

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

**Project 02-13-26 01:20 pm**

Created on: 2026-02-13 13:19:37

Project Length: 01:55:31

Account Holder: ██████████

File Name: Steeple\_ISH3\_130226\_PT2-MP3.mp4

File Length: 01:55:31

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:10 - 00:00:15:22

The time is now 11:05 and time for this issue. Specific hearing three to resume. Um, can I just check with Mr. Ray wood? The live streaming has recommenced.

00:00:18:05 - 00:00:52:20

I see, yeah, I see a thumbs up. Brilliant. Thank you very much. Um, so moving on now to requirement 21, which is, um, decommissioning and restoration, which sets out the provisions for securing the decommissioning and restoration of the proposed development. I'd firstly like the applicant to talk us through the details contained in this requirement and how it would successfully ensure the decommissioning and restoration of the proposed development.

00:00:56:22 - 00:00:57:10

Thank you sir.

00:00:58:20 - 00:00:59:15

So the deadline.

00:00:59:17 - 00:01:29:23

For decommissioning is to start. Decommissioning is 40 years after the date of final commissioning. The date of final commissioning is a defined term. It can be found in article two, and is the date that is given to the local planning authority under requirement to subparagraph four, and that states that a notice of the date of final commissioning with respect of the first phase of work number one,

00:01:31:16 - 00:01:42:00

must be given to the local planning authority within 15 working days of the date of final commissioning for that phase. So, um, you define your start point.

00:01:44:06 - 00:01:57:24

Um, 39 years and six months later. So six months before the 40th anniversary of that date, um, the undertaker must submit to the LPA for.

00:01:57:26 - 00:01:58:17

Approval.

00:01:58:19 - 00:02:41:01

A decommissioning plan, and a decommissioning traffic management plan for approval by that local planning authority. Um, there is a separate, uh, period of three months where the applicant is providing that plan, uh, more than six months ahead. Um, no decommissioning works can be carried out until the plans submitted have been approved, in consultation with the Environment Agency and Natural England. And the key thing here, sir, is that six months before the anniversary period is giving that a sort of maximum period in which to agree that decommissioning plan.

00:02:41:03 - 00:02:56:00

And that's considered a reasonable period to to start with. But there is nothing in this order that would prevent the plan from being provided earlier if the Undertaker wanted absolute certainty regarding approval of that plan.

00:02:57:29 - 00:03:21:17

Decommissioning must commence no later than 40 years after the date of final commissioning. The approach to decommissioning will be set out in those plans, and the timeline for decommissioning is as per subparagraph five, which is two years or other period as agreed in writing between The Undertaker and the LPA. Excellent.

00:03:22:26 - 00:03:41:23

Brilliant. Thank you for that. So just just to clarify, and I think this is definitely my understanding of this. Um, and it's the how the 40 year period is reached. Um, so it's when the first completed phase commences operation by generating electricity. So

00:03:43:15 - 00:03:45:25

that applies to the whole development.

00:03:47:05 - 00:03:48:07

Yes, that's right sir.

00:03:48:21 - 00:04:08:19

So just for everyone's clarity. So for example, if the date of the final commissioning of the final phase occurs, let's say, ten years after the date of the final commission of the first phase, that the lifetime of that final phase would be 30 years, for example, not 40.

00:04:10:27 - 00:04:16:07

Yes, sir. That's correct. The period is defined in relation to that first phase of development. Okay.

00:04:16:09 - 00:04:40:18

That's fine. So that clarifies that it's not 40 years for each phase. It's. That's it. Okay. Thank you very much. Um, could you just explain further the process of how the site would be restored if the

undertaker, for whatever reason, went into liquidation, how an insolvency practitioner would take on the responsibility of the benefit of the order.

00:04:58:21 - 00:05:13:15

I believe I might have to take that away and confirm that in writing. I'm not 100% clear that the order sets that out, but could provide that in full now, unless I think we will provide that in writing.

00:05:14:28 - 00:05:18:03

I'm happy for you to take that away in writing. And.

00:05:28:28 - 00:06:06:26

Makes sense. So I suppose it's just for iteration. Um, the development consent order. I think the term used by Miss Barlow USA was runs with the land. I mean, that's an appropriate, um, description of it. Um, there's no way, uh, that land can be vacant. I do not have an owner. If the undertaker were to go insolvent, any party stepping in the Undertaker shoes, um, whether fully operational, um, ownership of the land, uh, would be bound by the requirements of this order.

00:06:07:10 - 00:06:16:18

Um, so in that sense, the answer is much more in relation to sort of the inheritance of an order, inheritance of land rights. Thank you sir.

00:06:19:09 - 00:06:53:06

Okay. That's fine for an initial explanation, but if you can expand upon that in writing, just, um, um, just to, um, yeah, just to explain if there's any concerns about if it's effectively to make sure that if an undertaker was to go into liquidation, in simple terms, that the solar farm just wouldn't be left there in isolation for a period, I think is really what we're trying to get at. But I'll let you, um, explain that further and how the the order and the provisions within it, the criminal liability, that sort of thing, all ties in with them.

00:06:53:15 - 00:06:54:19

Thank you sir. That's understood.

00:06:57:10 - 00:07:04:24

Thank you. Could I ask Nottinghamshire County Council if they have any queries on the wording in this requirement?

00:07:08:21 - 00:07:39:07

Um, thank you sir. Um, no particular concerns. We actually welcome the reference to, um, a waste management strategy accompanying the decommissioning plan. Um, obviously as a waste, uh, waste management. Waste planning authority. Um, we have expressed a strong desire for, um, recycling and recovery of materials. Um, admittedly, this is quite a long term project. You know, it's not infinite, but, uh.

00:07:39:16 - 00:08:04:03

Uh, so no particular concerns, actually, you know, welcome the framework, which hopefully will encourage, um, uh, recycling solutions and, uh, recovery of materials from the site. Thank you. Thank

you for that clarification. Um, we have two hands up, and I'll, um. Ask you to, um, ask for your questions, Miss Warren.

00:08:04:09 - 00:08:37:20

Christine Warren again. Um, is 40 years decommissioning? Is that set in stone? Or do we? If we have improvements on the solar panels, do they get upgraded? And if step fusion is going to do what it says it's going to do. Does that make the solar panels obsolete. And the decommissioning can become, become, uh, forward from not 40 years to maybe 20 years that the solar panels have. We got to be the the panels have got to be there for 40 years before you decommission.

00:08:37:26 - 00:08:42:14

If something else comes along, that's better. Could the decommissioning be sooner?

00:08:43:24 - 00:08:52:25

I'll tell you the other question. I think your response to Mr. Haycock did address that to a certain extent, but I'll let you respond again in a moment. I'll just take the other point first, though.

00:08:54:08 - 00:09:28:04

Thanks. Julie Barlow, resident. Um, a similar question. Um, was can the, um, the date be varied by agreement with the LPA? It's not set in stone. And also can the reinstatement conditions at the minute. There is an undertaking of a perceived undertaking by residents that the land will be returned to agricultural use. But we've seen locally where when developments have come to an end, the landowner has, has, has requested that certain infrastructure be left in place.

00:09:28:19 - 00:09:59:08

Concrete plans, for example. Um, so can that be varied so it isn't actually return to agricultural use. And I think you touched upon the point about the assurance, um, that for Commissioning. Um, from my knowledge of other energy industries UK onshore there is a there has been in the past a situation where a developer did go into liquidation insolvency.

00:09:59:26 - 00:10:11:21

Um, the infrastructure wasn't. I'm not quite sure if it's still there. And the letter of the law was that actually the liability fell to the landowner

00:10:13:08 - 00:10:24:16

under that that particular area. I'm not saying the same applies for this, this industry. So it's just making sure there is adequate financial provision for decommissioning.

00:10:26:12 - 00:10:46:08

Thank you for those questions. I think they're there. They're worth the applicant respond to I think the first one for Mr. Warren, you did sort of touch upon anyway. But I'll let you re-emphasize the point that you made about the timing of the decommissioning, the 40 years, and then also the other points that were raised there as well. If you could just respond to those, please.

00:10:48:26 - 00:11:00:16

Thank you sir. Okay. Got for the applicant. Um, the 40 year period is a maximum period. There isn't a process within the DCO for that to be agreed to be extended.

00:11:02:03 - 00:11:25:24

Um, there were comments made in relation to decommissioning earlier. Um, there's there's that that's that's something that would be subject to prevailing market conditions. Um, regarding future use. The applicant has assumed that the land will be restored in its environmental statement. It will be held to those principles

00:11:27:12 - 00:11:47:19

regarding use after the survey. Uh, the authorized development. That's not something that is within the applicant's control. Um, it will land, will pass back to Reversionary landowner at that time, and it would be for that landowner to determine, under their own discretion, how to use their land. Thank you sir.

00:11:48:07 - 00:12:06:00

It's just one follow up point that I have in terms of what your outline, um. Proposes at this stage. Are you is your outline proposal at this stage to remove everything, including underground cabling as well at this stage, or is it to retain some of that infrastructure in the ground?

00:12:15:22 - 00:12:19:24

At the moment. The environmental statement assumes total removal. Thank you sir.

00:12:21:05 - 00:12:29:29

Thank you for that clarification. I will now move on to schedule two, part two. Um.

00:12:32:22 - 00:13:06:23

Which sets out the procedure for the discharge of requirements. And I want to turn to Nottinghamshire County Council. Really on this particular item? Um, because your local impact reports. Raises the issue that several other requirements fall within the county council's remit. Which is, uh, requirements eight, which is the construction traffic management plan. 13, which is the public rights of way diversions. Um, which in your opinion, you consider should be discharged by the highway Authority and required.

00:13:06:25 - 00:13:33:14

16 which is surface and far water drainage, which should be discharged by the lead flood authority. Now, the applicant's referred confirmed in its response that it does not agree with this and considers that actually that should fall within the remit of the local planning authority following the applicant's response. Can the Council explain whether it's agrees or not with that position, and if not, what you consider the requirement should provide for?

00:13:53:24 - 00:14:26:01

It's the this. This simply relates to the fact that such matters are the province of the county council. Um, and it would be clearer and would be swifter if those requirements were discharged directly, um, by the county council. Uh, we're clearly cognizant of the fact that, um, eventually, um, it's more likely that we'll be in a single form of government anyway down the line.

