significant area that that's that side that will be on a not a great road. Thanks.

00:20:53:20 - 00:21:12:11

Yes. You are right that there will be some decanting between those two. The numbers are probably in. There's quite a large spreadsheet that the client did with all the vehicle movements, which is what we've used to get the numbers out of there. I would have to go back and check that absolute number, though. I couldn't put my finger on it now in in the spreadsheet.

00:21:13:06 - 00:21:17:21

Okay. Thank you. Um, would that help you if that was specifically found?

00:21:17:23 - 00:21:50:13

Yeah. I mean, it's just that there is an awareness that not everything is being taken off the roads and there will be an impact because again, it's it's difficult when you're doing the project, um, Risk assessment impact assessment to identify that there will be some further movements on the road that

might not be quite clear as it is known it. And the question as well is on the off road movements. We also know from the work we've seen on October to Hymenium, they're putting access tracks in.

00:21:50:16 - 00:22:07:06

I'm not sure there'll be the same access tracks that you guys are going to be using, and there will be combined impact of those two projects on that side of the development. Is that all factored in as well? As part of, you know, the impact it will have on us as residents. Okay.

00:22:09:03 - 00:22:16:27

Would you like to just comment on on where that interaction is? And I'm assuming that it's not part of your project.

00:22:16:29 - 00:22:22:22

So no, but cumulative impacts were considered in the ES and in the documents that we've done.

00:22:24:29 - 00:22:30:20

Would it aid you to have those, um, detailed numbers from the spreadsheet? If we put that down for them.

00:22:31:14 - 00:22:35:01

So we know what we're going to be working with. Thank you.

00:22:35:21 - 00:22:39:01

That's an action point. Thank you.

00:22:42:21 - 00:22:43:20

Want to continue?

00:22:43:25 - 00:23:20:18

I was going to go on to Mr. Fleming's now. Yeah. So yeah, Mr. Fleming is absolutely correct that we have got, um, a routing that comes from the north, from the A1, and then works its way down from the north. Um, that is set out in the outline construction traffic management plan. Um, and it does include measures to manage the construction vehicle routing within the order limits. So this includes the traffic routing avoiding certain the steeple village to ensure that, you know, traffic isn't going through that village.

00:23:20:20 - 00:23:55:26

It's coming from the north. And Mr. Fleming read out some extracts of, you know, our reports that do set out how that is going to work. So the outline construction traffic management plan that has that routing that we've discussed and agreed with, Nottinghamshire County Council and National Highways will be secured by a requirement, requirement eight, I believe, of the development consent order, which is app Dash 041. And then in practical terms that will, you know, have to be policed by the my clients, the developers of it.

00:23:55:28 - 00:24:37:14

And then there will be fair warnings given to people that are found to not be adhering to that routing. You know, they will get warnings. And, you know, there are examples of other projects in, you know, the country like the Hinkley Point project, where, you know, contractors and workers, you know, get, um, thrown off the job. You know, it's, you know, they're not allowed to work on the job. Um, so they are the, you know, their the procedures and the requirement that is required, and the types of things that can be put in place and are put in place on projects to police that, you know, if people are found to not be going along along the agreed routing.

00:24:39:10 - 00:24:40:04

Thank you.

00:24:41:21 - 00:24:43:24

You must continue. Yeah.

00:24:44:16 - 00:25:00:13

That does bring me on to the, um, the North Laverton junction, which is to the south of the site. And, you know, that is not included within any of our work other than to say that people won't be using that junction because they won't be coming from that direction.

00:25:03:12 - 00:25:04:06

Thank you.

00:25:10:20 - 00:25:45:16

In terms of the, um, Stoughton Road, the Gainsborough Road, Wheatley Road, T junction, and this was one that we did respond to in the um, written representations and other documents submitted at deadline one um, again, Mr. Fleming, you know, correctly says we get the most up to date traffic data that we can from Nottinghamshire County Council, which is actually via East Midlands, who supplies with that information. But if they're not, you know, attended by the police and not recorded, then they are not recorded.

00:25:45:18 - 00:26:23:16

So when we've done our analysis and consideration of the personal injury accident data in the ES appendix, in the transport assessment, you know, we've done the assessment to the guidance that we are required to do, you know, but it doesn't flag up as a, you know, a sort of unsafe route for us to using. You know, our traffic is going to come down there. It is going to turn right along there and go left into the site. It will then come back and reverse. But what we have committed to, you know, is a series of mitigation measures such as Signage, you know, slow down construction vehicles.

00:26:23:18 - 00:26:56:12

There are construction vehicles. There is the routing. So, you know, we would put in place fair warning of that, you know, to try to, you know, make sure that it stays as safe as it's recorded now. And, you know, it's the mitigation measures that we put in. They're not fixed. They can be monitored, you know, and if issues arise, you know, there can be banks, people put into areas, you know, that require the additional support, you know, or there could even be, you know, temporary traffic signals or things like that that are put in place.

00:26:56:14 - 00:27:09:00

So there are commitments within these documents that mitigation measures, you know, with an appropriate level can be considered. Should it be seen that there are, you know, any issues that may arise?

00:27:12:01 - 00:27:18:17

Thank you for that explanation that that that's clear of of what you've done. Um.

00:27:20:21 - 00:27:31:04

And lastly, we had some comments about the quarry. Was that something that you considered or is that outside your assessment?

00:27:32:09 - 00:28:06:18

And I would have to double check on that. We are using the quarry access, and we did look at the design of the quarry access and looked at the swept path analysis for our vehicles using that. And again, you know, that is an access that could have the signs of, you know, mitigation on that access. Should it be required to be necessary for the vehicle flows that are going to be going in and out of there? But it was designed to be an access for larger vehicles then for our, um, vehicles, when there's some big loads delivered, um, such as the transformer, that might not be the biggest load.

00:28:06:20 - 00:28:42:20

There may have to be some alteration to the central island so that we can get in and out, but that's within the junction. Um, on the other points about the amount of traffic the quarry has on there. You know, it's in the cumulative assessment again just before I finish. So if I'm allowed you did ask me about the 86. Yes. We did record speeds. So I can, you know probably let you have that that information of the automatic traffic counters that we had down. You know that's why we put them there to make sure where we look at the accesses, we put the we look at the right visibility.

00:28:43:29 - 00:29:02:00

Would you appreciate that information, Mr. Fleming? Yes, yes, that's good news. The only comment I'd like to add, the other comment I'd like to make is that I'm not. I'm approaching this in a doom and gloom perspective. I don't want to see anybody killed and injured like none of us do.

00:29:03:21 - 00:29:39:18

And all the mitigation that can be put in signs this that the other. The one thing that we noticed that this particular junction, the traffic coming from North Wheatley when it comes to interstate in the stable village it goes round a left hand bend, which means it goes round a blind bend to the junction. And that was where we were catching people doing 40 and 50 mile an hour. These were local people doing 40 or 50 mile an hour around that corner, because lots of them weren't stopping at the junction. They were going a bit further down and going through the steeper village and, and appreciate all these signs will go up, slow down, this, that and the other.

