



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Lime Down Solar Farm Project
Hearing:	Transcript of preliminary meeting - Part 2
Date:	21 April 2026

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

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

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

File Name: LDS_21APR_PM_PT2.mp4

File Length: 00:36:25

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:17 - 00:00:16:14

Everyone to please take their seats as we will be ready to resume the hearing. It's 1120. People could take their seats. Please, sir.

00:00:34:11 - 00:00:40:22

We are ready to resume the preliminary meeting. If people could please take their seats.

00:00:50:16 - 00:00:51:27

Thank you very much.

00:00:53:23 - 00:01:24:25

So I would now like to turn to annex F of the rule six letter. You will note, the examining authority made several procedural decisions on such things as the use of artificial intelligence, statement of common ground, document updates and deadline for submission of written reps and local impact reports. Annex F provides further details regarding all of our requests, which we suggest you read through. I do not intend to go through them all, but I would like to draw particular attention to just a few things.

00:01:25:02 - 00:02:02:21

Firstly, the use of artificial intelligence or AI in submissions. Now we understand the benefits that AI can bring when it is used ethically and transparently to aid such usage. All participants in the examination are directed to Pin's guidance for submitting information that has been generated or altered by AI. If any party uses AI to create its submission, it's important to let us know. This does not include basic spell checks or grammar tools, of course, but in this context all parties should specify which AI systems or tools have been used.

00:02:02:24 - 00:02:38:15

The source of the information that the AI system has based its content on, and what parts of the submitted information or representation AI has been used to create or alter. When you have used AI to summarize, substantially rewrite or add commentary to information which goes beyond a simple factual description. This can affect the accuracy and interpretation of the underlying data. In addition to telling us that you've used AI, as with all other information submitted to us, it is your responsibility to ensure that it is fit for purpose, accurate, complete and not misleading.

00:02:39:16 - 00:03:15:00

If you do not declare the use of AI in any evidence, submission where it has been used, or remove evidence of AI authorship such as watermarks, the reserves the right to reject the submission if it highly suspects AI has been used. As a general comment, I just want to reiterate something which I said earlier, and that is that the quality of the response is what matters rather than the quantity. And in

responses from the public, we are most interested in any effects that the proposed development may have on them and their local surroundings, as opposed to more generic statements which AI can create.

00:03:15:02 - 00:03:56:12

So we would really ask you to think local so that we can really understand your local issues and not just the generic statements. Now moving on then, to statements of common ground. We just heard about statements of common ground, where we were talking about the time table and the rule six letter had initially requested the statement of common ground, that initial statements are submitted by deadline one. And we named a number of parties we felt that the applicant should concentrate upon. But we've heard from Wiltshire Council, for example, there's a little bit of difficulty in making deadline one for the initial statement, I just want to ask, would the applicant be concerned if this were pushed back to deadline two?

00:04:00:13 - 00:04:34:26

Claire Broderick for the applicant? No. We'd rather. The initial draft was as informative as possible, so we will. We would be happy with that extension of time. We're aware that there are other draft documents. For example, I think I mentioned in terms of things like protective provisions, which were in the process of preparing, which may well inform the council's comments on certain matters in that draft statement of common ground. So I think that would be of assistance to the examination if that was delayed to deadline, too.

00:04:34:28 - 00:05:07:07

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Obviously, we will publish a rule eight timetable and that will confirm the date of deadline to. But having heard what you've said this morning, we think there's some benefit in in certainly pushing that back a little bit. Now I want to also come on to stop lying down because obviously we've received a request from Stop Lime Dam about, having a statement to common ground with the applicant. Now, it's unusual ordinarily in the DCO process for an applicant to enter into a statement of common ground with an action group.

00:05:07:21 - 00:05:34:28

But obviously you do represent a large majority of your community. We understand that we are not necessarily averse to a statement of common ground between the applicant and stop lying down. Um, but we would like to ask the applicant whether they feel it would be helpful to them to be able to produce one with you. So really, before Mr. Gazelka, I come over to you. I'd like to come to the applicant on that matter.

