



Planning Inspectorate  
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

## Hearing Transcript

|                 |                                          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|
| <b>Project:</b> | Lime Down Solar Project                  |
| <b>Hearing:</b> | Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Part 1 |
| <b>Date:</b>    | 2 July 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.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:07:24 - 00:00:40:22

Good morning everyone. It's now 930 and time for this issue. Specific hearing to begin. Can I just confirm? Everybody can hear me. A couple of nods would be great, I can hear. Great. Thank you. Can also confirm with CVS at the lovely. You knew what I was going to say. Live streaming and recording. Thank you. Um, welcome everyone to this issue specific hearing number three in relation to the Linden Solar project. My name is Jeanine Laver. I am an examining inspector, and I am the lead inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to examine this application.

00:00:40:24 - 00:01:15:00

My colleagues, Mr. David Love to my left, and Mr. Ben North, over to my right, are also examining examining inspectors. And they've also been appointed to this panel. Together we constitute the examining authority. And you will hear us refer to ourselves also as the X-ray. There are other colleagues from the Planning Inspectorate who are joining us today, both here and online. Our case manager, Deborah Allen, I believe, is at the back of the room. Um, it is Deborah that you should speak to today. If you've got any queries about how we are running this or today's arrangements or any connection issues.

00:01:15:07 - 00:01:48:20

There are two non panel inspectors in our breakout room shadowing this panel, and they are just watching the proceedings from that room. And we've also got several colleagues from our environmental services team at the back of the room who are just here to observe today. So we're just here with some housekeeping matters. I'm sure those of you have already been with us for the first couple of hearings are a bit sick of hearing this, but we do need to repeat it. There are no planned fire drills today. So as I said before, if we hear the alarm, it's the real thing and we do have to leave the venue.

00:01:49:08 - 00:02:08:11

The fire doors to the left. My left over here will take us outside the room or there are more fire exit doors outside of these doors to my right and just turning right. They take us into the car park and the muster point is at the EV charging points. Can I just check if there's anybody here from the press today?

00:02:10:11 - 00:02:50:03

Nope. Can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent? I have similarly done the same after my rookie error on Tuesday. Um, on line participants, if you could make sure your cameras are switched off and your microphones are muted just to help the panel minimize disruptions. Um, but you will be invited to turn those on if you need to come in to speak. Now, if at any point during the meeting you can't hear us or you have something which you wish to raise, please do raise your hands in the room or your virtual hands on team, and we will try to acknowledge that at some point and bring you into the proceedings.

00:02:51:03 - 00:03:14:13

Um, this hearing is being recorded and will be made available on the National Infrastructure Project website as soon after the hearing is finished. As CVS already bought with this in mind, could I ask you to speak clearly and speak your name and who you're representing every time? Just so that anybody watching back the recording or watching online knows who is saying what.

00:03:17:20 - 00:03:50:07

I would also say, because this is being recorded and published, it's important you don't add personal information into the public record that you don't wish for people to know about. That should be kept private or confidential. Please speak to the case team if you've got any queries on that. Now the agenda is for guidance only, and it's probably a little ambitious in terms of what we may be able to cover today. Um, if the discussions can't be concluded, it may be necessary for us to rejig that agenda or prioritize some items over others.

00:03:50:09 - 00:04:30:04

What we don't get through today, we will either defer to actions for parties. We may put things in second written questions, or we may have a subsequent hearing or hearings in September as we have reserved slots. Um, I apologize in advance if I have to ask people just to cut short the submissions or defer things to in writing at deadline for we will. However, despite the packed agenda, have some comfort breaks. It just helps everybody to get up, stretch the legs, get a bit of water, go to the toilet. Um, we are likely to break this transport issue specific hearing around 1:00 for some lunch and then the afternoon session will be purely on ecology and biodiversity.