00:29:39:20 - 00:30:16:18

And I would imagine that once all this heavy traffic starts, there will be less vehicles, there will be less solid more vehicles, but there'll be less speed. Hopefully there'll be less speed. But I know from experience I've seen it with Auto Harlow when these big 40 fours have come scrambling, screaming

around that blind bend, and if there's a HGV or something that was turning left or a long vehicle or a slow vehicle, even now, every time I drive down there, I'm very, very careful of that blind bend because people and even the people turning left, if they're turning left into Station Road to go through the village, they can look right, but they can't see what's coming around the bend.

00:30:16:20 - 00:30:47:23

It's a blind bend. So with all you know, the people pull out, they don't scream out. They're pulling out carefully. And they're driving out to pulling out slowly. But if somebody's coming down that bend at 50 miles an hour, there's going to be an accident. We've all seen it. We live there. We know what it's like. Um. I don't want anybody killed. I don't want anybody injured. Um, and it's right that we actually make everybody aware that this is a dangerous junction, and yet it's. It really is. And you've got to live there to know it's a dangerous junction.

00:30:47:25 - 00:31:18:17

And also, I'll go back about south about north Lebanon, no matter what you say, no matter what you plan for, it's a fact that all the light vehicles have come over the Lebanon Hill into North Lebanon, and they try and turn left and turn right and turn left and come down to stern. And the last aspect is the state of the roads in our area is a total utter disgrace in the last three months that road over 11 Hill is because they've had roadworks for over a month.

00:31:18:19 - 00:31:49:26

When the Anglian Water dug the road up Laverton Hill, going down into north London. It's like a roller coaster now because they've used a boring machine. There are 5050 great patches, which are about six or 6 or 8 by eight in either side of the carriageway. You are literally you don't drive a straight, a straight road. I came over here this morning. I zigzagged to Retford. I didn't drive in a straight line because you go in, you're going past these bloody grade holes all the time. They've been out in the last two weeks.

00:31:49:28 - 00:32:27:21

They've put little yellow signs around the deepest holes and they block the fact there's one very bad one, which at the top of the hill, which they've actually filled in. Well, how have they done it? They've just thrown along the tarmac and flattened it and that's it. But all the holes around it have all been left. Seriously, go over the go today, drive over the over 11 hill and see what I'm talking about. And literally in the last three months this winter, we've seen these robes literally fall apart in front of our eyes. In fact, right outside the the the surgery in north Lebanon, there must be a hole which must be must be nine inches deep, a huge hole.

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

Anything goes in there, you'll lose it. You'll lose a wheel. Thankfully, we know about it because that's where we live. Yeah. Thank you. Um, if it's any consolation, I think, um, we can report from other parts of the country that, um, potholes are in a sorry state. Um, but we do appreciate the the local information. I think the client does is, um, the the developer does as well. So, um, you know, thank you for providing it, Mr. Appleyard. You wanted to add something?

00:32:58:07 - 00:33:28:26

I certainly see Paul Parish Council. I actually live at the junction in question on Gaines Road, Sterling Road. And obviously, I'm a parish councillor. And it is a fact that approaching the junction on the head of the tee and into the trap, it travels too fast. Arguably, Gainza Road is the main road coming into Stirton Road, Station Road. Sorry, and we've actually discussed at parish council the thought of changing the priority of the junction.

00:33:28:28 - 00:34:01:29

So you come down, down to road and turn into the village, whereas now you should stop on going to the road. If you make a stop stop junction, it would stop the fast moving traffic, because when you're pulling out of going to the road, you're blind. Um, and so it might be worth, I mean, to get a junction change is a big issue. But given the the amount of traffic, you're going to try and turn right there, because even in an ordinary car turning right, your heart's in your mouth because you're committing blind.

00:34:02:01 - 00:34:08:24

Mhm. Thank you. So, uh, junction reconstruction or white lining might be the thing to do.

00:34:08:26 - 00:34:41:24

Thank you. Um, I'll just ask. Um, whether you wish to comment any further on what you've heard. Um, I'm going to put down as an action point to provide that, um, traffic account data that you you alluded to. So, so we'll add that to the list. And, and you can, you can access that at, um. You'll be within the deadline for information that comes out. Thank you. Um, I've come to the end of, um, agenda item seven.

00:34:43:01 - 00:34:48:06

Uh, there's another hand up. I'm sorry I missed that. Um, if you could introduce yourself, please.

00:34:50:03 - 00:35:12:15

Sorry, I can't see everybody in the room. No. Okay. Thank you very much. That, um, is very helpful to have received that local information. Um, the developer has been, um, writing down, so I think it's been noted. um. Agenda item eight. I'll turn to my colleague to um.

00:35:12:18 - 00:35:13:12

And so I'm.

00:35:13:14 - 00:35:22:11

Saying Patrick Robinson, the applicant would slightly longer distance transfer of personnel. If you could just give us a call for 30s for that.

00:35:28:28 - 00:35:32:04

Thank you, Mrs. Evans, for your contribution.

00:36:16:22 - 00:36:17:20

Yes. So we'll.

00:36:17:22 - 00:36:18:26

Move on to agenda.

00:36:18:28 - 00:36:21:26

Item eight, which is the historic environment.

00:36:21:28 - 00:36:22:13

Um.

00:36:22:29 - 00:36:23:26

And the first.

00:36:23:28 - 00:36:24:20

Part of this.

00:36:24:22 - 00:37:08:17

Agenda we're going to focus on is the current position of parties in respect to the need or otherwise for further pre determination, trial trenching and the adequacy of proposals to undertake further trial trenching. And I'm going to start firstly by um inviting Nottinghamshire County Council the first um for some questions that I have for you. Um and firstly I just want the council to provide an update on its position with requests with regard to your request for further predetermine and trial trenching and whether there's been any further progress and on on agreeing any measures with the applicant.

00:37:10:29 - 00:37:24:04

Thank you sir. Stephen Pointon, Nottinghamshire County Council I'm going to turn to my colleague Matt Adams, who's a remote remote today. So I'll just hand to Matthew as our principal archaeologist. Thank you.

00:37:26:00 - 00:38:05:19

Good afternoon sir. Matthew Adams, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, um, our position remains the same. Um, to my knowledge, the applicant hasn't proposed doing additional, um, trial trenching. And our position is that the current assessment is still insufficient. Um, as it does not, um, provide an understanding of the significance or the extent of the archaeology, um, that we know about on the site from their own, um, non-intrusive and desk based assessments. Um, and therefore they cannot describe the impact from the developments on that, on the archaeological resource in line with, the current policy.

00:38:05:21 - 00:38:40:29

And one and three. Um. Um, we accept the work that they have done to date the dust based assessment, um, the geophysical survey, which which has identified a few focal areas. Um, they have suggested removing four areas which, um, we would, um, support in principle. Um, however, geophysics results, um, are limited in what they can tell and the information that they can, um, provide in terms of, uh, significance, um, or be relied upon to define extents of archaeological remains.

00:38:41:02 - 00:39:02:25

Um, the third element that we would normally expect, um, is trial trench evaluation. And the applicant has undertaken 16 trenches, uh, over the battery storage area. And therefore in those areas, they do have a good understanding of the the archaeological potential. Um, and so, yes, at the moment, our position remains largely the same as it was at the last hearing.