00:05:36:03 - 00:06:14:02

Clare Brodrick, the applicant? Yes. We actually had a meeting with representatives from Stop Lying Down and Mr. Gazelka yesterday to discuss the form of statement of common ground and what topics that could usefully cover so as to aid the examining authority rather than just a being a document to reiterate the party's two positions. Um, we discussed and sort of agreed on the format of that document. Some of that is going to be dependent on more technical information that may be being submitted as part of the written representations.

00:06:14:04 - 00:06:47:08

So, um, the applicant is happy to have a statement of common ground. Um, the topics that it will cover may be quite limited in terms of those areas of agreement. Um, particularly whereby um, there may be agreement on technical experts on the type of the baseline and the methodology in a similar way that we would be doing statements of common ground with other stakeholders where, um, stop lying down, have engaged experts to prepare evidence on their part.

00:06:47:10 - 00:07:17:13

We feel that there could be helpful to have a statement of common ground to document those areas where there is agreement on particular topics. However, we didn't feel that it would be helpful when we had our discussion yesterday to sort of rotate the policy position, for example, or to reiterate points where there isn't any agreement at all on kind of in principle issues, as it were. It was more going to concentrate on those more particular topics that you may find of assistance.

00:07:17:24 - 00:07:18:12

Thank you.

00:07:19:14 - 00:07:51:25

Yes. Thank you. I guess from our perspective, what we haven't requested in this are, in essence, statements of disagreement. We are looking at statements of common ground and appreciative at the moment. That part is probably Mars part. But the point is that there should be hope through a statement of common ground to to actually reduce the areas of disagreement. So just going through a position of everything's in opposition, that really won't be a benefit between stop lying down and yourselves to have a statement of common ground in that effect.

00:07:51:27 - 00:08:00:28

So it sounds like there is a way forward between the parties. Mr. Gazelka, do you want to comment on that?

00:08:01:00 - 00:08:34:05

Um, Daniel Gazelka, stop lying down. No. Um, I agree with what the applicant has just said. We're very conscious that there's no use in basically repeating our relevant reps and the response to relevant reps. And so we will be producing a document which may take a little bit longer than you might experience with other statements of common ground legal bodies as a result of the extensive disagreements. But we hope that something which you can at least see some level of agreement so that you can have some comfort, that some things are agreed and some particularly technical items you can set to one side from our perspective.

00:08:34:07 - 00:08:36:15

So we will help in whatever way we can on that.

00:08:37:21 - 00:08:45:10

Okay. I think we will issue a procedural decision as part of our rule eight to direct a statement of common ground between the two parties.

00:08:47:05 - 00:09:24:26

Clare project for the applicant, I'm just to say, on the remainder of the the list of parties that are listed in annex F. We have contacted those organizations. We are still waiting to hear back from some of them as to whether they wish to enter into a statement of common ground. Um, the document that I mentioned earlier in terms of that statement of commonality that will submit a deadline, one will set out the status. So if we requested, for example, you've got a number of the water undertakers on there, it may well be that they don't consider it appropriate to enter into a statement of common ground, and protected provisions are sufficient, in which case we'll provide that update in that statement of commonality document.

00:09:25:18 - 00:09:27:18

That sounds very helpful. Thank you.

00:09:30:06 - 00:09:39:25

Okay. Um, does anybody else have anything to say about statements of common ground before I move on? Wiltshire Council, please.

00:09:41:06 - 00:10:11:13

John McCullough, Wiltshire Council. Uh, it's helpful to receive that indication regarding the direction for a statement of common ground between the applicant and stop lying down. That's indeed a position that we, the council, support. We also note that there may be other stakeholders, in particular perhaps at the town and parish councils, who may request a similar direction. And so we simply ask that if those requests are forthcoming, that we support favourable consideration of them from the council's perspective.

00:10:12:16 - 00:10:43:04

Thank you. We haven't received any representations, as I understand it, from parish councils, to enter into statements of common ground. I would reiterate the comments I just made with stop line down statements of common ground are about trying to get to areas of agreement, and if there are parish councils that feel that statements of common ground they could enter into with the applicant, then obviously they should put that in their written submissions and we would consider that through through the process.