00:14:26:03 - 00:15:02:02

So there will be changes to the definition of local planning authority. So I do accept that, um, however, the um, you know, it's all about matters. It's all being referred to in terms of making sure there's, uh, no, no hold up, um, to, uh, nationally significant, uh, projects. Um, and, uh, in terms of, uh, responsibilities for the highway authority and lead flood authority, um, they are, um, matters which the local planning authority has no relevance or concern for.

00:15:02:04 - 00:15:34:20

Uh, and it matters which, um, uh, where requirements can be, uh, can be discharged directly, um, elsewhere in other DC, those, um, uh, those those responsibilities being identified and the county has been identified as the appropriate, uh, body for, for discharge. Um, so simply a matter of, uh, trying to ensure that there is, uh, uh, clarity on responsibilities and

00:15:36:12 - 00:15:39:05

the processes is handled as swiftly as possible.

00:15:41:22 - 00:16:16:24

Okay. Thank you for that. Um, does the council currently have a role in discharging requirements or even other conditions for for planning applications, particularly those planning applications? If let's say that you, Bassetlaw District Council, determine an application for a housing scheme and it has various highway works and then it has planning conditions on it. Do you have a jurisdiction to discharge those conditions, or is it possible district council in consultation with with Nottinghamshire county councils?

00:16:19:26 - 00:16:28:22

Yeah, it is the local planning authority. It retains the control in consultation with the Highway Authority.

00:16:31:12 - 00:17:03:08

Okay. And you've, um. I think you just referred before to other, um, Biko's. Um, I, I won't hold it to you now, but if you could submit some examples of those to us for deadline for. And then I think the applicant can then review that yourself and then, um, see whether you have any further update on, on the council's position. I think that would be, um, useful.

00:17:06:10 - 00:17:13:06

So just to just to clarify a similar thing, if what you're saying is, is, is

00:17:14:26 - 00:17:25:23

Bassetlaw District Council or the local planning authority, which I accept could actually change anyway, and this could be a material, if this is to be consented. But based on what we've got at the moment. Um,

00:17:27:09 - 00:17:42:28

if if the applicant doesn't accept the position that it should be used in discharging authority. Are you wanting some wording added to this that it has to be in consultation with with any other secondary local authority or something like that?

00:17:46:06 - 00:18:33:05

Certainly that is something we've stressed and already mentioned a particular wording change that would notify that point, um, in practice. Of course they do. Um, the whole process of discharge, though, you know, is, is it's complex enough without involving two authorities. And it needs to be clear, uh, that, uh, that the county council has statutory responsibilities that do need to be engaged and we need to be engaged as early as possible in that, um, especially, you know, in terms of the deadlines of meeting, uh, um, you know, requirements for discharge.

00:18:33:07 - 00:18:41:26

So that's that will confirm or confirm the details of where those responsibilities have been split in other DCO. Certainly. Okay.

00:18:52:27 - 00:18:55:29

Do you want to respond to anything you've heard at this stage?

00:18:57:18 - 00:19:34:10

Yes. Uh, just just in brief. Um, firstly, the order would not need to just for clarity, would not need to anticipate any change of structure at a, at a local level. Uh, were responsibilities to be subsumed into a unitary council that would follow as part of that process? Um, I think what the applicant is trying to ensure is consistency and how these requirements are Scientist Josh that ensures efficiency in going forward when it seeks to roll out this DCO.

00:19:34:28 - 00:20:07:14

Um, I take the point around areas of expertise within NCC. However, it's important to, uh, because as you as you said, sir, in relation to discharge. Think about what is the purpose of this. This is a planning control. In that sense, it one looks at roles in which a county planning authority has, uh, you know, these things extend to types such as education, but in relation to things like highways. That's not actually a county planning authority matter.

00:20:07:16 - 00:20:34:28

That's matters relating to highways from a planning perspective, still sits with the local planning authority and areas of expertise. Uh, you know, go to the county for consultation. And in that sense, the structure which is proposed, which is to sit the sign off of planning control with the local planning authority, is considered to be the appropriate structure in this case. Thank you sir.

00:20:35:20 - 00:20:46:10

Okay. Thank you for your clarification on that. I've got one. We've got one question for Miss Warren. And just on the point of this, I'll just wait for the microphone to come.

00:20:46:19 - 00:20:57:08

It would be good that it went to our local planning department. If our planning department was taking any active, um, um, interest in this case, the not.

00:20:57:12 - 00:21:30:10

Okay. Thank you for your observation. Uh, my final question to the council on this point in this particular one is the gold fees, because you've, um, um, which is set out in paragraph 31, paragraph 6.14 of your local impact report, which states further clarification could be provided on how this would apply. So that's the distribution of these. Um, could you explain how the requirement as currently drafted.

00:21:30:17 - 00:21:31:09

Um.

00:21:35:04 - 00:21:46:03

How, um, it could provide further clarification on this matter and whether this is something that you've seen on other, um, development consent orders.

00:21:50:28 - 00:21:55:12

So this is requirement 31, just to clarify, which is it is fees.

00:22:16:05 - 00:22:29:25

Sir, I, I'm afraid I'm going to have to take this away and just come back to you on this. Um, I don't have the the answer right in front of me, so I'll gladly submit the further statement to deadline for.

00:22:32:22 - 00:22:36:27

Okay. That's fine. Thank you for, um, confirming that, um.

00:22:39:11 - 00:23:06:12

That brings us to the end of the questions I had on schedule two. And unless anybody else has any comments they wish to make on the requirements in general for the that's proposed, I don't see any hands up in the room or online. So, um, that now brings us to the end of item five. And now we will now move on to agenda item six. And I'm going to hand over to Mr. Wiltshire for this particular item.

00:23:11:11 - 00:23:13:03

Thank you, Mr. Robinson.

00:23:13:05 - 00:23:13:22

Um.

00:23:20:12 - 00:23:58:09

So, yes, this is, um, item six on the agenda, which refers to, um, schedule ten protective provisions in relation to the proposed North Humber to High Mound and Project. Um, some of you were present, but some weren't. But during the the compulsory acquisition and temporary possession hearing that we held on, um, two days ago on 11th of February, we heard submissions from um National Grid on the background to development of the North Humber to high modern project and its interaction with the Stirton, the steel development.

00:23:59:18 - 00:24:39:18

Um, during that hearing, the applicant and National Grid undertook to discuss and agree a way forward regarding the drafting of without prejudice, protective provisions regarding the North Humber to Hymenium project as a separate part to schedule ten of the DCO, which they're going to submit to us by deadline five. Um, we spent quite a lot of time on that, and we don't require the parties to repeat these submissions further in this hearing. However, we are happy to hear any brief submissions from parties on any further points of importance and relevance on this matter.

00:24:40:14 - 00:25:03:00

Um, so I will, um. I think I'll start first with the applicant as, um, they didn't say a great deal at the, um, hearing to two days ago, and I think they wish to address this on that matter. And then I will

00:25:04:25 - 00:25:10:13

enable National Grid to respond and any other parties in the room. Um, so.

00:25:10:15 - 00:25:25:16

If I can suggest that might be useful for us to come after the applicant to the National Grid can deal with us both together. But I'm entirely in your hands, sir. What you see? Obviously, we weren't present on Wednesday afternoon, so it's our first opportunity to make a number of important and material points to you.

00:25:25:18 - 00:25:29:16

So I'm happy with that. If National Grid is. Thank you.

00:25:30:18 - 00:25:32:04

Thank you very much, sir.

00:25:32:06 - 00:25:33:21

And good morning, Isabella.

00:25:33:27 - 00:26:29:29

For for the applicant now. So I understand at this point what you're interested in is a general overview. Plainly, we've seen National Grid's deadline three submissions. And we do have some detailed points to make in respect of them. Either they will come in second part of this agenda where you lead a discussion on these matters. If not, will of course respond to them in writing at deadline four but at this stage, in terms of general overview, you'll be aware, sir, that National Grid, I'm going to call them ingot if that's okay, and gets current preferred route for section ten of the North Humber to him on scheme, runs to the east of the railway line between pylons for 211 and 220, and interacts with a significant proportion of the applicant's proposed solar arrays.

00:26:30:01 - 00:27:01:23

And for your note in the recording, the extent of the interaction is shown in the applicant's deadline. Two submissions. Rep 2052 electronic page 311 and Get has selected that route. In spite of the fact that the Staple project has been in the public domain since October of 2023, and the applicant has objected to that route consistently since August 2024, when it submitted its response to an gets localised consultation.

00:27:01:28 - 00:28:12:28

We understand that the landowner has also consistently objected to the eastern route, and has proposed a number of alternative routes which run to the west of the railway line since at least March 2025. The impact of ingots. Currently preferred route is described in the applicant's response to your first written questions at rep 2052 from page 311. And the way that this issue manifests in this examination is that N seeks to secure protection not only for its existing assets, but for future assets that will be comprised in the high margin project by, for example, preventing the applicant from exercising well, from acquiring, from acquiring any land that may be comprised in the high margin project without its express consent, and by preventing the applicant from developing within the proposed hymen and order Limits and any development that would impede their development.

00:28:13:03 - 00:28:46:25

Now the applicant recognizes the need to protect existing assets. Negotiations are underway. Both parties are confident that agreement will be reached, but the applicant strongly resists the imposition. The imposition of protective provisions to protect future assets, the routing and program of which are as yet uncertain. National grid plainly hasn't submitted its application yet. We understand there are a number of objections to its route, not least from us and the applicant, and possibly others.

00:28:47:09 - 00:29:19:26

And I note that at the compulsory acquisition hearing on Wednesday of this week, Inga addressed you on this matter under the agenda item dealing with sections one, two, seven and 138 of the Planning Act. Now, that may simply have been a matter of administrative convenience, but it's important to note that neither section one, two seven nor 138 applied to land or apparatus that may be owned by statutory undertaker in the future.

00:29:20:02 - 00:29:50:13

Section 127 specifically applies to land that has been acquired by statutory undertaker. Section 138 applies where a DCO authorizes compulsory acquisition. And there is. That's the relevant wording. There is relevant apparatus in, on or over the land, and yet obviously hasn't acquired land for the purposes of the home on and project. And nor is there any apparatus in the land in respect of that project.