00:39:05:00 - 00:39:38:15

Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Um, I think to aid discussion during this item, if we can turn to your response, which to our first written questions, which was 11 .0. 11, I think it would be useful to display appendix four from from your response. So if I can get the applicant to display that, I'll tell you where it is. It's in document rep 2-063. And it is the last page of that document.

00:39:50:27 - 00:39:53:14

That's it. Brilliant. Thank you. So, um,

00:39:55:04 - 00:40:30:07

what I'm going to do is just ask some questions to you based on your response with reference to this plan. Um, so I can get a bit of, a bit of a more understanding. So you've referred to the areas in blue which I believe are the areas where, um, no solar panels are proposed as part of mitigation. Um, and you say no evaluation has been undertaken to determine significance, state of preservation date or extent of the remains present. Can you clarify? Are you seeking further evaluation in those areas?

00:40:32:07 - 00:41:11:12

Uh, Matthew Adams, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yes. So we would seek for the evaluation in those areas, particularly around the area that the the applicant applicant has defined there. These these areas have been identified through geophysical survey. Um, we find um in Nottinghamshire and in large areas across the country. That geophysical survey is good at identifying the focus of activity, but not necessarily the extent. Um, Um, which would trial chance evaluation would determine. So perhaps in the area that the blue areas themselves wouldn't necessarily need um, um, a large amount of trenching, but certainly the areas around it would to determine the extent.

00:41:11:14 - 00:41:51:20

And I can give the example for the quarry site that, um, has been mentioned already in this session to the east of the site, um identified similar archaeology through geophysical survey. Um areas were excluded from that development. However, when they started stripping it, far more was found that hadn't been picked up on the geophysics, including some nationally significant archaeological remains, um, relating to Roman activity. Um, so we would seek for further evaluation around it and in the areas that the geophysics identified as well, that haven't been excluded from, um, proposals at the moment.

00:41:55:04 - 00:42:05:24

Okay. So not in the blue areas itself, but in those green areas that are um. That circled those blue areas is that way. You're saying in particular.

00:42:05:29 - 00:42:35:19

In particular, yes. It would be sensible to, um, target some of the, um, blue areas, particularly, um, we find the geophysics results again. We, we do find that we get false positive results as well. So, um,

some sites we've, we've had in the county or in the region, um, where possible, archaeology has been identified when it was evaluated with trial, trenching was found to be of geological origin and therefore could be included in the development without any further work. So it goes both ways.

00:42:38:00 - 00:42:51:12

Okay. And and within those green areas, are you seeking, um, all of the land within those green areas to be subject to predetermined nation trial trenching?

00:42:53:06 - 00:43:10:24

Yes. That's what we would recommend. Yes. certainly some of the larger areas as well. The geophysics results were obscured by green waste, so there is actually no data in those areas. So at the moment the application is moving forward without any reliable data in those areas.

00:43:12:13 - 00:43:37:19

Okay. That's good clarification. Um, in terms of identifying the significance of the of the assets, could you just, um, explain to me a little bit further what what you would expect to find from extra pre determination trial trenching? Um, in terms of identifying the significance?

00:43:39:00 - 00:44:14:24

Yeah. So at the moment, um, with the geophysics results, we just have location. Um, there's no other information attached to that other than what can be, um, basically surmised from conjecture. Um, with the valuation, um, you get down to the archaeology and you have a limited investigation of it. Where features are minimally excavated. Um, you find the the depth at which it is. Um, sometimes, you know, it's just below the plow surface. Sometimes there is a lot of overburden above it which can help with, um, designing mitigation strategies.

00:44:14:26 - 00:44:51:05

Um, you will find, um, datable material which will tell you what date it is. So, um, particularly, um, you know, often geophysics results are very good at identifying certain periods, Roman, um, and medieval. But you might find prehistoric as well, which elevates the significance, certainly the rarity. Um, can be um, it will affect the significance. So, so the data that you recover it, um, oh. And the extent as well, so often the, the results from geophysical and non-intrusive survey, um, give you a limited view of extent.

00:44:51:08 - 00:45:10:00

You can actually define or better define mitigation areas from evaluation because you're actually seeing the features on the ground. Um, and yeah, so and all of that is necessary to, to understand significance and therefore to understand the impact from development.

00:45:12:14 - 00:45:32:20

Okay. Thank you. And you and you and your the opinion that there is the potential for you've mentioned before around the quarry how you saw nationally significant remains. Are you concerned that that could be the case, um, in these areas that there could be nationally significant remains potentially in these areas?

00:45:33:08 - 00:45:58:03

Um, there could be we won't know until we look is the simple answer to that. And and it's normally we it's, you know, we can determine that from the results of evaluation as far as possible. Again, evaluation still has its limitations. Um, but it can give a much clearer and much more reliable picture of what is going on than can otherwise be obtained from non-intrusive and desk based, um, information.

00:46:00:24 - 00:46:32:06

Okay, thank you for those, um, points for the for the time being. Um, I will turn to the applicant now. And I think my question to you is, um, can you set out and explain to me how you believe that the information in your documentation identifies the significance of the assets within these areas, and particularly how your geophysical survey has, in your opinion, identified the significance of those assets?

00:46:34:15 - 00:46:37:02

Thank you, sir. Laura Garcia for the appellant.

00:46:41:12 - 00:47:26:10

We have undertaken a full suite of evaluation to support this application, ranging from desk based assessment to site work over analysis of LiDAR analysis of aerial photographs. Followed up by geophysical survey across the entire order limits, then followed up by trial trenching in those fixed areas of the scheme to the north. The geophysical survey has been successful in identifying archaeological features in discrete areas of the site, and those areas which have been are more densely, more densely populated have been excluded from the scheme to preserve those areas in situ, which is which is sort of the founding principle of archaeology.

00:47:26:12 - 00:48:07:04

You know, we shouldn't be trenching where we don't need to because it destroys it forever. Um, the geophysical survey as set out at plate one of my my, our archaeological strategy documents, which is our EP 2053 sets out. Um, it has a little plate that sets up the geology of the sites and overlays some of the geophysical survey results on that, and that shows that the geophysical survey was successful in identifying anomalies on river terrace deposits and on alluvial deposits, where there was some concern that it perhaps might not be as successful as it might be, but it clearly has been successful.

00:48:07:24 - 00:48:42:03

Um. In addition, the trenching that was undertaken in the northern portion of the scheme was successful in ground truth in the geophysical survey, i.e. where the geophysical survey said there would be an anomaly, there was an anomaly where the geophysical survey was blank, the trenches were blank. So we've tested the veracity of the of the geophysical survey results as well. Um, in terms of, um, how our work has identified the significance of assets, um, through through the work that we've done, including the geophysical survey and the trenching.

00:48:42:23 - 00:49:14:26

An example could be the area to the south of Littleborough. The the areas of the south of the the scheduled monument of Oakham that clearly has identified some a road with settlement on either side. It is likely that that is that is probably medieval in date. Um, and the extent of that is is well defined.

There's nothing to suggest, you know, we the areas that we've identified as the. No, the no, the preservation in situ zones include a buffer within them.