00:10:43:12 - 00:10:57:11

Um, given the large number of parish councils, there obviously is an element of resourcing involved in that and we would need to take some notice also from the applicant about their position on that. But at this point in time, we haven't received any requests.

00:10:59:08 - 00:11:11:22

Uh, Joel McCullough for. What's your counsel? Indeed, madam. We'll leave it to those town and parish councils to make their representations. I simply set out the support on the side of what? Your council. But I can't take it much further than that.

00:11:13:15 - 00:11:16:06

Does the applicant have anything further on that.

00:11:17:18 - 00:11:41:08

Clare project for the applicant? No. I need to echo that it would be a statement of common ground, would need to deal probably with some specific matters relating to that particular elements of the scheme that are within that parish, rather than necessarily setting out in principle points on the scheme. So if there's specific technical points or very localized points than happy to consider any requests for statement of common ground. Thank you.

00:11:41:17 - 00:12:16:03

Absolutely. And as I reiterated before, what we're looking for from from interested parties and parish councils are the real local things, the things that impact their their community, their parish, rather than the wider spread of topics which can be covered elsewhere in other written representations. Okay, so moving on. Um, to document updates, we did request, um as a procedural decision in our rule six letter, some document updates from the applicant, specifically compulsory acquisition and land rights tracker.

00:12:16:17 - 00:12:49:11

Um, the X-ray. We note that in response to our rule six letter, the applicant has submitted an updated land rights tracker to capture additional information that we that we requested. However, we note that the likely duration of temporary rights sought has not been included in the table. Um, the applicant is requested at this preliminary meeting to revisit this um, in its subsequent updates of the tracker, or explain why it cannot identify the likely duration of temporary right sort.

00:12:49:17 - 00:12:58:06

We will be included in this request as a new procedural decision in our rule eight letter. So I just want to ask the applicant if they want to make any comments on that.

00:12:58:18 - 00:13:36:03

Project for the applicant. Um, we we did note that the request and it has been noted on in other examinations for this particular project. All we can say for any of the given points is the entire duration of the, um, construction period. It's not possible at this stage to specify the exact time period per plot. So we could add the column, but it would, it would just be the entire duration of the construction period that would go in that, in that column. So we didn't feel that that would be of assistance, um, to you, um, in the sense that it doesn't provide an individual breakdown per plot.

00:13:36:05 - 00:13:36:28

Thank you.

00:13:37:21 - 00:14:07:21

I think that statement alone is more helpful than us having no understanding of how long the temporary rights are sought, because it isn't clear. Obviously, each plot is very different, and some it might be the whole of the construction period. It might be the first month in others where you're just creating an access, which is to be, you know, maintained for the life of, of, of the development, but still as a temporary possession. So it would still be helpful for the land rights tracker to to have some information about the duration of temporary rights, please, and say we will put something in our rule eight about that.

00:14:09:13 - 00:14:45:08

Um, then I just want to touch upon additional submissions. Since we publish the rule six letter, we made procedural decisions to accept additional submissions from the following interested parties Alex Lloyd-Jones Conor Harkins. No one without my glasses. It's really difficult. Jeremy Nicholson, Philip Elmslie and Rupert Lang I mentioned this simply for our procedure. Um, we've also made a procedural decision to accept an additional submission from the applicant. Um, that was obviously in relating to their way that they were going to comment on relevant representations, but that did get published on the examination library.

00:14:47:15 - 00:15:50:17

Now, if anybody wants to make any comments on any of those documents that we accepted after the rule six letter, then deadline one Friday, the 1st of May is the time to do that. Now, before I pass over to my colleague, Mr. Northover, to deal with item six on the agenda, um, as part of our rule eight, the XAT will be making a further procedural decision to request additional plans from the applicant. So I would just set out what these are so that we can understand the visibility of the proposed development in the winter months from year 15 onwards, where the applicant has a viewpoint that currently has a year, one winter and a year 15 summer photo montage, we would like the applicant to provide either a winter year 15 photo montage, so that we can understand the effectiveness of the screening planting in the winter months or we require a justification for not providing a year 15 winter view.