00:29:50:17 - 00:30:27:28

So in summary, the applicant's position is that it's not appropriate to impose protective provisions to protect future as yet uncertain, and get infrastructure in the event that Angot does continued with its preferred alignment. The correct and appropriate procedure is for it to seek the necessary compulsory acquisition powers that it requires through its own DCO in due course, which would require justification in the public interest and which, if confirmed, would trigger a requirement to pay compensation.

00:30:28:16 - 00:31:09:13

It's clear from its deadline three submissions that National Grid recognises that this option is available to it. Because it has said, and I quote here, in the absence of suitable protective provisions, the North Humber to High Mountain project would need to address the interaction between the two projects through its own DCO application and that is what it should do. It's not appropriate for Angot, in practical terms, to seek to safeguard or compulsorily acquire land by the backdoor through protective

provisions on this DCO without having established a case for doing so in the public interest, and which on end gets proposed.

00:31:09:15 - 00:31:48:06

Protected provisions would engage no requirement for compensation in response to the applicant's objections. Njit has sought to emphasize the importance of their high minor project, and the applicant does not, and has never disputed the importance of that project. Its case is simply that it will be for Njit to justify its proposed route choices and compulsory acquisition powers through its own DCO application. Through that process, the applicant will have the opportunity to make representations about alternative routes that may be available that would minimise the impact on this project.

00:31:48:14 - 00:32:27:06

Plainly, it is not possible through this process for you to resolve the route selection related to next project, not least because other people will have an interest in that route selection process. We understand we're here and we object to their route selection. The landowner is there and they object. But we also understand there are other developers in the vicinity who've been referred to by the landowner. Data center Step Fusion Energy Project will be interested to hear whether they've objected to ingots proposed route, but essentially that that can't be determined.

00:32:27:08 - 00:32:59:21

We're not asking you to determine. We simply say we need to have the opportunity to come to dispute and interrogate the route selection process through ingots own examination process. We've provided you with the flavor of the submissions that we will be making in that process, which are at rep 2052 from PDF 240. So, to be clear, it's not a question of this examining authority, choosing between the relative importance of the two projects and get.

00:32:59:23 - 00:33:08:05

We'll have every opportunity to justify its route and the powers it needs in its own application in due course. And we say that's the appropriate process.

00:33:10:10 - 00:33:11:04

Thank you.

00:33:11:10 - 00:33:17:28

Thank you very much. Um, yes. I'll turn to, um. Is it Mr. Jobs.

00:33:18:03 - 00:33:20:19

And Mr. Riley? Riley? Mr. Jarvis is online.

00:33:20:21 - 00:33:21:07

Okay.

00:33:21:09 - 00:34:11:17

I'm very grateful, sir. Thank you. If I can, by way of introduction, the landowner is fully supportive of this DCO application for the steeper renewables project. And indeed, the position that has been advanced by an old friend. Mr.. For on behalf of the applicant this morning, it fully endorses those

submissions, sir, and indeed also those in writing and considered it is now abundantly clear from both advocate materials, sir, and also the oral submission for National grid have fallen well short of demonstrating that it ought to have protected provisions in this DCO relating to future assets as part of the Northumbria High Mining Project, Bedford Lantern ultimate is not subject to the principle of that project, and recognizes that the applicant does its obvious important, does have serious concerns in a number of respects, and wishes to outline here this morning.

00:34:11:29 - 00:34:51:03

The first of those is the currently stated preferred route for that project, as identified by National Grid and statutory consultation last year, is one in which we take serious issue. We also will take issue with the approach and the way in which the National Grid has identified that routes, including, we will say, the adequacy of the consultation which has been undertaken, noting that National Grid continues to be under a duty to undertake that exercise properly. We will also be raising serious concerns with the approach, which has been adopted to consideration of alternatives to the currently stated preferred route, including.

00:34:51:07 - 00:35:22:20

There are alternative routes which we have presented to national grids and which even now has not been fully appraised by National Grid. And that is something fairly set at paragraphs 28 and 48 of their deadline tree submissions. And I should say, sir, for the benefit of of today's hearing, there is a copy of a map which shows that alternative routine in National Grid deadline tree submissions that's available is figured and on page 13 says you do have that for you.

00:35:23:14 - 00:35:56:12

And we will also be raising points, we will say, about lack of proper and conscientious engagement with us to land any. We do accept, of course. And indeed, as my friend has outlined, that the Northumbria High Mining Project will itself be subject to examination, and it is not for you to make any determination on the route for that project as part of this TCO examination. But the point was, we do wish to raise before you, and none of which will be news, National Grid, as we have made these points repeatedly in correspondence and multiple occasions.

00:35:56:14 - 00:36:28:07

We say they are our materials, the matters which now arise for determination and in the way identified by new hearing nos. And therefore we have to be allowed a fair opportunity. And we appreciate the opportunity of being here today to make these points before you. Of course, there are also points that we will make as part of any future examination. As in our submission, they will plainly go right to the heart of whether or not development consent should be granted for that project on the basis of the current and unsatisfactory route alignment.

00:36:28:16 - 00:37:06:17

Our principal concerns are not just because of proposed the impacts that the proposed route alignment on this renewables project, and in our submission and the information before you is to the extent of sterilization and also the economic impact, which would be result if if that is the case, are quite stark. But also, as many of the friends hinted at our serious concern about the impact that may follow for now. Currently preferred routes on other extremely important and nationally significant projects which the land owner wishes to facilitate on its land, and we say this would potentially be affected.

00:37:07:28 - 00:37:39:03

We would say that those projects include their data centre and also potentially development relating to the Steppe Nuclear Fusion project, which is planned to come forward, and West Berlin Paris Station A and we will say the benefits of those schemes. And indeed, said a nuclear fusion project is itself quite simply, groundbreaking. You'll be aware it's a very significant commitment made by government, including financial commitments and the size of that investment to that project, and they are very significant for the country as a whole.

00:37:39:05 - 00:38:40:27

Yet National Grid's currently preferred route, we say, will seriously threaten or frustrate the ability of this landowner to support these projects. And indeed, it may well have significant implications for the steppe process itself, noting the closeness with which it comes to West Brighton Paris station A including the site access and the bordering railway. All of this, sir, and the fact these matters are here before you is despite the fact that, as we have said, we have presented an alternative route, National Grid, which we say is plain and any reading is preferable to the currently stated preferred routes, and the landing remains wholly unclear and indeed wholly confused and dissatisfied as to why National Grid does not wish to pursue either that alternative route, or indeed any of the previous alternatives performed by the landowner, who has always sought to engage in a collaborative manner, but has been disappointed by what we would characterize the lack of conscientious and positive engagement by National Grid.

00:38:40:29 - 00:39:23:21

We have had course and last a number of weeks to review the what we would call a high level and vague reasoning, which has been offered by National Grid in its deadline, treats and missions to you, but that is following what National Grid itself says was an initial appraisal. And for example, it cannot be seen as reliable as the lack of any genuine comparative analysis of effects. And in our submission, it will not withstand any real scrutiny. We note also paragraph ten of the Network of National Grids deadline tree submissions, which would appear to present a picture of direct engagement and positive engagement with the landowner and its agents on development design.

00:39:23:24 - 00:40:14:19

In our submission to the approach of National Grid to date, which has included serious concerns in the consultation process for the Northumberland High Mining Project, including areas in the Design Development report which submitted to the western half. For example, of this approach and from the diagrams has been such and has been so shortcoming that we are very likely to argue, as part of any future examination, that they have clearly fallen well short of the duties and faith in us. And in terms of chronology, and as my friend has identified such weather concerns as the impacts on both this project and also the other projects, I have referred to that as early as the 4th of March last year, we offered National Grid alternative routes for pylons for AFF 202 to 4 221.

00:40:14:21 - 00:40:48:09

We also made a formal design amendment request in early April last year, and in respect of the most recent alternative, which is therefore referred to following an initial appraisal by National Grid that was presented under 15 to December last year. And the most important point was to withdraw, sir, from all of this, is that all of those routes settled in the original identified route corridor for the

Northumbria to High Mountain project, as published by National Grid in 2023. It sits within that graduated source which was proposed by them at that point.

00:40:48:11 - 00:41:19:07

And in our submission, that means that many of the reasons now put forward before you in those deadline three submissions as to why the current rules are set to be preferable appear to be wholly inconsistent in our submission, which is previously published position. For example, as much as said about the alleged need to avoid an interaction with the existing overhead 132 kV line, but that was not previously treated as an insurmountable obstacle by National Grid and at any stage in respect of our alternative routes.

00:41:19:09 - 00:41:50:14

And I do want to make these points, sir, because a number of points have been made in this deadline tree submissions about our alternative routes. So it's important that ideal before you say what we say are the clear benefits of that alternative route. And indeed they are multifold. So they include the fact that it will be significantly cheaper for national groups to deliver that route to deliver out alternative routes. And that is because we have pragmatically and conscientiously indicated the national grid as early as March last year.

00:41:50:16 - 00:42:26:02

Then, in respect of the woodland solar farm for which we are also the landowner, we would be prepared not to seek compensation and as the landowner, to absorb the depreciation in the value of that scheme for the benefit of the project promoter. That would mean that land assembly costs would be reduced significantly and is wholly unclear. Therefore, in light of that background, why National Grid continues to persist with its submission to you in its deadline three submissions that it needs to avoid an impact on any sort of any sort of interaction with that solar project.

00:42:26:10 - 00:43:11:10

Why that continues to be the case has not been explained to us and indeed, as we've said, appears wholly at odds with the proposed preferred route. The much greater level of impact that would be had on generating capacity as a result of the interference with this scheme, and also the request for protective provisions. As part of this TCN and more, we have indicators that we will take all necessary steps to quickly complete and complete land agreements with National Grid, so as to allow for the undergrounding of that section of the one tree, two kV overhead line, which would be crossed by alternative routes where necessary, and again, that would make land assembly significantly easier and less expensive than the preferred route.

00:43:12:18 - 00:43:46:29

We also consider that our position is such that we will be able to facilitate a more effective delivery of the construction timetable for those alternative routes. Moreover, it reduces the land by approximately one kilometre, which we say based on the costings put forward by national readiness, preliminary routine and siting study would result in a very significant construction cost saving of approximately £3.8 In palms. Moreover, it is a better design and it is one which accords far better with the whole thread rules.