00:04:30:27 - 00:05:05:17

So what are we here for? As I just said, we're looking at transport this morning and the implications for the areas immediately surrounding the proposed development and the impacts from the broader construction routes. Outside of the order limits, Mr. Love will be exploring the applicant's approach to habitats and species, as well as mitigation, Enhancement and monitoring this afternoon. So as we're distinctly split into two halves for this hearing, I'm only going to go through introductions at this point in time for the morning session for any additional participants around ecology this afternoon, Mr.

00:05:05:19 - 00:05:18:08

Love will run through those. So all I wanted when I come through introductions is for the main speakers for the transport section. So we'll come to the applicant first. Um, Miss Broderick, I want to introduce your team for today.

00:05:20:02 - 00:05:44:22

Good morning. My name is Claire Broderick. I'm a partner at Pinsent Masons LLP, solicitors for the applicant Lime Down Solar Park Limited. And I can be referred to as Miss Broderick. I'm joined by a number of members of the applicant team, as requested. I'll just let those sat at the table introduce themselves. And should another expert need to come forward to answer a particular question, then they can introduce themselves then. Thank you.

00:05:46:08 - 00:05:54:19

Good morning everybody. My name is Wil Threlfall. I'm a senior project development manager at Island Green Power. Project manager for Lime Down Solar Park.

00:05:57:00 - 00:06:24:14

Good morning everybody. My name is James Darell. I'm a director at, uh, Transport Planning Associates. Um, I've got over 25 years experience. I'm a chartered member of the Institute of Logistics and Transport, and I'm a member of the Chartered Institute of um Highways and Transportation. Um, and I'm here on behalf of the applicants, and I'm the author of the Transport and Access chapter. Uh, the outline CMP, um, and the transport assessment.

00:06:27:20 - 00:06:38:13

Good morning. William Barrett, technical director at Aecom. I'm the environment lead for the project and Mr. Barrett for referral. Thank you.

00:06:38:15 - 00:06:39:08

Thank you.

00:06:39:20 - 00:06:45:25

So I'll come over to Wiltshire Council. Miss Chalabi, please. Good morning. My name is Odette Chalabi.

00:06:45:27 - 00:07:20:00

I'm a council instructed by Wiltshire Council and I'm a barrister at Landmark Chambers. The key spokesperson in this issue specific hearing this morning will be David Lee, who sits to my right, and David Lee is a service specialist in the highways development management team at Wiltshire Council. We also have available online Kevin Schneider, who's a traffic and network manager, and if he needs to participate, he'll be doing so via the teams. And we also have, although not expected to participate in a substantial way.

00:07:20:02 - 00:07:30:20

Sitting next to Mr. Lee, Mr. Nick Thomas who's the Director of Planning, Economy and Climate at the Council, so likely to be led for the most part by Mr. Lee today.

00:07:31:21 - 00:07:52:01

Thank you. Well, it's right in front of me. Okay. Um, I just want to check. We don't have anyone here from the Cotswold National Landscape Board. I don't believe they were intending to participate, but just want to confirm that. right. It's nobody showing. So I come to stop them dying. Mr. Elko, please.

00:07:53:18 - 00:08:19:21

Thank you, Madam Danny Elko for stop lime down cancel. Assisted by Celia Reynolds. Where both from 39 Essex chambers instructed by. Stop lying down. And then to my left is Mr. Bruce Bamba, um, who is director of Royalton Transport Planning Consultancy Limited. And he is a member of the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport. And he will be providing our expert evidence on transport matters.

00:08:19:24 - 00:08:30:10

Wonderful. Thank you. Um, is there anybody else that I've missed that hasn't registered or has registered to speak, whose name have not called out online or in the room?

00:08:31:26 - 00:09:13:10

I've got no show of hands. Wonderful. Okay, so that concludes the introduction. So we can move straight into the substantive part of the hearing. Um, hopefully we'll all have a copy of the agenda in front of you. First item is construction. HGV and AIL routes. So primary concern raised by interested parties, not least the council and stop lying down is the use of the rural roads by construction vehicles. Similarly, the Cotswold National Landscape Board has raised concerns about the applicant's selection of routes through the National Landscape Area and whether the most suitable route options have been selected.