00:15:50:22 - 00:16:00:10

For example, if there is no proposed vegetation screening in the photo montage and the year 15 photo montage would look the same as the year one winter view.

00:16:04:08 - 00:16:28:21

So did you get all of that? We will put it in our rule eight letter. Um, but just so we're clear now, we would be looking. We appreciate the time it would take to produce photo montages. So we would be looking at deadline three at the latest for the provision of those Winter 15 photo montages, although obviously deadline two would be more helpful to all parties. Over to the applicant to comment, please.

00:16:29:00 - 00:17:03:24

Claire. Budget for the applicant. Yes. That's noted. I think what would be most helpful is we'll check with the team that produced those photo montages to understand the time frames, and then we can inform the case team as soon as possible as to when it's likely so that if that deadline three date is not achievable for a particular reason, then we would then we could let you know as soon as possible. We do have, um, the relevant people attending or coming later on today. So we'll be able to check with them this afternoon so we can update the case team in the morning on those on those timeframes.

00:17:04:14 - 00:17:41:03

We would really urge for deadline three to be met if, I mean, if at all possible, simply because that would inform our hearings. And as my colleague Mr. Love mentioned earlier, um, or it might even be Mr. Northover, we are likely very highly likely to have a landscape and visual impact hearing in that June July block. Um, so that year 15, those year 15 photo montages would be particularly helpful to us and to obviously other parties in the room. Um, there's another set of plans which we just want to put you on notice for now that we would really like by deadline to in this case.

00:17:41:05 - 00:18:17:22

And that's because the plans are already in the plan set, and that is an updated set of landscape and ecological mitigation plans. Now the current library reference is app Dash 084. Now those plans, it would be particularly helpful if they could show the guidelines on the plans so that where one plan ends, you know which of the other plans you then need to look at next to see left or right or north or south. We don't have guidelines, so if you lay them out on a table together, you have to really know the geography to be able to piece them together.

00:18:17:24 - 00:18:54:17

So if we could get some guidelines on those, that would be helpful. Um, but what we would also really require is that the plans show the overlap of the site features on the different plans. I think there may be 5 or 8 plans in the set. Um, and at the moment, for example, if we were to lay site C sheet two on top of, you know, site A, there are overlapping fields, but on one plan we might see some hatching to show an ecological mitigation area.

00:18:54:19 - 00:19:11:14

And on the other plan it shows nothing. But they should show the same things because they are referring to the same fields. So that's particularly what we are looking for is where that where the plans overlap. They should contain the same things from the legend.

00:19:14:00 - 00:19:20:26

And we will be looking for that at deadline two. Again, we'll put this in our rule eight letter to be a bit more clear.

00:19:22:03 - 00:19:35:16

Clear. But if the applicant yes, that's noted again, I don't envisage that being difficult to comply with in terms of the timeframes, but we can confirm with the case officer in the morning once we've spoken to the GIS team. Thank you.

00:19:36:14 - 00:19:44:19

Okay. So does anybody have any further comments on procedural decisions, either ones we've issued are the ones we've just said that we will be issuing.

00:19:47:01 - 00:20:28:18

Clare project for the applicant. Just on the point you'd raised earlier about the Land Rights and Negotiations tracker, I hadn't been able to bring it up in time. We did add an explanatory note in relation to temporary possession to the front end of that tracker, um, explaining why it wasn't, um, why we hadn't added that specific column. But obviously, if you've got a further points to raise on that and you're going to raise that in the rule eight, that's fine. But we did add an explanation as to why we hadn't included that column in the front end introductory text of the of the updated Land Rights Negotiation Tracker that was submitted for procedural deadline.

00:20:28:20 - 00:20:36:27

A and I just wanted to make sure that you'd seen that, as it were. Um, before asking the question.

00:20:36:29 - 00:21:10:09

I had seen it. I guess where I was coming from was it was still unclear, um, that all parcels are subject to the whole of the construction period for temporary possession. Now, if that is the applicant's position, then obviously that's that will be what's before us. Um, but if there are other if there are parcels which are only subject to a very short window of time. Like I said, if you are creating an access, would you intend to maintain throughout the operational period? Then obviously that's a much longer period of possession.