00:43:47:01 - 00:44:18:16

For example, we would remove a dog leg proposed by tower for a hefty 110 and also overall achieve a straight line between towers for AF202 and for AF221. And it would also overcome many of the serious material planning impacts of the currently preferred route. So, for example, the route would be moved away from the steeple, which is a number of important and statutorily designated heritage assets which would be impacted.

00:44:18:18 - 00:44:56:12

And it would also avoid impacts on residential dwellings within itself, something that Holford Rule sees as desirable. In particular, the current route advocated for by National Grid has a north to south alignment, which inevitably increases the impact of an overhead line in close proximity to the west of the village. And moreover, unlike the preferred route, it will create a clear visual break and will not cluttered a landscape. And we also say, will avoid likely traffic, conflict and congestion, which we anticipate will be the result if our preferred route is consented.

00:44:56:14 - 00:45:27:02

And it does not appear to be something that even now National Grid is properly considered. So, for example, you've heard reference to the quarry here this morning. It does not appear to us that the impact of traffic operations from a consented point down the steeple have been properly considered, nor the impacts on that village a significantly increased construction traffic by having that preferred route. So all of that, we say, are clear and real benefits of the landowners alternative routes.

00:45:27:04 - 00:45:31:18

And if none of that has ever been properly addressed to, engaged with by National Grid,

00:45:33:08 - 00:46:12:13

that means the landowner with a sense of dissatisfaction and disappointed. And notwithstanding the clear statutory duties upon National Green to take consultation responses and feedback into account, it appears determined to press ahead that preferred routes are not properly considered, except to very many benefits of the alternative route that we are asking them to consider, and we are willing and able to facilitate. There has been therefore no conscientious consideration and as approach we say, is firmly at odds with a requirement to carry out consultation as a formative stage and to take responses into account.

00:46:12:15 - 00:46:46:20

Our experience has been the opposite. This is highlighted by the fact that even now, National Grid has not taken the time, nor the effort to carry out the additional survey work from the landowners lands, which would allow it to properly appraise the alternative route presented by the landowner. It is also highlighted by a recent letter we received in the 2nd of February this year, in which it propose only very tiny tweaks to the route, and offered absolutely nothing of substance to address the concerns consistently and repeatedly raised by the landing.

00:46:46:27 - 00:47:23:03

In the absence of any team that can be described as a proper appraisal by National Grid, it is difficult to see how they will ever be able to properly and fully justify the discounting of the alternative route. The best the National Grid could say in its deadline three submissions was that it carried out an initial appraisal of the landowners alternative route, and it would provide a hearing, a full update on a full

appraisal. We await with interest any such update given it's never been provided to us, and indeed, in the interest of procedural fairness that made it into the course, we will need to respond to whatever is said by National Grid here today.

00:47:23:05 - 00:48:02:21

And having had the opportunity to take appropriate instructions. In short, sir. And drawing to a conclusion, our position is that our case and to the public interest, lies firmly in favour of an alternative route for the North. Humber to hire mining project is very clear. It takes a more proportionate approach to impacting land in connection with that project in the public interest. If what it is anticipated result in reduced planning impacts and it would resolve clear planning objections, no cousins reasons supported by evidence have been provided by National Grid as to why our alternative route has not been pursued.

00:48:02:23 - 00:48:50:25

And indeed, National Grid may say much to you of delay, but the fact is that much of that delay could have been avoided, given the fact that this route was proposed as early as March last year, so that's not a good reason. Therefore, in conclusion, and in light of the multiple benefits of our alternative routes and the fact that the harms of the preferred route could therefore be avoided, we consider that they will face real difficulties in any future examination for the Northumbria High Mining Project. We will argue, as I have said, that there has not been an adequate explanation of reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition of the land, which will be required to facilitate that project through the impacts of the exercise of compulsory purchase powers and the compensation which would arise have not been minimised in the public interest.

00:48:50:27 - 00:49:27:12

And this case is decisively one where it is both relevant and necessary to consider whether there is a more appropriate site elsewhere, and as it is one where the evidence firmly indicates that is the case and falls decisively in favour of a more appropriate alternative in those circumstances. Therefore, in our submission, and to assist you with the questions that you have to decide as part of this examination, we say the applicant is entirely right to resist the imposition of protective provisions and this DCO for future assets, which may come forward as part of that other project.

00:49:27:19 - 00:49:51:07

That is because there are very real concerns about our the currently preferred route, and it is not at all clear. Far from it that it will survive examination. Given the very real and robust challenge which it pursues any further the landowner intends to make, and it is indeed very likely that other people, such as the applicant, may and may also do so. Thank you very much.

00:49:52:01 - 00:50:14:19

Thank you very much. Um, Mrs. Warren, I have noticed you've got your hand up. I'll, um, I'm going to let, um, and get to speak first, because they, um. We need to hear their side of this. So, um, I will come back to you, though. Don't worry. Thank you. Thank you very much, sir Jonathan Welch for mgt. Um, I'm conscious that.

00:50:14:21 - 00:50:15:06

The.

00:50:15:08 - 00:50:24:03

Indication was that you wanted a five minute overview. We've obviously heard a fair bit, but I'm going to endeavour to keep that. And if you want more detail, either prove me now or in due.

00:50:24:05 - 00:50:54:11

Course you can have threes can have slightly more than five minutes. So I'm grateful for that. Um, there are three, three strands, I think, to the overview of nuggets case here. The first is the extent of interaction between Northampton Heinemann and the Atkins project. The second is alternatives and route selection. And the final is the principle of require the requirements for protective provisions in relation to future infrastructure.

00:50:56:15 - 00:51:31:04

So I'm going to take those in turn by May 8th. Um, as a somewhat high level at this stage. And we can get into the detail if we need to in terms of the extent of interaction. The short point is that this is not a significant as is asserted by the applicant. We've addressed this in our D3 submissions at paragraph 21 and following. I'm not going to read that out. The 100 acres that is affected on temporary basis is itself less than 5% of the development area, and in fact, it's only less than 1.1.

00:51:31:06 - 00:51:39:28

7% of the development area that is required permanently. That is important context for everything that we're going to be discussing under this agenda item.

00:51:42:07 - 00:52:13:27

There's an assertion in the deadline to submission from the applicant that 124 acres is sterilised, and this is not accepted by NGOs and is not, in fact, evidenced by the applicant. Um, it said that there is a significant portion of land that is stranded in between the proposed North Harbour route and the railway. You'll be familiar, I think, from last time when we looked at that on a plan, it is said to be stranded by the applicant so as to make it inefficient to develop.

00:52:13:29 - 00:52:46:08

That's the word they use. Inefficient. With respect to them, inefficient is almost meaningless. In this context. It's not been said that it's unviable. It is. It seems to be a matter of preference for the developer that they would find it inconvenient and would prefer that the delivery was not complicated by the. Net scheme. That is of course understandable, but it can't be in any sense determinative. Indeed, in my submission, it's a matter that should track very limited weight, given the national imperative that the North Hampton high mileage scheme be delivered.

00:52:46:10 - 00:53:20:26

And I'm not going to go over grounds that I think Mr. Booth addresses you on on need on Wednesday, we would emphasize that point again and rely on everything we've said about the critical need of this 90 kilometre project. But that, again, is important context. So the the alleged, um, loss is not is not evidence or accepted in the way that it's been put forward. Then the applicants refer to construction and uncertainty delay effectively and say in their D2 submissions, well, they'll miss their grid connection deadline.

00:53:20:28 - 00:53:51:11

That is entirely based on a false premise. If I may say so, that the Northumberland mine land will be inaccessible from the moment that the CPO powers are activated by, and get to the moment that the Northumberland project is finished, and that is simply not realistic. So that's the false premise on which their argument about uncertainty and delay is based. Um, this is eminently capable and indeed completely confident. It is capable of being overcome by discussions and cooperation about coexistence.

00:53:51:18 - 00:54:28:19

Unfortunately, the detail of that has only really started to kick in in 2026, but we are making some progress, I'm pleased to report. Um, so if this is a problem, it is a problem at the moment of the applicant's own making. And we've explained in our deadline three submissions at 29 to 32 how it is that already we've proposed some design tweaks to minimise land take and disruption. You'll see those at 29 to 32 self-evidently in Get, which is not a commercial competitor with the applicant here, has no interest or incentive in delaying the applicant scheme.

00:54:28:21 - 00:55:04:19

And we've set out what we've said about compensation at the end of our three submissions so far as that's relevant. So this point about uncertainty really must carry no weight because it's capable of being overcome by negotiation. So the position therefore put forward by the applicant on interaction is overstated. First, in terms of the physical extent of interaction, when one looks at the reality of how much land is permanently required, in fact, in get frequently permits and applicants frequently ask for the ability to put solar panels underneath lines and in close proximity to lines.

00:55:06:10 - 00:55:37:26

Secondly, in terms of the financial loss, the figures used in the D2 submissions use gross revenue figures for the generation loss, not profit, so those figures can't be relied upon at all. And in terms of delay, I've already explained why that's not a problem. Um, other than one of the applicant's own making in terms of route selection and alternatives, I'm a little bit in your hands because we're in a slightly bizarre situation, if I may say so, where the applicant has said, well, this examination is not the time where we're going to get into it and get through selection.

00:55:37:28 - 00:56:15:08

But the landowner, who one assumes is working in some level of coordination with the applicant, has said has spent 20 minutes telling you why N gets route selection is wrong and won't succeed at the examination. I genuinely don't know how much you're going to be assisted by me rebutting every single point. Nevertheless, um, what has been said by the landowner? That selection is to a large extent, simply duplicative of what the applicant has said in their written case. It's not accepted by any as a fair characterization of the route selection process, and much of what was said by the landowner is, in fact, inaccurate.

00:56:15:10 - 00:56:48:05

I'll come on to a few of those points at the moment. The short points on a route selection evolution are these and there are four points. The first is that the African scheme is two kilometers of ultimately relates to two kilometres of a 90 kilometre overhead line scheme and get is promoting. It's going to

promote. So the route selection process is a complicated one of which this is one part of the jigsaw. It is necessarily a sophisticated iterative process.