00:49:14:28 - 00:49:54:07

They're not tightly drawn to the geophysical survey. We've included a generous space around them. Um, and it is clear that that there is archaeology there. And it is clear because of the form of it that that is not geological in nature, that that is man made. Um, it is the case. It was a point I made at the, um, the previous hearing, but it sort of it bears repeating here that there is no policy requirement to undertake, um, trial trenching as part of a part of an evaluation strategy, and as part of a suite of information to support an application, either DCO or t CPA.

00:49:55:03 - 00:50:27:22

If trenching was fundamental for providing sufficient information to enable a decision maker to make their decision, it would be mandatory, but it is not, which suggests that for some sites, desk based assessment might be sufficient to provide that information. It might be desk space plus aerial. So a staged approach basically where you you don't have to provide trenching to provide the decision maker with the with sufficient information in order to make their decision. And that that is exactly the the approach we have taken.

00:50:28:08 - 00:50:59:00

It. Also, I set out in my archaeology strategy note at appendix one is a table that sets out a number of, uh, DCO and TCA solar, um, scheme decisions of recent years of methodology that our methodology of how we chose those is set out in the document. What that clearly shows is that there are a large number where geophysical survey only. Has been undertaken predetermined, and no trenching has been undertaken to support that application.

00:50:59:02 - 00:51:27:02

A recent DCO example is the Helios scheme in North Yorkshire that did geophysical survey across the entire order limits identified discrete areas of archaeology, which were removed from the scheme via no dig foundation um and no predetermined or no predetermined trial trenching took place to support that to support the application and the LPA, um was agreed with that approach, as did Historic England.

00:51:30:15 - 00:52:08:04

Okay, I get that, but that obviously is one case assessed on its merits. And, um, I'm listening to the local authorities and archaeologists who are telling me that there's remains a significance. And you said that there isn't a policy that requires, um, changes to be undertaken. And, you know, I'm looking at Ian one, but also it's the secretary state decision making. And in determining applications, the secretary of state should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the proposed development.

00:52:08:11 - 00:52:32:06

You refer to one area where your, um, around little work. Um, how can you explain to me how the Secretary of State can satisfy that paragraph with all these other areas, um, that have been referred to as by Nottinghamshire County Council and how your geophysical survey can satisfy that particular paragraph.

00:52:34:05 - 00:53:04:24

Um, because it has it has identified, um, archaeology and I believe that the significance of it. We have assessed the significance of of the archaeological deposits within the environmental statement. We've set out what what the harm will be and what the mitigation will be. I think a very important point to make, a point made by Mr. Adams there about an example of how trenching is important about the extent, um, geophysical.

00:53:04:26 - 00:53:36:05

Sorry about establishing the extent of deposits found in the geophysical survey. And he used the example of a quarry scheme. Now a quarry scheme cannot be mitigated. It will remove that archaeology forever. With our scheme, we can we can mitigate whatever is found. And I think at the point that we'd make is there would be no difference in the approach to archaeology that is found during trenching pre determination.

00:53:36:07 - 00:54:07:00

Then it would be post determination. It would be exactly the same response. Um, because we can we've got those five bullet points of different mitigation, uh, routes that we can take. As set out in the post consent trenching, which is app one, two, six. Um, and it is the case that archaeology of any significance that that it could be within the order limits can be mitigated in a way that would either preserve it in situ or preserve it via a record.

00:54:07:02 - 00:54:11:07

But by which I mean, um, archaeology, archaeological fieldwork.

00:54:14:00 - 00:54:26:03

Okay. Thank you for that response. I'll turn it back to Nottinghamshire County Council. I do want to give you the opportunity to respond if and if Mr. Adams is back online, which is there anything you would like to comment on what you've just heard there?

00:54:27:01 - 00:54:58:20

Uh, thank you, sir. Matthew Adams, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yes. Um, quite a few things I'd like to come back with. Um, I'll pull up the quarry scheme. Um, first of all, as as that was mentioned last, um, There's also a solar scheme just to the north of this site. Uh, Bumblebee farm, Bumblebee solar, um, where they undertook pre-determined evaluation, um, including geophysics and trial evaluation. Um, they they did identify some discrete archaeology in exactly the same way that this site has. Um, they also discovered human remains only through trial trench evaluation.

00:54:58:22 - 00:55:38:11

It was not picked up, um, during the geophysics or any other type of evaluation. And that's the you know, that's the sort of issue that we're seeing, um, regularly on, on sites like this. Um, no policy requiring, um, trial evaluation. I would just like to direct you to footnote 94 of Ian, one that states the results are predetermined in archaeological evaluation, inform the design of the scheme, um, and related archaeological planning conditions. Um, we've spent the last 40 years, uh, assessing archaeological um remains in planning and trial and evaluation has been at the core of that.

00:55:38:13 - 00:56:30:26

So it's somewhat surprising to hear the applicant's position that it is unnecessary. Um, they're also trying to to say that trenching destroys archaeology forever. It is it is true that, um, it there is a destructive element to archaeology and to trial and evaluation. However, um, they're trying to draw an equivalence between trial trench evaluation, which is undertaken under archaeological control and supervision by professional archaeologists who have also, um, have professional accreditation and experience as opposed to um, their development, which will have an impact on areas of archaeology that perhaps have not been identified because the evaluation has been insufficient, which will have a destructive impact, um, on, you know, on unknown archaeological resources.

00:56:31:02 - 00:57:02:16

Um, so this sort of there's a sort of false equivalence argument here. Um, that's being presented. Um, I would also just like to point the applicant mentioned other schemes. Um, and again, you know, we we appreciate that the pre dissemination evaluation, um, should be targeted to a small a few areas as possible. And the majority of evaluation will actually happen post consent. Um similar schemes in the region.

00:57:02:21 - 00:57:33:19

I think the applicant actually the applicant has noted it in their own note. Um, I think the lowest percentage that we've seen is 0.3%. Um, it's worth noting that the applicant has to date done 0.01% of their site, which is an order, you know, orders of magnitude below what other schemes have delivered in the region. Um, I don't know about the the site in Yorkshire, but certainly that would not be something that we would see as reasonable in this region.

00:57:33:21 - 00:57:54:15

And I would just go back to the point that understanding significance, it really needs to our valuation to know what the archaeology is at the moment. We have focal areas that are lines from non-intrusive survey that we have no idea what the date is. No idea of the depth, no idea of the extent.

00:57:57:25 - 00:58:01:29

I'll take the applicant and I'll let you have the opportunity to respond to those points.

00:58:02:25 - 00:58:34:11

Um. Thank you. Um. The point. Um, I might just come to them in a bit of a random order, if that's okay. I've just made my notes sort of in a bit of a random way. Footnote 94. Um, we have complied with this. The predetermined, um, evaluation that we have done has demonstrably informed the design of the scheme. We have excluded four areas of of the scheme based on the geophysical survey. Um, so we've absolutely complied with with footnote 94. the point about trial trenching.

00:58:34:13 - 00:59:05:06

It is a matter of fact that trial trenching, archaeologically monitored or however it is done, is destructive. It is the nature of the beast, um, in terms of levels of impact. In our Archaeological Archaeology strategy document, we set, we've done a very, very rough and it's really rough calculation of what the scheme will actually impact upon in terms of square meter. And it's around 33, 33,000m².