00:21:10:11 - 00:21:29:22

But if it is something which is just purely, um, while you, you bring your trucks in, um, and then you no longer need it, then that will just be for the construction period, I appreciate that. Um, but if there is, if there are any parcels where we're able to get any clarity, it would be helpful to us. But you don't need to answer that now. Yeah.

00:21:29:24 - 00:21:44:25

Clare? Yes. No, you don't want to go into substantive matters. We'll give some thought as to whether any additional information can be added to that introductory text to give some more clarification in terms of particularly the distinction between some elements of the cable route corridor, perhaps in the sights. Thank you.

00:21:45:20 - 00:21:48:22

Great. Thank you. I will now pass over to Mr. Northover.

00:21:50:22 - 00:22:21:28

Thank you. So, moving to any other matters. This agenda item allows anyone to raise any other matters relating to procedure for the examination that have not already been discussed under previous agenda items. I would just like to raise one issue here. Um, we have received correspondence from an IP concerned about the applicant's approach to responding to relevant representations, particularly the thematic approach in the applicant's procedural deadline. B's submission, which is PDB 004.

00:22:23:10 - 00:23:12:07

The XAT considers that the applicant's approach to responses to the majority of representations by theme is a pragmatic and reasonable one, because similar and or identical statements are made by large numbers of submitters of relevant representations, and for the applicant to repeat their responses over and over again to each one would result in considerable duplication. However, where IPS have raised discrete issues, for example, something about the impact on their individual property or business, then it is not unreasonable for those IPS to expect a discrete response to that issue, and we request that the applicant looks at subsequent and representations more closely in that regard, and so does the applicant wish to comment on that?

00:23:16:17 - 00:23:46:20

Project for the applicant? Yes. As you notice, we took a thematic approach to representations raised by interested parties generally. So typically members of the public as distinct from party, the sort of prescribed consultees, statutory parties and affected persons. So those with an interest in the land they were dealt with in our sort of part one submission, and then the part two submission dealt with other interested parties.

00:23:46:24 - 00:24:20:08

What we had tried to do is to link those by theme. As you'd identify, there were a large number of relevant representations. Dealing with relevant representations by theme is quite common for DC applications, particularly where they are of a of a similar nature. We had tried to make it clear in terms of giving the relevant references where people could go to to find the responses, and we do believe we've covered, um, those responses sufficiently.

00:24:20:14 - 00:24:56:06

But obviously going forward with more, if more detailed, relevant raps are submitted and we will make sure we keep an eye out for any specific points, um, albeit that some elements are potentially covered by a Generic response in terms of impacts on socioeconomics. For example, if it's have we assessed something, then it may well be we have given a response to explain how our assessment on socioeconomics has been carried out, rather than by reference to a particular business, for example, that is outside that is not an infected person for the scheme, but the points noted.

00:24:56:08 - 00:25:00:22

And we will take that on board for responses to written representations.

00:25:00:25 - 00:25:12:03

Okay. Thank you. Does any do any other parties wish to comment on this matter or anything under any other matters at this stage? Yes. Doc Klein down.

00:25:13:28 - 00:25:43:29

Thank you, Sir Daniel Gazelka for stop lying down. Um, it's a discrete point. Um, arising out of this morning, um, one of the public made me aware that the press attempted to attend the hearing earlier, and I noted, madam, we asked if there was any press in the room. As we understand it, the case officers give the direction to them because they've not signed up a procedural deadline. A I think it was. They couldn't attend just for the assistance of specifically the press. We'd welcome a direction.

00:25:44:01 - 00:25:59:12

But while it is important that people generally sign up at the appropriate time to attend these meetings from an access to information perspective for the public at large, a relaxation of those rules be made specifically for the press. Both of these hearings and future hearings.