00:56:48:13 - 00:57:27:12

Secondly, as an iterative process, Njit has along the way listened to a wide range of voices at far beyond, with the greatest respect, the applicant and the landowner in this case, because that is what Edgar is obliged to do, not least under its own licence conditions and as a responsible statutory undertaking promoting a large scheme. Third, the route selection process is necessarily a multifactorial judgment, bringing in a number of specialisms, not simply the commercial interests of landowners, but environmental factors, heritage considerations and programming needs of n get.

00:57:27:14 - 00:58:00:13

There are a wide variety of factors that are considered forth. Um, contrary to what you've been told this morning, and as we've set out in our D3 submissions, the applicant and the landowner have been engaged with for a considerable period of time. In fact, only a month after this scheme was made public, didn't get contact res about a meeting to discuss the project. So the notion that there's been no engagement is a false one. Um, there having been engagement, as we've summarised in our submission.

00:58:00:18 - 00:58:31:05

Um, necessarily the interests of the landowner and applicant have been taken into account, um, in an iterative process of route selection. So I can go into more detail on the route selection if I need to. Um, Suffice to say, so far as the change requests are concerned, um, the applicant's position hitherto or up until December has been the ten get needs to avoid its its project entirely. That was the basis for the requests made.

00:58:31:07 - 00:59:04:06

The requests made last year up until December when things changed bit and get considered the change requests in the summer of last year. The change request I should say, is a it's a process that is established by Njit with its own governance procedures and in bringing in specialisms so that when a change to a proposed route is requested by an interested party of whatever kind, whether it be a landowner or statutory body or other, um, and it doesn't simply take an unstructured approach and send an email saying yes or no.

00:59:04:10 - 00:59:39:07

There is a there is a detailed governance process that accompanies that, um, which culminates in the applicant, sorry, it culminates in the requestor of the change being the first to be told about the outcome. So if you make a request to change a route like the landowner has, they will be the first to be told what the final outcome is of the consideration and get is given to that. And in this case, it is really important that I make this point. There is a meeting on the 23rd of February between N get and the landowner, which I'm sure my friend is aware of.

00:59:39:09 - 01:00:15:09

He's been fully instructed when he is going to be relaying the final outcome of the December change request, and following the normal approach, the landowner will be the first one to be told, rather than it being sprayed around in public. Before that, that is the approach I can get. Takes the preliminary

view of the December change requests. The end gets preliminary view on. That request is set out in the D3 submissions, and you can see a few high level points that will be of concern number one this December route.

01:00:15:18 - 01:00:47:29

Well firstly it doesn't avoid all of the applicants scheme. Secondly, um, it passes in very close proximity to the village and 200m from the scheduled monument, 200m. It is on raised ground. It over sails or clips by 20m residential properties and an animal care facility, just as a matter of high level, obvious examples of what you get when you draw a straight line on a plan, which might look easy in principle, but in practice and then get is well experienced in dealing with this.

01:00:48:15 - 01:01:23:09

The exercise must be a bit more sophisticated than that. Um, so the change requests that were considered in the summer last year were dealt with properly. The outcome was relayed to the applicant, to the landowner. The change request from December made is it's still in the process of being dealt with properly. And the notion that night has not reached has not told the applicant. What it's not told the landowner. What its view is is simply a false one. And yes, it's taking its standard approach to engagement on that. So coming then to the the principle of the provisions, again, we've set this up.

01:01:23:11 - 01:02:01:23

This is the principle of these protective provisions. We've set this out in our D-3 submissions at paragraph 49 and following, um, and yet seeks protective provisions in respect to infrastructure not yet built. Um, the process for applying for its DCO and yet is well advanced with the application is to be submitted, as you know, uh, in September later this year before the DCO is granted for, um, steeple renewables. We've provided you with two examples of precedents where such um, equivalent protected provisions were imposed.

01:02:01:29 - 01:02:22:27

Those were provided, I think, with our relevant rep. Um, and those are important because they completely blow out the water that the applicant submission this morning that as a matter of principle, you can't impose these. It's clear that the Secretary of State has done so in those two. So as a matter of principle, they are open to you to recommend including.

01:02:25:07 - 01:02:43:04

And we can't go behind that. There's no reason why they're prohibited. I take the point about the statutory provisions that were often referred to 127 and 138, but that only gets you so far. The fact is, protective provisions such as these for future infrastructure have been found to be justified and imposed.

01:02:44:28 - 01:03:16:18

The response that the applicant has given on the protective provisions has been thereafter twofold effectively to say, um, that well, the moder and hourly more um s were something different because they were about contingent infrastructure effectively. But that doesn't really go to the point of principle for the reasons we've set out in our table two of the D3 submissions. The second point they make is about the Viking carbon capture scheme and the North Humber Diamond project.

01:03:16:20 - 01:03:56:27

And in that case, it's accepted that the Northampton model project was at a much earlier iteration. This was 2024. We are now in 2026, a mere matter of months away from a submission of a DCO, where necessarily on a project of this scale, as you will know, fewer things can change the closer you get to submission of DCO. We're in a position of some certainty as to its submission and its form. And as you have also seen from our D3 submissions, end, yes, is not working to an open deadline, but to a fixed deadline effectively, by which time it must get this scheme operational.

01:03:57:22 - 01:04:34:12

So the time constraints are not hypothetical. They're not about, um, some nice to have aspect. They are essential to be the contingent infrastructure required for, for example, the Dogger Bank development. I think you heard about on Wednesday, the Bay boundary upgrade. And in order to comply with with MPs licence conditions. So there is eminently a policy justification in this case for imposing the protective provisions given where we are with the Northumberland Modern Project and the proximity of its submission for examination.

01:04:37:21 - 01:05:09:18

So the thought, for those reasons, the protective provisions are justified in principle and justified in practice in this case, given the factors I've suggested just briefly, in terms of the way I'll say is the way forward here, we've presented the protective provisions on the basis that the two projects can and must coexist, and even on the applicant and landowner's new case. Based on their December submission, they accept some measure of overlap.

01:05:09:20 - 01:05:41:05

As a matter of principle, I'm not quite sure how they can work. On the one hand, suggest they accept overlap. On the other hand, completely reject protected provisions because they don't know that we'll be overlapping. Um, recently I can report the have been a series of positive meetings between the net and the applicant, both between principals and engineers, to hammer out points of detail. And these necessarily are on a on a confidential basis you'd expect.

01:05:41:07 - 01:06:17:01

But they must necessarily recognise that it's no answer for the applicant to tell them to go somewhere else, nor for the landowner to tell kneecaps to go somewhere else. That's that's simply not a reasonable response. Um, because as I said, the Northampton high volume scheme is not a it's not aspirational or nice to have. It is about the transmission infrastructure of the country and is of great national importance. What is anticipated by England now is that if the DCO is granted for the applicant scheme, the works to deliver that project can proceed.

01:06:17:03 - 01:06:52:25

Cables can be laid across the north up to high mountain corridor. The corridor will be left undeveloped for a relatively short period of time, and then, once North Humber to High Mountain has been constructed. The balance of the applicants project. So that is the the parts that were interacted with can be delivered. Panels can be put on that that patch between the proposed overhead line and the railway. There will be some areas of land not available for development, but those will be very, very small, just something over 1% of the total site.

01:06:52:27 - 01:07:27:07

So to the extent and to the extent that the applicant may have in fact suffered actual loss in consequence of Northampton model. That will of course be a matter for compensation. That they can argue in due course and get is not shutting that out and is aware of that and is responsible in that respect. And we've set that out in our deadline three submission so slightly longer than I'd expected I'd be. But I hope that's a helpful overview of where we are in terms of the position. I, I would submit that we're not in a, we're not in a position where there needs to be a clash that goes to the end of this examination.

01:07:27:09 - 01:07:37:03

There is eminently a solution here that is available to the parties and, and get very much hopes that that will be fruitful in the, in the very, in the very near future. Thank you very much.

01:07:37:18 - 01:07:46:19

Thank you for that. Um, I will come back to the applicant. Um, I'm going to. Mrs. Warren had a hand up early on. Let her speak.

01:07:46:21 - 01:08:26:21

Hi, Christine. Warren again? Um, the landowner's barrister and the lady that spoke. Not once did they mention, uh, residents. Uh, and it's in the public interest. The landlord has never consulted ever any of the residents within Stoneleigh Steeple or anywhere near his land. Um, and this is just a classic example of the combined impact of two projects colliding. Plus the step fusion and the impact it's got within our villages. And if you can't see that two projects now fighting against each other are not having an impact on the residents and the people of our villages, you can't get any more classic example than what you've just heard.

01:08:26:23 - 01:08:56:27

Now the compensation, the landowner is out for compensation and the amount of money it can get because they it is pure money, nothing else. And the demand of all is exactly the same. But if you can't see that two projects now at this table are not colliding, and the impact that they have got on the residents in our villages, you can't see anything better than this example today. And if you do not look at this example today, you are failing the people around these projects.

01:08:56:29 - 01:08:59:27

Time and time again. Thank you.

01:09:00:16 - 01:09:08:00

Thank you, Mr. Warren. Um, I'll give the applicant an opportunity to respond to what they've just heard. Thank you.

01:09:08:04 - 01:09:24:22

Thank you very much, sir. Um, so I'll adopt the three headings, um, that my friend adopted a moment ago in terms of the extent of the interaction and the the stranded areas and the extent of sterilization, I'm going to turn to Mr. Bridges and he's going to address you on that topic.

01:09:26:26 - 01:09:43:04

Morning, sir. We'll reduce project manager for the applicant. I think it would be useful to, um, put on the screen. Um, the plan that we referred that my colleague referred to. Yeah. Rep 2052.

01:09:45:03 - 01:09:48:19

So this was in our D2 submissions.

01:09:53:13 - 01:10:31:04

And. Yeah. Um, so we talked about a user plan similar to this in the first hearing to talk about, uh, cumulative impacts and different projects. But just so we're all on the same page before I start explaining what the colors are and what's shown on this plan. You'll see a green shading basically to the eastern side of that plan. That is the graduated swathe that National Grid presented at their first round of consultation. The blue shading that goes off from the northwest to the southeast is the corridor.

01:10:31:06 - 01:11:02:19

The national grid put forward for their localized consultation, and then the darker blue, narrower, uh, corridor that is shown on there. That is the, um, routing and the order limits that National Grid presented at their statutory consultation. And, um, behind all that is the order limits for the steeple renewables project. So what we've got on there is the Steeple renewables project and the North Humber to Arnhem, with route corridors used in consultation stages.