00:09:13:17 - 00:09:44:13

Now, I don't want to spend any time on hearing route descriptions, but I am interested in hearing from the applicant. What alternative route options were discounted and why? And that's inclusive for the AIL routes. Now I think it would help parties if the route you're about to speak about or take us through are visible on the screen in some way, whether that's Google Maps, which you can drive your mouse around, or if you have some other, um, map that you want to use, just so that we understand the context of those routes as you're talking about them.

00:09:44:15 - 00:09:49:04

So, Miss Broderick, it would be over to yourself. Mr. Darrell, maybe he's taking us through this.

00:10:01:04 - 00:10:04:00

Can we just checking which plan might be the most helpful? Thank you.

00:10:20:09 - 00:10:31:13

James. Now for the applicant. I'll provide an introduction whilst we're digging up the plans. There we go. That's. It's quite a large area, so it's quite hard to zoom around, isn't it?

00:10:34:28 - 00:10:41:06

It's difficult because you won't be driving the mouse, but it would be helping if somebody knew the routes that you're going to talk about.

00:10:43:00 - 00:11:00:00

If I can provide an overview. In terms of route selection, that would obviously help because we're talking about what routes we selected and what routes we didn't select. So it would help everybody

understand why we didn't select certain routes. Um, and then I can I can take you through those routes on on screen.

00:11:00:02 - 00:11:04:13

Sure. That would be fine. I just don't want to go with street by street. No, I went through the route.

00:11:04:15 - 00:11:34:27

So. So, um, in terms of the general overview, in terms of our, um, route selection, it's important to understand that the majority of the trips coming from the strategic road network, obviously coming from the ports, um, and uh, the two sort of sites, it's basically two sites. There's two construction routes. Um, and the benefit of that is it reduces the number of trips on each route. So it reduces any impact.

00:11:34:29 - 00:11:57:18

Now to get to the site. And it's common with pretty much every other DCO solar farm, you're going to have to use some rural routes. So what we needed to do was try and rule out routes that we thought were unsuitable. Um, generally those routes would be locations where you'd have you'd have to go through the center of a village with a school. Um, and,

00:11:59:05 - 00:12:04:24

and so that falls in line with our sort of route hierarchy that we, we looked at. So.

00:12:07:03 - 00:12:37:13

Um, the route higher hierarchy takes account of severance of communities. So that would be driving straight through a village and, uh, roads, vehicle driver and passenger delay, um, non-motorized use delay, um, hazardous loads and pedestrian safety. Um, in practical terms, what that meant for us was trying to avoid routes that have got extensive limited forward visibility. Um, trying to avoid routes of any accident Hotspots.

00:12:37:21 - 00:13:08:09

Um. Any routes with schools, village residential centres. Um extensive lengths of single track carriageway, which is essentially a three metre wide road. Um the requirement for excessive excessive highway mitigation and engineering work. So we wanted to reduce that as much as possible. Um, and the requirement for extensive vegetation removal, um, or crossing narrow or weak bridges. So these were the main points.

00:13:08:11 - 00:13:24:21

So the idea was to avoid some or all of those, um, if possible. So if we were to take um, routes to uh, line down A, B and C, for example, um, where we're.

00:13:24:29 - 00:13:27:03

Maybe zoom back on that plan.

00:13:34:19 - 00:13:37:05

It's difficult to do it without driving the map on the right.

00:13:37:12 - 00:13:38:01

I know.

00:13:39:03 - 00:13:39:22

Um, I think.

00:13:39:24 - 00:13:43:16

The wider plan was probably a bit more useful to you.

00:13:57:00 - 00:14:27:21

Anyway, essentially the route, the routes to aiming to come from junction 18 along the A46, along the B4 at um 040, then the B4, A39 and then the unnamed road west of Welton, um Alderton Road and then Fosse Way. Um, first of all, you're coming off a motorway junction, which is which is perfect for delivery vehicles. Then you're getting on to an A road, which is also great for HGVs. Then you're on to two B roads, which is absolutely fine for HGVs.