00:26:00:22 - 00:26:31:01

Yeah, I can comment on that. Um, we had over 300 people registered to attend, um, today, and obviously we had to provide an overflow room for for visuals. Now, the priority for being in this room were people who had registered to speak naturally, and we had people subsequently, once the deadline had closed, um, who had made requests to attend, um, whether to speak or observe, and we had to turn them away simply because of the capacity of this venue.

00:26:31:09 - 00:27:04:11

Um, there are obviously fire regulations and the number of people that could be in the venue. So it is not just the people who were participating here. It is also members of staff just in the venue themselves. Plus you know, our Pins team, CVS. So we all added to the numbers for this venue. Now we have to assume that everybody who came or who registered was actually going to appear. So when

the press did arrive this morning, I made a request to to be in the room. We did have to turn them away, simply because we assumed that the 300 people we had made capacity for would be here.

00:27:04:23 - 00:27:23:11

So yes, it's unfortunate in the sense that they were turned away, given what's stop lying down and the publicity that you are trying to achieve for, for, for the community. And we understand it. But we had to prioritize the people who had registered and had they all attended there would simply not have been room.

00:27:25:06 - 00:27:51:27

Of course. Thank you madam. That's completely understood. I think it's more just if that concern were to arise prospectively in the future, it may help to. Possibly. For a space to be reserved for the press or something of that nature. Um, just taking into account I'm not saying it's necessarily about SSD or anything else. I mean, the press may turn up and be supportive of the application. It's just from a access to information. Um, the context of the public at large.

00:27:52:18 - 00:27:54:03

Appreciate it. And thank you.

00:27:56:23 - 00:28:10:09

Okay. Thank you. Was there anyone else who wished to speak on any other matters, either in the room or online, if you've raised your hand? Yes. We've got a hand at the front and the left. If you just wait for the roving microphone to come.

00:28:18:12 - 00:28:21:21

If you state your name first as well.

00:28:21:25 - 00:28:53:28

My name is Charles Buchan. I'm called Edward Buchan. Um, this is a small point, but I tried to get into app 274 biodiversity net came Cambridge assessment. It's the statutory biodiversity metrics calculation. I couldn't do it. It's supposed to be interactive. I think in order that you're going to change your assumptions and see the impact. I was unable to do that. I got into it another way. Um, please, could you look into this and see if it could be made more user friendly?

00:28:57:27 - 00:29:01:17

Sorry, could you just repeat the number of the document for that?

00:29:03:10 - 00:29:06:15

It's a PP274.

00:29:09:21 - 00:29:19:22

Is there someone from the applicant team that could perhaps assist this gentleman with being able to view that document?

00:29:24:04 - 00:29:59:01

Clare, project the applicant. Um, yes. We can discuss and show him where it's located. There. We did upload or submitted for procedural deadline. A which is a different application reference number. The actual spreadsheet which is interactive. So the I think the document the gentleman is referring to is the original PDF that was submitted as part of the DCO application. But then we were asked to submit the kind of spreadsheet, as it were. Um, a procedural deadline. A but we can give them the correct reference numbers. I think it's PDA dash 008, I think, but we will double check.

00:29:59:25 - 00:30:07:07

Thank you. Yes. So the updated document is PDA 008 for that. Thank you.

00:30:08:28 - 00:30:11:27

Was there anyone else? Ah, yes. Mr.. McCullough.

00:30:13:16 - 00:30:32:06

Joel McCullough, for your counsel. Just a brief point. So we support, uh, submissions there regarding the appropriateness of reserving of a direction being issued to reserve some kind of space for the press going forward. And, um, take the A is taking that under consideration. We just wanted to express our support in light of that.

00:30:33:23 - 00:30:39:25

No. Thank you. Okay. Any other hands in the room or online?

00:30:42:15 - 00:31:17:15

I'm not seeing any. Um, so. Okay. Next. The next steps in this process. As you'll be aware, we have our first open floor hearing or off this afternoon starting at 2 p.m.. A speakers list and running order was published on the 2nd of April. Due to the large number of IOPs wishing to speak, it was not possible for people to specify or be allocated preferential times to speak. However, we have been able to accommodate all those who registered to speak at procedural deadline.