00:59:05:08 - 00:59:37:06

And that's based on a worst case scenario of, of cable, of a worst case of everything. And of course, it should bear in mind that the impacts from the solar panels themselves, it's not a it's not a lump of 33,000m². It's individual elements put together. A number of the um responses from Nottingham County Council have requested 3% trenching. That's 266,000m². That is an order of.

00:59:37:08 - 01:00:09:02

And if we did, you know, a standard archaeology trench is 30 30m by two meters. That's 4400 trenches. Now, I'm not saying that that's necessarily what would be asked for, but even a 1% sample of this scheme would be 88,000m². So a scheme that disturbs 33,000m² to be asked to trench any, any sort of 88,000m². Just that's not mitigation, that's not making anything less severe.

01:00:09:12 - 01:00:39:14

Um, so I think in order just to address that point about the level of disturbance from, from the scheme versus trial trenching, um, the human remains point again, you know, we could it is far more likely that a solar scheme would avoid, Um, human remains, then it would to hit them just because of the nature of how it is. There are piles that are driven into the ground again, as has demonstrated last time. There are about that thick.

01:00:39:16 - 01:01:09:27

It is far more likely that a that a scheme would avoid burials and ephemeral archaeology of that nature than it would be to, to to hit them. But also, you know, we're not saying it is not our approach. And I think that's very, very clear in our strategic strategy document, we are not saying we don't want to do any more archaeology. We would just like to wait until the the consent is in place before we start undertaking destructive archaeological works.

01:01:09:29 - 01:01:38:17

Because and again, this is the nature of solar. We wouldn't be putting forward this strategy if this was a quarry or a road scheme, because whatever we find in that post, consent trenching, there are mechanisms in place to preserve it in a way that is appropriate to its significance, and the scheme is fully capable of absorbing any such changes that may arise as a result of post determination trenching.

01:01:41:11 - 01:01:46:26

Just to make sure I got that last pleated mechanisms in place to do mitigation to preserve significance. Sorry.

01:01:47:21 - 01:02:13:09

Yes. Yeah. So, um. Yeah. If significance archaeology, if significant remains are found, there are mechanisms in place to either remove them from the scheme no dig foundations, which also means clipping up of cables, making sure the access tracks are run at ground level, avoiding running vehicles, um, especially during wet weather to avoid rotting of the ground, for example. Um. And. Yes, sorry.

01:02:15:11 - 01:02:19:12

Mr. Adams, you have your hand up. Um, anything you'd like to come back on?

01:02:20:02 - 01:02:53:13

Um, yes. So just, um. Well, um, I mean, I think we're it's very clear that we're at odds, professional opinions on on what's necessary. But I would just like to also raise an issue with the flexibility that, um. Um, and the issue of pushing all of this work to post consent. Um, I mean, at the moment we're, we're asking that the, that certain areas are evaluated. Um, so that perhaps the, the most significant, um, constraints on development are, are properly understood before consent is given.

01:02:53:17 - 01:03:28:27

Um, one of the issues of pushing all of this work and this has been raised again, I think in this session, um, that, that all of this will be then the burden of this will be put on the, the, the developer or their successors and title, which is something that we're seeing, um, a lot of on other schemes that these powers consent, um, evaluation and the mitigation schemes become incredibly complicated. Um, and ah, then um, it, it leaves a, um, a great burden on whoever then subsequently develops the site.

01:03:28:29 - 01:04:05:12

Um, we would seek at least to have some understanding of the high potential areas and the high impact areas. Um, at this stage, so that those are known and understood and can be carried through um, to based concerned design. And we do appreciate that, that the majority of trenching, um, outside of what we have suggested can be undertaken based consent. Um, and, you know, phased in line with, with, with the scheme and the development itself. But we would maintain it as essential to properly understand the areas that, um, I identified on the screen at the moment.

01:04:05:17 - 01:04:06:26

Um, at this stage.

01:04:09:27 - 01:04:18:19

Okay. Thank you for that, Mr. Adams, that your position on that is clear. So I will come to the applicant to do a final response on this matter.

01:04:18:29 - 01:04:53:03

Thank you. Just a point about, um, the image that's on screen now, which is the areas identified by the council. I heard reference there to sort of, um, evaluating areas of high impact. Those areas don't target any of the areas of high impact from the from the scheme. They don't they a lot of them are just in areas of solar arrays. Um, they don't target sort of, uh, cable runs or something like that. Not that a cable run is particularly high impact. It's a meter wide, but none of those areas are targeting areas of high impact.

01:04:53:05 - 01:05:18:01

And those areas are based on information that we have already provided throughout this application. They're based on either HDR records or the geophysical survey. Um, so I wouldn't necessarily say that they're based they're targeting areas of high potential either. So I'd just like to make that point about those areas of archaeology there. The point about the DCO and

01:05:19:16 - 01:05:29:27

the archaeological If I evaluation and post consent strategies, I think you know those measures will be secured, as Mr. Robinson has set out earlier by by the DCO. And so

01:05:31:20 - 01:05:41:15

complex or not, those measures are secured and they, they wouldn't and indeed they couldn't fall by the wayside. So that's just that's that.

01:05:42:24 - 01:05:55:10

And in terms of the post evaluation survey you're doing, you haven't um, pinpointed any particular areas at the moment. To just outline briefly what your, your strategy is for that.

01:05:55:16 - 01:06:34:26

I think, um, obviously preparing for this, I was I was thinking through that question and sort of day one with, with the consent in, in our hand would be we'd go to the LPA, identify those areas, um, perhaps using using that figure as the, the basis for, for discussions, um, for discussions about where to place trenches and things like that, and we'd open up those conversations. Day one. Um, and look for, look for the ways in which we can, um, evaluate the scheme to allow the archaeology to be addressed in a way that is appropriate and proportionate.

01:06:39:11 - 01:06:43:10

Thank you, Mr. Adams. I think you had your hand up before. I, um.

01:06:43:26 - 01:07:00:11

Yes. Thank thank you, sir. Matthew Adams, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yeah. I mean, these these absolutely are areas of high archaeological potential, um, many of which the applicant themselves have identified. Um, so, you know, I just like to, to, um, to, to,

01:07:01:28 - 01:07:41:06

I don't know, rectify that. The, the impression that's been given there, the, um, if there are areas of known high impact, I think I said in my, my advice, I haven't identified them on there, but, um, those areas we would absolutely expect as well. And, you know, we're more than happy to welcome to work with the applicant on on an appropriate training plan for these areas and the areas of high impact. We appreciate that these areas do change. Um, so, you know, we we are happy to work with the applicant to design an appropriate training plan for that and these areas that are absolutely of high archaeological potential.

01:07:43:27 - 01:07:54:19

Okay. Thank you very much for that. I saw a hand up in the room. So I'd like to open the opportunity for people to, to, um, say what? From what they've heard, this is Barlow.

01:07:54:25 - 01:07:55:15

Julie Barlow.

01:07:55:17 - 01:07:56:02

And.

01:07:56:04 - 01:07:58:21

This this is a personal observation rather than a comment.

01:07:58:23 - 01:07:59:08

On.