00:14:27:23 - 00:15:07:20

Is already HGVs using these roads. Um, and then you're uh running along with the Allinson which is wide enough to to HGV's. And then to get to A, B and C you have to use Alderton Road and Fosse Way. The reason why you have to use that is because the alternative routes will go through Churston or through Norton, their narrow village centres. Um and Norton, for example, has almost single track road limited for visibility. And frankly, it would be unsafe. Now it has been agreed with Wiltshire Council and at the meeting last week to stop lying down that that route is the best of the alternative routes.

00:15:07:22 - 00:15:17:27

So that is something that is agreed as far as I know. And that can be confirmed by the, um, by Wiltshire and by stop lying down, I'm sure, today. So.

00:15:20:02 - 00:15:52:22

So again, there is no alternative suitable route. Um, and that is the best route to get to A, B and C, so that rules out all other routes to get to, um, lying down D and E, obviously we're using junction 17, which is fine. It's a motorway junction. You know our deliveries are outside of peak hours. Motorway junctions and motorways are there to for logistical purposes. Then the A49 going north which is on Wiltshire HGV route which is on their website.

00:15:53:03 - 00:16:23:25

Um and then turning left to um climb down D west. Um so that's through past Bradfield Cottages. That section of road already takes HGV. There's a small industrial site just north of the bridge at Bradfield Cottages. Um, and that is a concrete delivery site. So there's already HGVs using that. And then from there onwards that it's quite a short length to actually get into the access.

00:16:23:27 - 00:16:36:10

Again. That avoids going through Norton. It provides direct access or quick access to the motorway network. Um, and it's just a, it's just a common sense, logical selection. Um,

00:16:38:08 - 00:17:00:14

in terms of the cable route access. So we've got cable access in Littleton that will use the canal to get to there, the alternative routes to get to those two access points, because that's where the cable route is located, would be to drive through Lavington Village, which is not acceptable. Um, can.

00:17:00:16 - 00:17:01:29

You point out where that is?

00:17:02:01 - 00:17:16:27

What? Leamington village? Yeah. It's just it's see the blue light. So there's a red line that goes north into London D and then there's a blue dotted line that it joins. That's where it joins. That's called the street. And Lavington is just south of that.

00:17:16:29 - 00:17:17:26

Okay. Thank you.

00:17:17:28 - 00:17:49:26

Okay. So again it was a common sense and a logical um, decision because there were there is no other suitable alternative route to get to those accesses. Um, as I've said in our, uh, responses. Um, the heavy trips to the cable routes are roughly four a day for HGVs a day. Um, so the number of HGVs can actually be managed, I think, quite successfully.

00:17:59:09 - 00:18:00:12

Does that conclude?

00:18:00:14 - 00:18:31:09

Uh, no. Well, there's loads and loads to say on this, so I don't know where we can go because I'll see the routes to get to the cable route south. There's lots of different routes that you can take. And but in the majority in the main what we try to do is stick to the A roads, stick to the B roads. Um, and try. And if we were going to go on any sort of, uh, narrow rural roads to be on them as, as, as short as possible. So shortest time as possible. So again, you know, the whole idea was to try and stick to these wider roads as much as possible.

00:18:31:11 - 00:18:47:22

If we couldn't avoid using a slightly rural road or a narrow road. Then we had to use that. But we take into account the existing traffic flows on that road and also the expected cable route traffic flows which are quite low and can be managed.

00:18:47:27 - 00:19:00:11

Were there any other discussions around your adverse indivisible loads or ales? So I probably will refer to them for the rest of the hearing. Um, or was it similar process that you went through for those.

00:19:00:21 - 00:19:30:07

Uh, James Darren for the applicant. So the all routes are exactly the same process. Um, obviously what we need to do there is, is focus on using the widest roads possible, and that's what we've done. Um, it's important to remember that the ale deliveries, um, are managed, um, and can be escorted.



Um, and we'll have special management measures in place. It's also dealt with outside of the DCO under a special order.