01:11:03:22 - 01:11:12:27

With that in mind, just to explain the the points that have been made about the figures used and the areas described and.

01:11:15:13 - 01:11:54:02

It's the 124 hectare acres that we've stated will be sterilised. National grid stated in their D3 submission that, um, 70% of that area would not be impacted. That is on the basis of if that line was built there today, as there is on the eastern side of the site, there's existing infrastructure. That is not the case. When we stated in our D2, um, response the order limits, um, of circa 100 acres.

01:11:54:04 - 01:12:29:13

So where the national grid order limits interact with the staple order limits, that amounts to 100 acres. We stated in our representation that was a worst case scenario, because at that time when we had requested from national grid areas, we've heard that we can go through the areas of no go, areas of construction. They're either unwilling or unable to provide us with that information. Therefore, we have to assume that the whole of that corridor was not available to be used for construction, for access, for cabling.

01:12:31:19 - 01:13:11:10

So therefore you have to assume 100 acres is not available for development. How we get to 124 acres is if we could zoom in slightly to the North Humber to Home Island. Order limits between that and the railway line We've you've heard over the last few days how areas of access are going to be achieved. And you'll recall that that western parcel of Stirling, the steeple essentially divided by the railway line and certainly the northern part to the west of the railway line, is accessed from the road.

01:13:12:13 - 01:13:56:04

So there is no interaction. There is no physical way of getting from that eastern side of the railway to the western side of the railway. So the 24 acres is quite simply the area of land between the the North Humber to Mana border limits and the railway. Because at the at that moment in time, we had no other information to say that we could get to that land, to build it, to construct it. And even if you could helicopter in the solar panels, we need to be able to lay cables through the Northumberland marl and order limits to connect them up to the other side of the order limits so that electrically it works.

01:13:56:15 - 01:14:11:06

So I hope that explains where 124 acres came from. It is not a made up number that is overstated. It is simply with the information we had at that time. We had to assume that that was the worst case.

01:14:16:08 - 01:14:51:08

Yes, yes. Sorry. Just to going back to the point about the 70% sterilized that they've made. And as I said at the beginning there, that's if the the overhead line was there today. And that's very different. On the eastern side of the side, we have National Grid Insurance. If you've heard about the piece for existing assets, when there is a known constraint, whether it's an overhead line, a pipeline and a hedgerow, those features Solar is a flexible form of development that can go around them, can go within close proximity to them.

01:14:51:10 - 01:15:15:23

We've heard about the going underneath them. As a developer, we don't normally propose to go underneath overhead lines. On the other side, we've got a stand off of 20m, and when you've got a fixed structure that doesn't move and is there, yes, it is perfectly conceivable to construct around existing assets. But we haven't here. We have got a corridor that's been thought to be sterilised and we can't go into.

01:15:20:11 - 01:15:58:22

Thanks, Isabella, for the applicant again. So still under this topic of extent of interaction, um, and get submission to you, was that the uncertainty related that we've alleged relating to their project should be given? No, wait, no, wait in your determination. And I know that you looked briefly at the terms of the ingots proposed protective provisions on Wednesday. We had understood they were to be addressed today. Um, so if I could just provide you with some comments on the actual wording of the piece and the uncertainty, we say this gives rise to now there are two versions.

01:15:59:00 - 01:16:31:25

They're both exactly the same except for some formatting issues. So National Grid submitted with their relevant reps and with their deadline three they put some more the same ones in, but they had some red font and that the numbering has gone awry. So I was going to use the one and their relevant rep, which is relevant rep 049 page. I think it's page ten because they're already. So clause one, um, has the definition of apparatus and gets preferred version.

01:16:32:01 - 01:17:03:17

Clause one has an apparatus definition of apparatus which includes any electrical lines, mains, pipes, plant, etc. all other apparatus owned by Njit. For the purposes of the construction, maintenance and

operation of the Hymenium project. Do you have that before you, sir? Is that okay? Okay. Thank you. So short point is, apparatus is defined to include all future apparatus associated with the high modern project.

01:17:05:00 - 01:17:55:13

The north to high modern project is defined simply as a new high voltage transmission line and associated works between Creek Beck in Yorkshire and Hymenium in Nottinghamshire. The precise route isn't specified or defined in the proposed protective provisions, not by reference to a map or a plan or anything of that nature, and but the project is defined to include land on which North Humber to Hymenium apparatus is situated, and on which such apparatus would be needed for construction, use or maintenance, so it will be immediately apparent that the scope of the definition is exceedingly broad and would encompass any future design changes to the North under time on and project still within clause one.

01:17:55:15 - 01:18:41:00

Definitions. Specified works are defined to include any of the works authorized by this DCO that will or may be situated over or within 15m of apparatus. Remembering. Of course, the apparatus includes future apparatus or which may in any way adversely affect any apparatus. So those are the definitions. Clause three then requires the undertaker to use reasonable endeavours to avoid any conflict with the high margin project, and that includes, because reasonable endeavours is defined itself ensuring that the design and program for connection works.

01:18:41:02 - 01:19:12:06

Don't. Unreasonably impede or interfere with the high volume project and facilitating a coordinated approach to program land assembly and the carrying out of the projects. Clause 72 prevents the Undertaker from acquiring any land forming part of the High Mountain project without any gets consent. And of course, we know that the extent of that land is not specified or defined on any plan or in the piece. Um,

01:19:13:24 - 01:19:37:10

clause ten prevents the Undertaker from carrying out any specified works, which you'll remember includes works that may be within 15m or affect future assets without any gets written approval, and any approval may itself be subject to conditions imposed by Njit.

01:19:39:11 - 01:20:11:09

To facilitate the construction, commissioning, operation and maintenance of the hi modern project. Again, it's not possible for Njit to say now where that apparatus will be. And clause 15 requires The Undertaker not to impede access to the Home Island project and or to provide alternative access. So, taken together, Engels protective provisions would prevent the Undertaker, without any gets consent, from acquiring any land which it may need for that project.

01:20:11:15 - 01:20:52:21

The final design and routing of which may yet be subject to change. And I pause there to note that Njit has very recently this week closed a consultation on its project. Um, plainly, for consultation to be lawful, it must be undertaken at a time when plans are still at a formative stage and capable of being changed in response to the consultation, and then gets on project website, which confirmed the

consultation, which has recently closed, and confirms that all consultation responses will be taken into account and may affect the scheme.

01:20:52:23 - 01:21:36:13

And that would have to be correct. So plainly there is scope for further revisions to the nature of the route. Um, so in addition to the Undertaker being unable to acquire any land or carry out any works which might affect apparatus, the location of which is unknown, there's plainly the scope for future changes to the design and and gets proposed would also require the Undertaker to undertake positive steps to ensure that the design and programme of its project does not impede a future project the construction program for which remains uncertain.

01:21:36:22 - 01:22:16:05

So if Njit were to be afforded that level of protection, the certain effect is that, at a minimum, the applicant would only be able to commit to final design and commencement of construction in an as yet undefined overlap area with and gets approval and the obligation on Ingot not to unreasonably withhold consent doesn't really offer any protection at all, because the whole purpose of ingot piece is to protect the high margin project. So it wouldn't be unreasonable for ingot to hold out and refuse to give consent until such time as it has certainty about its route and design.

01:22:16:13 - 01:22:49:23

So we say there is very real uncertainty, and it presents a very real commercial risk for this project. The applicant's proposed project provisions are well, they Seek to protect existing assets in the normal way. And on that, I'll just touch on the precedents that Angot have referred to. So they've they've provided you with two precedents, but hourly more and the Moana offshore wind farm schemes. And we've provided comments on those in our deadline to submissions.

01:22:49:25 - 01:23:20:07

But we say that the circumstances are very difficult for a number of different for a number of reasons. First, in both of those cases, the protective provisions were agreed. By the end of the examination. They were agreed between Net and the applicant, not least because the future energy projects were extensions to substations which the offshore wind farms needed.

01:23:20:11 - 01:23:59:27

So that means that there was no dispute at the end of the examination for the examining authority or the Secretary of State to resolve in respect to those protected provisions. Second. In both of those cases, the protected provision protected a particular fixed node the connection point into the substation, which meant there was little or no variation or uncertainty risk. Whereas here, as we've heard, this is a 90 kilometre overhead line and changes to some portions may require consequential changes to others.

01:23:59:29 - 01:24:34:18

And we know that route can't be finally fixed because otherwise the consultation would be unlawful. Um, and third, the areas that were subject to protection in those two cases didn't affect the generating capacity of the schemes. They didn't prevent or delay the applicants from progressing the design and construction of their offshore wind farm arrays. If you think about they know their connection point is

going to be to this particular substation, which may be extended, but that doesn't stop them getting on with the design and construction of their offshore wind farm array.

01:24:34:20 - 01:25:07:11

It's just the connection point, so it's very much less of an impact. And fourth, it's important to note that neither we nor you are privy to any side agreements, commercial agreements that were agreed between the applicants and national grid in those cases which may have made protective provisions and acceptable to them. So we say, in fact, that the Viking CCS scheme is an important and relevant precedent.

01:25:07:14 - 01:25:38:28

It's the only case that we're aware of. The only case where there was a dispute at the end of the examination. And so the Secretary of State had to make a determination. And we have provided, um, the PPE is the one get proposed on the Vikings scheme there in rep 2052 from page three and 99. And what they were proposing then on Viking is very similar to what they're proposing here.

01:25:39:00 - 01:26:19:29

They proposed a definition of apparatus that included specified future projects. They proposed a requirement that the undertaker used reasonable endeavours not to impede those future projects, or to acquire land forming part of those future projects, or to impede access. So very similar to the purpose proposed here. And that case came after the hourly mall DCO, which Inga again relied on as a precedent in that case. Yet the examining authority accepted the applicant's position that future projects, which would not be determined for some time, should not impinge on the Viking DCO.

01:26:20:01 - 01:26:50:11

And the Secretary of State agreed. We have also produced the final piece that the Secretary of State did impose on the Viking DCO, and that's again in rep 2052 from page 389. And you'll see, for example, the definition of apparatus only included existing and there is no protection for future assets. So yeah, as I say, Angus has sought to distinguish Viking from the North Humber project.