01:07:59:10 - 01:07:59:25

Behalf of anybody.

01:07:59:27 - 01:08:01:00

Else. And it's something.

01:08:01:02 - 01:08:04:01

I said at the last meeting. Um,

01:08:06:00 - 01:08:08:11

there's regulations, there's guidelines.

01:08:08:13 - 01:08:08:28

There's best.

01:08:09:00 - 01:08:43:05

Practice. The other solar projects and other significant, um, projects in the area have done a lot more and given more regard to heritage. Heritage assets and talking subsurface and above ground. And they've been criticised for not giving enough weight to heritage in the examining authority's reports. My my observation here is what I'm hearing and the message that's coming across in this room to me today and the previous one.

01:08:44:29 - 01:08:59:15

And I don't want to be offensive to anybody, but it sounds to me, as the applicant isn't responsible operator. They're not giving due regard. In fact, it's quite the opposite. It's almost contempt for heritage,

01:09:01:05 - 01:09:03:21

which a little bit of leeway

01:09:05:09 - 01:09:35:12

or meeting the minimum requirements or requests of lots of county council in the scheme of it wouldn't be that difficult. I mean, um, Miss Garcia, Mr. Garcia, um, quoted a huge number of square meters that would have to be trial trenched if it met the minimum that was done at the other solar projects. Um. However, to put that in context, we're still talking 1% of quoted what the whole area was. That would be an even bigger, bigger number, its relative sunset.

01:09:37:19 - 01:09:41:29

Anybody else who has any points they want to make in the room? Yes. Mr. Gibson.

01:09:42:25 - 01:09:44:13

As you would expect. Yes.

01:09:44:15 - 01:09:47:05

Um, right. Part of the.

01:09:47:07 - 01:10:17:18

In your in your request for clarification, we came back on the issues of the extended, uh, scheduled ancient monument. And I noticed from that last diagram there that the areas of blue that are now excluded actually include the areas that we raised concern. So that is a move forward, I guess. Uh, but I can see where Matt Adams is coming from in the sense of we still don't know what's happening outside and beyond those areas, and certainly from our perspective.

01:10:17:28 - 01:10:59:24

And I know that what we are doing in Littleborough itself is now out with the scope of the project, because it's in a mitigation area. Um, but just to give you an idea, um, because I'm quite keen on this, I got involved in the first Heritage Lottery funded project in 2015/16, whatever it was. Um, I've slept since then. When I was approached for people to do some work locally to us, I gave permission for, uh, excavation work in our orchard, which is out with the scheduled Ancient monument area.

01:10:59:26 - 01:11:37:02

In that orchard, we found a medieval building. We don't even know the extent of that. This year we're going to probably do some work on it. We also found a section of Roman road. Nobody had any idea that stuff was there. That's why I can understand why Mr. Adams is taking the approach he is in. Okay. We are absolutely in the middle of central Oakham at that point. Um, but the ribbon developments go on so that that to me, the informed, the informed approach is it's a precautionary approach that says, actually, we don't really know where the extent of the archaeology is.

01:11:37:04 - 01:11:56:17

And just a question actually, to our friends here, um, because you did some geophysics and you discovered what we already discovered five years previously, did you actually look at any of the reports from the HLF work? Because, you know, that might have actually guided what you were doing?

01:11:58:24 - 01:11:59:15

There we go.

01:12:00:24 - 01:12:13:11

If you just band up when you might have just. Yeah, yeah. And is there anybody else in the room. Are you have you finished? Is that okay? Thank you. Is there anybody else in the room who would like to make any comments. So if I.

01:12:13:15 - 01:12:16:28

Might say just to put a marker down, Patrick Robinson for the applicant.

01:12:17:00 - 01:12:17:18

Yes.

01:12:17:28 - 01:12:19:05

If I may, I think.

01:12:19:07 - 01:12:20:07

I'm going to come to you now.

01:12:20:09 - 01:12:32:28

But it's both a point that I think there's a couple more points for Miss Garcia to speak to, but then I have a suggestion about how we might take this forward. But I suspect you may also bring across a remarkable certain number.

01:12:33:22 - 01:12:37:09

If I turn to Miss Garcia first, and then, yes, I'll come back to you as well.

01:12:38:29 - 01:13:17:13

Um, thank you, Laura Garcia, for the appellant. Um, just to come back to Miss Barlow's point. Um, I would just refute it in the strongest terms we have absolutely had due regard to the, um, heritage of this site, both above ground and below ground. Um, I am a full member of the Chartered Institute for archaeologists. I sit validating member applications for that. I am bound by the ethical code of conduct. Um, I have been in this job for over 20 years and it would be against my professional ethics to not properly, robustly assess heritage assets.

01:13:18:03 - 01:13:53:18

Um, as is demonstrated by our baseline app. 122 our environmental Statement app series 67 our mitigation strategy app. 124 are post consent WSI app. 126 Our archaeological strategy notes rep 2053. We have taken archaeology and heritage into account at every step of the way. As I've stated before, it is not the case that we would put forward the strategy that we have for any other type of development.

01:13:53:20 - 01:14:31:20

Solar is is specific here because it is a low impact form of development, something that is acknowledged in the national policy statements. Um, in an oh gosh, I think it's Eon three You'll have to bear with me. Apologies. I've forgotten the specific reference there. Um. Sorry. Ian 32.1.109. Impacts from solar are generally limited. So I'd just like to provide that assurance that it is not a case that we haven't been responsible in our duties towards heritage, both our statutory duties and the duties as required by the policy.

01:14:31:22 - 01:14:43:18

So I just wanted to provide that, that that assurance there. Um, in response to Mr. Gibson's question, I'll let my colleague, Mr. Sutherland, introduce himself and just answer that.

01:14:44:02 - 01:15:06:05

Uh, Donald Sutherland for the applicant. Uh, yes, sir. With your career about the geophysical survey reports today were shared by Nottinghamshire County Council. They're unpublished documents. As far as I'm aware. They weren't directly available, but we got various funds and involved work around

certain people. And also, it's a local myth. And there were some primarily magnitude and resistivity as well done. Yeah. And so they were all.

01:15:06:07 - 01:15:09:06

Reviewed and there have been included that obviously, as.

01:15:09:09 - 01:15:32:26

Matt alluded to, to celebrate something. Well, obviously, we're looking at the full extent of this. This is a survey across a wider site. So it doesn't make sense to avoid piecemeal bits of patchwork where together the technology evolves. Having one contractor doing a whole order limit space for more sites, and we'll leave that bit because of materials that were there. It just makes far more sense to have a cohesive survey across the entirety of it.

01:15:34:12 - 01:15:38:02

Okay. Thank thank you for that response. Was there anything you wanted? Sorry.

01:15:38:18 - 01:16:12:03

Just to respond through the chair indirectly on that. Yeah. Part of my point on that was because a lot of work had already been done and reports were written by Cranfield Institute, and we did a final report. And indeed, Matt's colleague colleagues at the time, Matt's predecessor, um, wrote reports and so on. Had you not taken or had the opportunity to get access to those, we would have gladly made them available, because what we want to make sure is we are protecting. As you can see, I've got, you know, I just I'm amateur, right? You're a professional.