00:19:42:04 - 00:19:42:21

So come in.

00:19:42:23 - 00:20:17:21

Then back to the Cotswold National Landscape and the position of the board. Obviously they're not here to speak for themselves, but they've clearly expressed some concern about a number of construction routes running through the Cotswold National Landscape. Um, and I suppose the thing first thing that jumped out to me when I looked at your assessment of the routes was that all of the things you've just explained try to avoid central villages, try to avoid severance, NMU delay.

00:20:17:27 - 00:20:29:29

I believe that's all the ISF guidance that's informed that route selection. but what I didn't see in the material was that there was any consideration of just avoiding the Cotswold National landscape.

00:20:33:19 - 00:20:35:24

James Darren for the applicant. Um.

00:20:38:10 - 00:20:54:17

The route itself is a consequence of the site location. Um, as I say, we have provided a Cornell technical note which explains clearly why we chose the route we did. And what other alternative routes were available? Um,

00:20:56:03 - 00:21:25:21

the routes that we're using, the A46, etc., already have quite a lot of HGVs on, uh, on them. So it's already a route with HGVs on it. The M4 goes through the Colonel, which obviously has quite a few vehicles on it. Um, that that our construction is temporary. Um, also reduces what I see as, as the impact along there um, long term And as I say, there are no alternative suitable routes.

00:21:28:17 - 00:22:10:18

Okay. Before I come to the other parties, then I just want to just read out one of the statements from the Cotswolds National Landscape Board. Um, this is in their rep. 3154. And it's a response to your technical note. So the board states that if alternative routes for the construction traffic that are located outside of the national landscape are deemed unsuitable due to highway constraints, and consequently, the only way to reach the construction locations is to route traffic for a significant distance circa 20km through the national landscape, causing significant adverse impacts on its tranquillity.

00:22:11:02 - 00:22:38:01

The board considers the project has not been sensitively designed, and would question whether fundamentally, the site is in the correct location for a development of this nature and scale. Now, I'm certain you're going to provide a fuller response to that. Um, a deadline for those would be normal, um, in writing. But I just wonder at this point what your position is on that statement. Could I ask Wiltshire Council just to keep their talking down, please?

00:22:46:23 - 00:22:48:11

Uh, Clare project for the applicant.

00:22:50:06 - 00:23:23:21

Obviously their comments relate to site selection process generally in terms of why we obviously citing the solar project itself. Um, in this location, I think that that we discussed at issue one, the um, process that the applicant undertook to locate sites. Um, transport links were part of, um, the consideration that was undertaken in terms of trying to find suitable locations for solar sites.

00:23:24:03 - 00:23:59:14

What Mr. Daryl is explaining is once the sites, um, had been selected, the the process that was undertaken to then find the most suitable construction routes to those sites. Um, so a large proportion obviously, as Mr. Daryl said of major, uh, the strategic road network and the, um, the A roads are already located within the Cotswolds national landscape. So the applicant's position that they are appropriate roads to use for HGV movements.

00:24:00:11 - 00:24:16:07

I think it is perhaps useful to um, I don't know whether it's useful now or at, um, another point in time, just to clarify the numbers of HGV movements that we're actually talking about For this particular.

00:24:16:09 - 00:24:17:21

I want to clarify those yet.

00:24:18:03 - 00:24:49:04

They're coming up later. But that is also a consideration in terms of deciding whether the routes were suitable. We obviously mentioned yesterday that we were providing a further technical note in respect of tranquility, that, um, is from a from a sort of we obviously considered a technical note from a, from a sort of a landscape perspective, but we are doing some further work in response to those comments on from a sort of a noise, uh, perspective, um, linked to traffic movements. But it does all link again, it's what's proportionate.

00:24:49:06 - 00:25:21:24

And the number of vehicle movements were actually talking about for a scheme of this nature. However, as we said in the technical note and in the site selection documentation that has been provided as part of the application, from a highways perspective, the most suitable route was selected. It was located through the national landscape, and exercise was done to establish whether there would be a better route that avoided the national landscape. And as Mr. Darrell has mentioned, there aren't any suitable alternative routes that would minimise traffic through the national landscape.