00:31:17:17 - 00:31:56:28

Hey, for anyone who did not have the chance to request to speak by procedure or deadline A, we can advise that we will be holding a second open floor hearing on Tuesday the 30th of June, and we will be issuing a notification about this with our rule eight letter, along with details of when and how to register a request to speak at this stage for the issue specific hearing tomorrow. On the scope of development, I would like to make it clear to interested parties that this is primarily for the applicant to explain certain elements of the proposed development to aid our understanding of it.

00:31:57:00 - 00:32:28:03

We will direct a number of questions to the applicant, some of which are likely to also come from parties who are registered to speak at the hearing. However, we remain interested parties to review our published agenda for issues specific hearing one as it may not be the most appropriate hearing to raise wider concerns about environmental topics and due to venue restrictions, we must close the issue of specific hearing tomorrow no later than 3 p.m..

00:32:29:24 - 00:32:40:20

Um. Just check before I hand back to Miss Ley. For what? There's any any more comments on any of the matters I've just raised?

00:32:43:00 - 00:32:43:15

No.

00:32:43:18 - 00:33:22:27

I'm sorry. Claire. I just wanted to highlight that, um, as as per the agenda for the open floor hearing, you've noted, in order to ensure that there's sufficient time for everybody who's registered to make representations that you are not wishing for the applicant to respond orally at the open floor hearing. So we will be attending and making detailed notes of everyone's submissions, but we will submit a response in writing to those. Um, it obviously varies depending on examinations, whether the applicant does respond, but we've noted the request here that, um, that the time is allocated to those wishing to make relevant representations.

00:33:22:29 - 00:33:38:22

So it was just a flag that that the applicant was not proposing to respond in the actual hearing itself, but we will be listening and taking notes of what everybody is saying. So I just wanted to flag that. Now, in case that it wasn't mentioned at the beginning of the open floor hearing. Thank you.

00:33:39:07 - 00:33:49:12

Yes. Thank you. I believe we will be mentioning at the start of the open floor hearing as well. Thank you. Um, in that case, I'll hand it back to Miss Slava to close the meeting.

00:33:51:28 - 00:34:31:11

Thank you. Um, I realized that this morning. You tend to hear more from us than we hear from you. Um, that's, unfortunately the nature of preliminary meetings. It's all very procedural. Uh, we do look forward to this afternoon and hearing from interested parties at the open floor, hearing, uh, because of the number of participants, we realize that speaking time is quite restrictive for you as individuals. Mostly to three minutes. Um, but there is plenty of opportunity in the remainder of this examination once we open within that six month window for us to hear from you more, but we do welcome you.

00:34:31:13 - 00:35:02:12

Registration will open at 115 for the open floor for in-person and virtual. I don't think there's very much change to the setup, so you may not have to leave the room, but Case Team will direct if that is the case. There will be a digital recording of the proceedings today and that will be available as soon as practicable. On the Lime Down Solar project page of our infrastructure website. And again, we will look to publish our rule eight as soon as we can.

00:35:02:26 - 00:35:14:11

Um, after tomorrow's hearing has concluded. Does anybody have any queries for us before we close the preliminary meeting?

00:35:18:06 - 00:35:29:00

Nope. I'm not seeing any, so. Oh, sorry, I did. So remember without with my glasses on, I can't see at the back of the room. So apologies. Could we have a microphone, please?

00:35:33:03 - 00:35:33:27

Matthew Hood.

00:35:33:29 - 00:35:41:03

A question for you. Is this your only project over the next six months as the examination authority you three together?

00:35:41:06 - 00:35:47:07

Yes it is. We are just allocated to this project. We will see this through to the very end.

00:35:47:09 - 00:35:48:26

Thank you very much indeed.

00:35:49:10 - 00:36:19:17

Thank you. Any other queries before we close the preliminary meeting and then open the examination? No. Okay. So thank you very much. I do appreciate how calm and helpful you've been to us today, and we look forward to seeing probably most of you, if not all of you, for this afternoon's open floor hearing. So the time is now. 1156 and this preliminary meeting for the lying down solar project is now closed.