01:16:12:05 - 01:16:44:11

You've done it for 20 years. I'm an amateur, but that doesn't mean that I have no interest or drive to make sure these things are done properly. Um, which is why we were pushing for the extension of the scheduled ancient monument site. Um, because Nighthawk hasn't got those. Who else go around digging stuff up? It isn't just a problem that we see in terms of the the protected, the projected project. It is a problem of preservation of archaeology per se. So that's that's why I'm finally coming back to you.

01:16:44:13 - 01:16:53:24

It's about you need access to the information. And I think we need to be sure that that information is taken on board and taken seriously anyway. Sorry, sir. I will.

01:16:53:26 - 01:17:19:03

Do it. Thank you for your submissions, Mr. Gibson. That's absolutely fine. Mr. point, did you. Did you want to say no? No, that wasn't okay. Well, I'm going to turn to Mr. Robinson, who I think is going to try and explain the way forward on this matter, which I think both myself and Mr. Wiltshire would, would welcome. Yeah, certainly. Try and suggest one, sir. Thank you. Um, Patrick Robinson for the applicant. Um,

01:17:21:02 - 01:17:48:29

when we sit, obviously, and listen to, uh, an irresistible force meeting an immovable object like this, after a while, you do start to wonder what is the outcome? Unfortunately, one of the outcomes is that

people listening go, well, if the developer is unwilling to do what the council wants, the developer must be unreasonable. In fact, the developer must be even as far as irresponsible. I think you will have all picked up

01:17:50:18 - 01:18:25:11

the message from Asghar said. Say, that is a suggestion that she and a cognitive settlement would absolutely resist, and rightly so. And clearly we are hearing differences of opinion which are not being resolved by discussion. So one of the things at this point, we might in other situations say, well, let's take this away. We'll discuss this and we'll see if we can. I do not think that is going to achieve anything. So I don't want to set an expectation in the inquiry program that that might.

01:18:25:13 - 01:18:56:15

But what it really does suggest and um, I do have my, uh, Mr. Gibson at least once, uh, in, in these proceedings, uh, wishing there was cross-examination involved and indeed. But there isn't. And if there is, we certainly don't resort to cross-examination halfway through a hearing to just sort of jump into that. Nor are we going to, but we are certainly at a point where we're frankly all heard enough.

01:18:57:00 - 01:18:58:13

And as I'd say,

01:19:00:08 - 01:19:02:12

I would say this is the point at which.

01:19:07:18 - 01:19:44:17

Now you will breathe a sigh of relief to say, allow us to address you on this, because you are hearing evidence, you are hearing opinion, you are hearing references to policy. So you should be hearing references to law. You should hear how all of these conflicting arguments are properly and logically set out, so that you can assess them for the weight to attach them. Because. So we have some. We're not going to go through it again, but we would make some very strong representations that what you're hearing is entirely in accordance with policy appropriate, sensible.

01:19:44:19 - 01:20:33:18

And we would have a contrary representations to make about the position that's being taken by the County council. But it's only right that there's time for each party to set out its case fully. I don't think it's a representation and a reply point. We know exactly what everybody is going to say. This very much is what? From what you've experienced in your inspectorate life. At the end of proceedings, you tend to say, let me have your submissions. So what I'd suggest on that and it can be quite late in the process because I don't think it needs a reply, would be for the parties to put forward their written submissions of why their position is appropriate, and then we can properly address you on policy, law and weight of evidence, which are what we'd like to do.

01:20:34:20 - 01:20:38:02

So thank you. That and I've heard I.

01:20:38:04 - 01:21:10:10

Was going to suggest after the, the, the last comment from Garcia that we're going to draw a line into this anywhere. I've heard every position on this. And effectively what we're using this process for is for me to do that. And we've heard your position, I've heard the county council's positions, and I've heard some positions from members of the public in the room. We've got that information. It will come down to a fact that we will hear the positions. It probably sounds like this will be an area of disagreement at the end of the examination that happens.

01:21:10:12 - 01:21:18:16

We know that that's the line of work that we're in. And then ultimately it would be a it would be a factor for us to weigh up in our recommendations.

01:21:21:17 - 01:21:51:06

Okay. I am going to move on now to the next agenda item, which is on the setting of Crow Tree Farm and West End Farm. And really on this one, it's really for the council and this is Nottinghamshire County Council, and it's in response to SSC 111 .0.6. And I would just like the council to, um, talk through its concerns a little bit more about the area of.

01:21:51:20 - 01:21:52:20

Solar array.

01:21:52:22 - 01:22:09:14

That you are seeking to remove. Um, What I think would be useful if the applicant can display that same document again that you had before. And effectively, if you could show the area in appendix two.

01:22:16:18 - 01:22:19:29

Not talking with rep 2-063.

01:22:29:28 - 01:22:53:15

And I will hand over to Nottinghamshire County Council to elaborate a little bit further on the area of seeking and how in particular it um, considers that the um, setting of Crow Tree Farm and I think that's also West End Farm and the Church of Saint Peter and Saint Paul would be preserved.

01:22:55:24 - 01:23:09:16

Sir Stephen pointed to Nottinghamshire County Council. I'm going to introduce my colleague Jason Morden at this point, who's online, and we'll we'll deal with these matters of heritage. Thank you.

01:23:11:12 - 01:23:12:00

Good afternoon.

01:23:12:02 - 01:23:46:21

Jason Morden, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yes, I think it's fairly clear the two areas, um, either side of the footpath, which is shown as the dotted pink line, um, that I would propose could be removed, um, in order to maintain a sense of, uh, rural setting for Crow Tree Farm. And that in turn, would help with the long approach and long views towards the rest of the, um, of the village with Saint Peter's and Paul's.

01:23:51:03 - 01:23:54:15

Okay. Just, um, just to confirm and

01:23:56:08 - 01:24:08:09

take for Crow Tree Farm. Is it the east when you walk along the footpath? I think it's footpath 19 you're walking towards. Is this, um is this your main concern?

01:24:09:11 - 01:24:46:08

Uh, um, Jason Morden, Notts County Council. Yes, I think it would. Well, it's both of those footpaths that you can see very clearly on the plan. Um, it depends on which direction you're walking them, of course. But in either any of the cases, you would have a sense of, uh, the, uh, solar panel presence as opposed to, obviously a, um, an agrarian field, uh, in particular, if you're walking in a easterly direction on the east west footpath, I think that would be the most, um, amplified, uh, sense.

01:24:46:15 - 01:25:14:03

Uh, even with the proposed, um, um, Screening, you would find yourself somewhat in a bit of a channeled view. Uh, ultimately, um, initially you wouldn't have that view either. You would have something much more industrial. So all those things would soften over time. I think that the, um, best solution would be to remove these two sections of, of paneling from, from the proposals.

01:25:16:03 - 01:25:20:18

Okay. Thank you for that. Um, for that summary. And, um.

01:25:23:02 - 01:25:36:07

Return to the applicant. Now, I know you've you've provided some, some comments in your, um, um, response to the council's written questions, but can you just, um, reiterate or state your position?