01:26:50:13 - 01:27:21:12

They say oh well, the Viking project had only been subject to stage one consultation, whereas we've undertaken stage one and stage two consultation. But the applicant doesn't accept that to be a relevant distinction. Um, as in Viking, it's clear that any DCO for the project will be not be determined for some time. Um, the route for the Himalayan project cannot be certain. Um, in light of the consultation that's been undertaken.

01:27:21:16 - 01:27:42:15

We don't yet know the outcome of the consultation exercise because no application has been submitted. So we haven't seen a consultation report either from the statutory consultation that took place last year or the more recent consultation that closed. Um, but as I say, there must be scope for changes to be made at this stage. Um, so

01:27:44:09 - 01:27:56:29

we say that the Viking case is the only disputed case. Um, and the Secretary of State found in favour of the applicant. Um, finally, on route alternatives and route selection.

01:27:59:26 - 01:28:37:12

As I said at the outset, I recognise that this is not a point on which you can come to a concluded view. What we would like you to take away is, um, the very real uncertainty that we say, um, remains outstanding. And just as a matter of chronology, I know you've seen the route shown, but n get carried out this non-statutory consultation in 2023 and they identified their preferred graduated swathe. And I think it's coming up on the plan again, which is the sort of green, the green colour to the east of the railway line to the east.

01:28:37:14 - 01:29:10:28

And yes, that would potentially still have some interaction with our scheme, but to a much lesser degree. And so they preferred their graduated sway. They said that that had been selected following careful analysis. We've put in their report. It's very thorough in July to August of 2024. They then carried out this localised consultation and at that stage they they renamed them, they called the graduated swathe, the Eastern Corridor. And they introduced this western corridor or possibly the other way round.

01:29:11:00 - 01:29:47:07

Anyway, they now had an eastern and western corridor. They made it clear that they hadn't decided which of the two was preferable. Um, then when they carried out their statutory consultation in 2025, they had this sort of hybrid of the two which you can see part eastern, part western. But the reasons for selecting that route are unclear. And I've heard what my learned friend said. Well, it's a multidisciplinary exercise and we have to listen to other people, not just you, the applicant and the landowner, but the design report we've submitted that came out with their statutory consultation.

01:29:47:09 - 01:30:19:09

They said the eastern and western corridors present different challenges and opportunities and neither is considered unfeasible. They said no feedback received during either consultation provided information to suggest that a route within the eastern or western corridor would be unfeasible, and no clear preference emerged through the consultation process. They said in the absence of landscape designations in either the eastern or western corridors.

01:30:19:15 - 01:30:53:03

Routing through either corridor would comply with relevant landscape and visual amenity planning policy so that they're raising these. They're raising these issues now. Crossing A132 line landscape impacts a heritage impact. Those weren't showstoppers then. We don't accept them. We there's plenty we have to say on the relative heritage impacts of merits of the eastern or western corridor. But but that's only going to be so useful to you at this stage.

01:30:53:05 - 01:31:35:18

We simply said, we do not accept the proposition that there are defensible reasons for this late decision to adopt the the eastern corridor, and we will be making those robustly. Um, thank you very much. Oh, sorry. Sorry. One issue, one issue showed to them, possibly one other compensation. I know my learned friend touched on compensation. As to the issue of compensation, and Gets has suggested in its deadline three submissions that it will be willing to pay compensation that is not secured through the protective provisions.

01:31:35:21 - 01:32:13:01

Instead, any compensation and sorry. And nor is it, of course, secured in the normal way when someone is subject to compulsory acquisition. And that triggers the requirement for compensation because Njit doesn't own this land. Um, so any compensation that they may be willing to pay would be reliant on a commercial side agreement. You'll be aware from our respective submissions that there's ongoing dispute about the nature of the impact, and there can be no certainty, even with both parties trying as much as they will.

01:32:13:18 - 01:32:50:00

the agreement can be reached and even if agreement is reached, it's one to which you will not be privy. So you're being asked to impose protective provisions that give ingot rights over land it doesn't own, and in respect of which its public interest justification has not been tested through examination rights that would indisputably sterilize part of the steeple development without securing any right to compensation. That's what you're being asked to do. And that's that will be the effect if you impose the protective provisions that are asking you to propose.

01:32:50:02 - 01:32:55:07

And we say that would be an extremely draconian step to countenance.

01:32:59:12 - 01:33:02:17

So just bear with me one second. There might be one just further point.

01:33:23:14 - 01:34:16:27

For the applicant. We are, as you would expect, engaged in in discussions with Engie. And we were slightly concerned to hear that some of the content of that, those without prejudice discussions appeared to be being aired a short moment ago. But but they have referred to principles of cooperation that are being discussed. What we want to know is, are those principles of cooperation something that Angot are willing to commit to through protective provisions, because unless unless they are, you can have no certainty about the nature of the offers that are being made about programming or Or facilitation that could be made to lay you no cables at this stage or the offers of compensation that have been made.

01:34:17:12 - 01:34:40:00

But we will continue to work with anger, obviously. Um, but in a way that says that, you know, you the issue for the examining authority is what is secured through the protective provisions. And I've explained, I hope, as clearly as I can, the uncertainty and the concerns that we have with those as currently drafted. Thank you.

01:34:40:15 - 01:35:12:00

Thank you very much. Um, thank you to all the parties. Um, you've made your positions clear, as clear as you can. Um, I'll refer back to, um, that action point that was in the, um, hearing two days ago. I just want to, um, read it out again, because that's very important to us. Um, and just make one thing a little bit clearer and if need be. We'll write it into the action point from this meeting.

01:35:12:02 - 01:35:31:29

We said that, um, previous here in the applicant and National Grid undertook to discuss and agree a way forward regarding the drafting of without prejudice, protective provisions regarding the North Humber to Heyman and project as a separate part to schedule ten of the DCO to submit by deadline five. Um,

01:35:33:22 - 01:36:05:14

I think it would be important from from what I've heard that within that it's clear which bits of the protective provisions you you have agreed. And I think broadly, they will fall under the category of the existing apparatus. And I'm assuming from what I've heard, the two parties will have different versions of the, um, that will apply to the, the new apparatus.

01:36:07:26 - 01:36:12:29

Isabella to fall for the applicant. We will certainly work towards that, sir. Yes.

01:36:14:02 - 01:36:14:24

Thank you.

01:36:15:02 - 01:36:18:02

Um, yeah. Jonathan will try and get me. Certainly will as well.

01:36:18:05 - 01:36:59:04

Thank you. Um, and this is a side issue. Um, I'm conscious that there are members of the public in the, in the room, and they've heard a very technical legal discussion that's gone on that. Um, Mrs. Warren raised the point of their involvement in, um, I'm just highlighting you've spoken about consultations that have gone on public consultations that, um, I think it's important that you you've heard the views of the general public about their involvement in this, and they're not left without, um, an involvement in decisions that are being made.

01:37:01:26 - 01:37:10:09

I have no more I want to say on the North Humber to. Hi madam scheme to you, Mr. Robinson. I just want to pick.

01:37:10:11 - 01:37:10:26

Up one.

01:37:10:28 - 01:37:51:15

Point about this section 127138 argument, because it was something that was mulling in my mind, and the applicant made its position clear that you don't consider this. The section 127138 case applies to the proposed protective provisions. Um, obviously I don't need to recite the test, but it's clearly important that the Secretary of State has to do that. I listened to Mr. Welch's response to that, where you sort of agreed with that, but then you said it was not the whole picture, to paraphrase slightly what it was, but it was along those lines.

01:37:52:10 - 01:37:57:04

Can you confirm whether the proposed protective provisions that you're seeking.

01:37:57:06 - 01:38:01:05

Triggers one, two seven and 138 of the act or not?

01:38:17:21 - 01:38:57:21

I think that in principle the answer is you're correct. Um, but we will. I'll just bottom that out and we can follow it up in writing. As in, you're correct as in that there wouldn't trigger. Um, but I think my, my point earlier was that that's not a reason in principle not to recommend, um, those provisions, but I will we'll we'll perhaps set that out in writing. So you have it very clearly. I think that would be useful because I'm thinking ahead to when we write our recommendation report and obviously having to make this very, very clear where there's a dividing line, I think there's an important dividing line to be struck here.

01:38:57:23 - 01:39:24:00

So we would welcome your clarification on the position. I get what you're saying is effectively you're saying it. Well, if it doesn't apply, then we still think we have a case for these being imposed. But it's it's separate to that. And I think that's what we would just like absolute clarification on. So that we're all so we know the parties positions and that we can make an informed judgment on that in our recommendation report.

01:39:29:22 - 01:39:38:22

Thank you, Mr. Robertson. I suggest that we move on to item seven on the agenda, which Mr. Robinson will take us through.

01:39:40:16 - 01:40:12:04

Thank you, Mr. Wiltshire. Um, this is this shouldn't take. I'm not anticipating this will take too long. This agenda item. But it's really. I'd like the applicant just to provide a very quick verbal update on the latest position with regards to the consents and licences that are identified in the Consents and Agreements Position statement, which is Rep 1-006 and whether you need any further consents or licenses that have been identified.

01:40:14:18 - 01:40:17:07

Thank you sir. Okay. Got for the applicant. Um,

01:40:19:07 - 01:40:50:14

in short, no, sir. Um, you've heard separately yesterday you've had an update in regard to the, uh, Lonnie and the draft, uh, EPs applications. Um, that would be the only update is just to give a more recent chronology of that. But you've heard that already. Thanks. That's that's very useful clarification. And thank you. And I just wanted to double check with with the local authorities.

01:40:50:16 - 01:41:12:08

It will have to be Nottinghamshire County Council that we asked this question at first written questions. And it seemed to be clear that you do not see a need for a section 106 planning application. But I just want to be absolutely clear going forward that that remains the position to we're not going to be expecting something that lands on our doorstep at a later date.

01:41:14:12 - 01:41:40:26

I just even point to Nottinghamshire County Council, certainly not from this county council's position. I can't speak for Bassetlaw, but I'm not aware of anything coming up that I've heard from them. But just speaking from the county council. Thank you very much. That's useful clarification and I'll now hand back over to that's the end of item seven, and I'll hand it over to Mr. Wiltshire to deal with the remaining items on the agenda.

01:41:44:12 - 01:42:14:13

Um, thank you, Mr. Robinson. Um, item eight is review of matters and actions arising. Um, I've got notes on 15 actions from this hearing and I'm happy to run through them if anybody wants me to, but I'm happy to publish them. Um, unless somebody wants me to read them out. Does anybody want me to read them out? No.

01:42:15:18 - 01:42:35:03

Okay. Um. Item nine is any other business. We've not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business. Um, I can see a hand up that is relevant to this hearing, but, um, I will take a question from, um, Miss Byatt. Thank you.

01:42:35:05 - 01:42:45:15

Emily. By representing central city or parish council. Um, a request for improved partnership working between stakeholders.

01:42:45:17 - 01:42:46:10

We've talked.

01:42:46:12 - 01:42:46:29

And.

01:42:47:01 - 01:42:47:16

Heard.

01:42:47:18 - 01:43:30:23

About, um, different stakeholders here today having, um, quite sort of complex, um, processes to go through to come to agreements about how they work collaboratively. Um, as a small team of parish councillors, we've got nine seats. We're all volunteers, many of which work full time, and it has grown exponentially. What's required of our small team? And one of the things that is particularly challenging for us is to keep our residents apprised of projects that are that have multiple moving parts and change from day to day.

01:43:30:29 - 01:43:32:22

And there are

01:43:34:17 - 01:44:19:19

quite a bit of variability about how, um, different project groups go about consultation, how transparent they are about the comments they receive and what they do with that data to make sure that it informs how they design a project and we as a community are in desperate need of joined up working. It has been proposed by residents, um, that we need a stakeholder group where we have a

seat at that table to be able to come together and talk about some of these things where there is cumulative impact.

01:44:19:21 - 01:44:52:00

What I would say in earlier stages of consultation is that projects will refuse to comment about other, other projects. So you end up in a situation where you have consultation, fatigue, mass confusion and utter chaos. So we as a community, however, this um, whatever, ultimately the decision is made on this project. It's something as a community we feel strongly that we need a link.

01:44:52:02 - 01:45:25:19

Person well, a group of link people to be able to post questions, get responsive answers in a timely manner. It is. It cannot be the role of US or parish council to try to get all the information from so many stakeholders, and it will cause a lot of distress to our residents. A lot of confusion. So as I say, that's something I think all stakeholders really need to take on, on board and hear us about.

01:45:25:26 - 01:45:48:11

Um, it's pleasing to hear Notts County Council, you know, reiterating the importance of the voice of the community. Um, but we will not be heard, will be drowned out by, you know, long speeches and technical jargon that we do not have resources to understand and represent ourselves Really?

01:45:50:17 - 01:46:28:27

Thank you. That was very well made. And there are a number of parties in the room. I just give them the opportunity to to respond to that. Um, maybe starting with the applicant. So thank you, Patrick Robinson, for the applicant, but we couldn't agree more. Certainly, if you move into the, um, uh, post consent design and implementation phase, liaison with the community is, um, massively important. And indeed that liaison with other developers to ensure if there is coordination with other developers, that that's done both in the development's interest and and with the and with the local community.

01:46:28:29 - 01:46:43:12

So anything that can be done to streamline the flow of information, how to detailed design with other projects into the community, and to take that feedback we'd be looking to do. And of course, a development representatives would be doing that.

01:46:45:22 - 01:46:50:02

Sorry, Yes. Just one. Oh, sorry. I just want to talk one more point. Just for the applicant.

01:46:50:14 - 01:46:50:29

That is.

01:46:51:01 - 01:47:18:05

Absolutely heard. And we heard yesterday. Um, I think for Mr. Fleming about the liaison group, it's a well-established principle in the minerals world to have liaison groups not just at construction, but on the ongoing maintenance that's been set up, obviously, for the steeple quarry. Um, sorry, the stone quarry. Um, we will look to we have communication lines with Holcim, whether that's something that we can expand upon and develop, we will do, but we we can hear what's being said and we will definitely take that on board.

01:47:19:10 - 01:47:57:03

I think pleasing to hear that. I would say the consultation has been highly disappointing to date. You know, we don't feel we've been heard. Um, and sorry, I did forget to mention earlier that just to give a sense of the level of anxiety and uncertainty we as residents live with, we heard from the representative of the landowner that There is potential talk of a project for data center. Now we are doing our level best to remain apprised of all projects, and this is another one we had no, no awareness of.

01:47:57:05 - 01:48:25:16

So, um, it's very unnerving for a group of people, um, needing to live and work, get our children to school and commute to work. Um, to know that such transformation is taking place in our local community. So our voice must be heard and and we must inform the construction, you know, the processes, the procedural elements as well.

01:48:26:15 - 01:48:57:14

Thank you. That's that's very clear. Um, I'll come to you, Mrs. One in a minute. I just, um, there's a few other parties around the table. I'd just given them the opportunity to to respond to what Mrs. Byatt said if they want to. So we've got the landowner, the National Grid and also Nottinghamshire. I don't know if they each want to say anything further, just to echo. I think in a way what the applicant said, that this is something that Edgar takes very seriously and both in relation to its own projects and indeed its interactions with other projects.

01:48:57:16 - 01:49:24:02

And that's part of the reason we're here today. And of course, the extensive engagement and working with the community is something that Angus is experienced in doing as a responsible statutory undertaker and developer, and is indeed part of the reason why the development of projects such as Northumbria High Modern do take quite a long time, because of the extensive nature of that of that work. So those points are certainly heard and and will continue to be taken seriously by engaged.

01:49:26:03 - 01:49:27:12

Thank you for that.

01:49:28:25 - 01:49:44:16

Yeah. Thank you very much, sir. Just to say, there's probably very, very little more than I can say to assist you on that. We've obviously heard what has been said, and indeed we understand the preceding consultation. You've heard our own dissatisfaction as a consultation has been undertaken engagement with us. So we absolutely appreciate that.

01:49:45:21 - 01:49:46:13

Thank you.

01:49:49:14 - 01:50:21:24

Stephen Pointon, Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, certainly, uh, echo very much, um, what's been said about future engagement with the community, uh, with a part of several, uh, community liaison groups certainly associated with minerals, but also in other major development areas across the

county where significant development is happening. Uh, and often we do do those with the, uh, the district council. Um, I think the issue here is the, the multiple projects in this area, which is quite unique.

01:50:21:26 - 01:50:55:08

You know, when we think about West Burton, solar already got approval. Um, the other projects coming into West Burton, uh, the Step project, uh, is on the West Burton Power Station site. That's something we are working with. And, um, it's subject to Projects consultation. So I think, you know, there's there's very, very good reason for, um, potentially the local authorities to help take the lead on pulling together, um, you know, single years and groups where we can have multiple parties, um, involved in keeping the community updated.

01:50:55:10 - 01:51:29:03

So, um, you know, I will take that away. I will speak to my elected members as well on that. Uh, and I'm sure Bassetlaw, if they were here, would say similar. Um, so, yeah, I can only hopefully assure the, um, the parish council that we will, uh, hopefully oversee that process going forward. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Pointer. And I will put it down as a point of action on here. Um, do you have any comments about what? You have any, um, ability to, um, encourage Bassetlaw to be part of that?

01:51:31:19 - 01:51:57:11

Have no authority whatsoever about all that. But, um, you know, we've already heard of local government regularization. We are going to be moving towards the single council in this area going forward, so I can only hope that would aid matters and make sure the right people in the room. But I certainly can pass that. I'll certainly be writing to the head of planning at Bassetlaw to update them on the outcome of the hearings.

01:51:58:03 - 01:52:01:04

Certainly that would be appreciated. Thank you,

01:52:02:22 - 01:52:04:20

Mrs. Warren. You had your hand up.

01:52:04:26 - 01:52:05:18

I did, I did.

01:52:05:21 - 01:52:06:11

Um.

01:52:06:26 - 01:52:37:18

We talk about the projects. Um, but the biggest project I feel that impacts on people is the landowner. And we haven't a clue what he's doing. The, um, the gentleman today is talking about compensation for the landowner and what's happening to landowner, but not nobody within certain people. Since it was, it was purchased a few years ago by Mr. Johnson. Actually knows what the intentions of of the landowner is. So we have all these projects coming through.

01:52:37:23 - 01:53:12:18

Um, which basically comes through the landowner who's selling his land off or renting his land and doing everything he needs to do. And if you looked at the map that went up the little white bit in the middle. It's still the steeple being squashed by all these, um, these projects. And the landowner, because the landowner of the first time in all the projects that I've looked at and watched, and it's the first time the landowner has actually had a representative, and that representative is here for the money that the landowner wants for his, for his money, he wants for his projects.

01:53:12:20 - 01:53:43:29

It's not once, as a landowner, considered the people that live in the steeple, and it seems as if he doesn't need to. He can do anything he wants. And all these projects are coming through, and the landowner continually makes money at the expense of the people of the steeple. And I think it's absolutely a disgrace. And I can't do this anymore. This is my last meeting, and I hope the landowner is happy when he's destroyed everything that we know. The land, the agriculture, everything will go.

01:53:44:01 - 01:53:51:12

So all you projects are here and it all bases on what the landowner is selling. Because he's sold certain his people down this morning.

01:53:52:26 - 01:54:07:13

Thank you, Mr. Swann. As you said, it's representative of the landowner here. And I do hope he'll, um, reflect back, um, the desire of the residents to to engage with the landowner.

01:54:07:29 - 01:54:11:01

Yes, sir. We will have a transcript of the meeting, and we will need that.

01:54:11:24 - 01:54:18:23

Thank you very much. Um, does anybody have any further points they wish to make before I move to closing?

01:54:22:09 - 01:54:24:00

No. Thank you. Um,

01:54:25:20 - 01:54:45:25

may I remind you of the timetable for this examination requires that the parties provide written summaries of the oral submissions made during today's hearing. On or before deadline for which is Thursday the 19th of February. May I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the Planning Inspectorate website as soon as practicable after this hearing.

01:54:47:17 - 01:55:10:24

Before we close, we'd like to thank all of today's participants for their time and assistance during the course of this hearing, and also for their participation in the examination to date. They've been extremely helpful to us in gathering the information we need to make our recommendations to the Secretary of State. The time is now exactly 1:00. And this is your specific hearing for the proposed, um.

01:55:12:25 - 01:55:16:27

SCL renewables project is now closed. Thank you.