01:25:37:03 - 01:26:14:09

Thank you, sir. Laura Garcia for the appellant. Um, just so the public rights of way under discussion here on footpath 20, which is it's a bit misleading there because it looks like they just come to a point. But footpath 20 carries on to the southeast to Freemans Lane. Footpath 19 is the southern one which travels west to east and sort of pops out near Shadows View, which is a grouping of modern residential developments to the western side of Stirton, just to just to places where we are. Neither of those public rights of way are heritage assets in their own right, so views from them only matter where they contribute to the significance of other heritage assets.

01:26:15:00 - 01:26:46:13

Just to talk a little bit, if I may, just about Crow Tree Farm, um, listed at grade two, the principal facade faces north onto Station Road. Um, so the only views that there would be of the assets are of the southern, um, elevation of that asset. There are, uh, formerly associated barns to the west, um, which have been considered to be curtilage listed. These are all converted into domestic use now and read very much as modern converted barns.

01:26:46:15 - 01:27:27:02

They've got roof lights in them. They've got windows there in a manicured garden setting, just as at a point when you're observing both of those buildings. Sorry. When you're observing Crow Tree Farm and the barns, they read completely separately. Now they're completely in their own, um, plots of land, and there is no sense if you're looking at them. There is no sense at all that there once was an historic association between them. Um, walking. Oh, and just quickly, on West End Farm, they're both of those assets were assessed in the, um, baseline in appendix one, uh, which is app one, two, two, um, West End farm, grade two listed building.

01:27:27:05 - 01:28:00:10

The principal facade faces east of that. It doesn't the the northern facade, which fronts onto Freemans Lane, presents a rather sort of blank and austere, um, view. There's a blocked opening and then two other windows. It is not the main entrance. It is not a particularly, uh, illustrative view of, of that asset. It doesn't read as a farmhouse. I would say, um, in longer distance, views of it move along, moving along footpath 20 if one is moving south east.

01:28:01:16 - 01:28:31:28

The views of the church. You can see the views of the steeple of the church. Um, as you're moving along that footpath. They will not change as a result of the scheme. Um, the, the footpath carries on with the amount of the church that is visible in that view will not change as a result of the scheme. There is no view at all of Crow Tree Farm along footpath 20 until the scheme is behind you. So you it that sort of north western part of the site is a little bit damp.

01:28:32:00 - 01:29:04:11

Um, it's down a little bit of a dip and you move up and you don't see or appreciate Crow Tree Farmhouse until you are beyond the area of the scheme moving along the footpath 20. Footpath 20 is also not a route that, um, ever went towards grocery farm, it almost deliberately bypasses it completely. So whether the views from that footpath to towards Crow Tree were ever intended to be anything other than a view, which of course isn't a heritage aspect, is to be debated.

01:29:04:17 - 01:29:37:20

The view of West End Farm along footpath 20 will not experience any change. All of the assets as you're moving along footpath 20 will still be readily appreciable in an agrarian setting because, um, by the time you're appreciating all of them either either in isolation altogether, the scheme is far behind you. Footpath 19, if I may if I may be allowed to just do the same exercise of walking along, moving eastwards again, one does not appreciate Crow Tree Farmhouse until one is outside of the scheme.

01:29:37:22 - 01:30:11:08

So the scheme is you're moving through, the scheme is behind you and then you see Great Crow Tree Farmhouse. It is noted that on both of those on sorry on Footpath 19, the view of Croce Farmhouse is in the context of a row of modern detached and semi-detached dwellings fronting onto Station Lane, a number of which have solar panels on their roofs. The views as walking towards Stirton along both of those footpaths are characterised by the modern development of shadows view. Um, which, because it's a new development, the bricks are very new.

01:30:11:14 - 01:30:42:14

It's very prominent in that view. So that view as you're moving towards Stirton, is one of a mixed, um, modern residential settlement with the West Burton Power Station in the view, and also the pylons and power lines with the noise and the visibility of the train line, um, also visible as you're moving through this landscape. Moving through. There was a reference there to a sort of tunnel effect, a trackway along those lines when you're moving in between those two fields.

01:30:42:22 - 01:31:15:28

The panels of FA are well set back from that footpath. Um, and they are being surrounded by hedgerows and solar is not. It's not a solid block of development. It's quite, um, it's visually permeable. You will still be able to see the ground underneath. There is a good there is a good distance separation between each of the rows of panels. It doesn't it doesn't present as an in dust. I wouldn't characterize it as an industrial form of development. They sit within it will sit within those fields and on and likely on top of.

01:31:16:01 - 01:31:35:07

So the character of an agricultural surroundings will still be retained as you're moving through. So for both of those footpaths, the ability to appreciate all of those assets in an agrarian setting will be preserved. And so the short answer to the long question is, I don't agree that those fields need to be removed from the scheme.

01:31:36:25 - 01:31:38:25

Okay. Thank you for your, um,

01:31:40:18 - 01:31:49:26

position on that. I'm clear of what the two parties positions are on this, so I think we would just take that away and consider that. Um.

01:31:53:10 - 01:32:24:04

The only question I had on on churches and patron Saint Paul, um, Historic England not here, but it's just one for the applicant. My reading of the deadline three submission, because the, um, Historic England had raised concerns in their response to first written questions regarding the relationship between the Church of Saint Peter and Saint Paul and the, um, medieval settlement and open field system. Um, just in general.

01:32:24:06 - 01:32:45:21

I'm not asking you to do this now, but it doesn't actually appear that your, um, response to deadline to submissions included a response to Historic England. Rather than do that now, can you? Can we have that as an action point for you to provide some? Unless I've missed it in your documentation in rep 3039.

01:32:49:29 - 01:33:03:04

So if if it wasn't, um, a if a response to that wasn't included, if you can um, if it was then just a signpost as to it. I think it's the best way.

01:33:03:21 - 01:33:17:03

So very quickly, I'll see if you can just give the headlines and see whether that's enough or whether there's there is material that may be, um, it will have to be submitted, but the idea of what it is.

01:33:19:18 - 01:33:32:23

Um, yeah. Um, I have read the response from Historic England and just, you know, a quick we will provide further material on that, but I can provide a very quick sort of response. But if you'd rather be.

01:33:32:27 - 01:33:42:06

I think it just rather is an action point, I think today. Um, probably be the best way to take that forward. Okay. Um, Mr. Morton, you have your hand up.

01:33:46:24 - 01:34:27:07

Jason Morton, Notts county council. Yes. Just in response to that request. That would be very useful for us to see. Um, I think we should make, um, the, the applicant and yourselves aware that, um, since Bassetlaw District Council aren't here, they have been looking actively at the creation of a conservation area and designation of a conservation area for stainless steel, which would include, I believe, in the version I've seen of the boundary, this area of land. Um, it would also include the, the land surrounding um, Crow Tree Farm, some of which might overlap slightly with the proposed, um, area of solar.

01:34:27:09 - 01:34:34:06

But at the moment that's not a designation, but it is one that is under active consideration.

01:34:35:29 - 01:34:56:21

Thank you for that. I think we heard that that yesterday and somebody made that point. So we've, um. Yeah, we're aware of that. Thank you very much. Okay. The time is now 25 to 4. I think it's time to take a 15 minute break. So we will adjourn this hearing until 10 to 4. Thank you.