00:25:21:26 - 00:25:29:11

So the applicant's position is that it's therefore appropriate to route traffic through the national landscape. Okay.

00:25:29:13 - 00:25:42:00

Thank you. Um, I'll come first to stop line down before I come to the council, please, if they have any comments they want to make. Mr. Bamber. Mm.

00:25:43:10 - 00:26:14:06

Um. Thank you madam. Uh, Daniel Kazakov, stop lying down. I'll bring Mr. Bamber in in a second. Um, as as I also referred to yesterday as well, I think this goes back to, I think one of the disputes between stock lamb down and the applicant about whether it's site selection process was an appropriate one at all. Um, because ultimately what what has been described there is um, a planning constraint which exists and can be clearly identified on a map was functionally ignored because there is no better option. And I think Mr..

00:26:14:15 - 00:26:40:15

Mr.. Bamber will go into the point about, you know, what other options are available. But it I would submit it's not the, the the point that if there's no other option therefore the route of it is available must be used. You have to consider the planning aspect of that. And obviously you have the view of the Cotswolds Landscape Board with which we agree. Um, so having made that alternatives and, um, site selection point, if Mr. Van wants to come in on any points about the route.

00:26:41:16 - 00:27:13:05

Thank you. Good morning. Bruce. Bamba, stop lime down. Um, a couple of points. Um, following on from, uh, what Mr. Towle has said. Um, first of all, um, I don't I wouldn't say that I agree that this is the best route selection. I would say it's the least worst route selection. Um, and I would also add that, um, the types of criteria used by the applicant to select the route.

00:27:13:17 - 00:27:44:03

Um are not, um, absent from the route that has been selected. So, for example, as the aware narrow carriageways, uh, lack of forward visibility going through sensitive villages. Um, but I think we'll come on to those. So I don't want to go into that in any detail. Now, um, on the tranquillity point, um, I'm interested to hear that a new note dealing with transport and tranquillity, uh, is going to be produced.

00:27:44:11 - 00:28:20:18

Um, the position of the applicant up till now has been that tranquillity, um, is more of a landscape point, um, rather than a transport point. Now, um, in my, um, written reps, which was appendix D of stop line downs reps, um, I refer to um, uh, public inquiry at mitten on the other side of the Cotswolds national landscape. I was the witness. Um, their transport witness, um, giving evidence about the, uh, transport supporting information.

00:28:20:26 - 00:29:16:12

Um, and the Cotswolds national landscape was involved with that. And they were concerned that the development would generate traffic within the national landscape. Um, and they were concerned that it would exceed the 10% threshold, which is the rule two from the ISAF guidelines. Uh, now, the inspector, um, um, in the decision which is referenced in, uh, the rep, the written reps, um, decided that there was insufficient information submitted on transport modelling to demonstrate that the development would not lead to more than 10% increase in traffic within the national landscape, and therefore, um supported the case that I had put forward, that it was not acceptable on that basis because insufficient information had been provided.

00:29:16:17 - 00:29:31:05

But I think it's in relation to this. I think it's important because it demonstrates that certainly the national landscape and the inspectorate considered that transport was an important element of tranquillity.

00:29:33:03 - 00:30:00:25

Um, the point that was made about the duration of the, um, the scheme, um, it is temporary, but at the same time it is two years. And I think that that's an important point because it's we're not talking about something that will a few months. It is something that is going to impact in transport environmental terms, um, in a way that is different from a um, a short term, couple of months type of scheme.

00:30:04:07 - 00:30:08:16

I think that's all I want to say at this stage. The other points will come up as we go through.

00:30:08:18 - 00:30:09:12

Okay. Thank you.

00:30:10:15 - 00:30:23:23

Thank you, Mr. Bamber. Just to flag to you, madam. That is section ten of rep 1-1. Uh seven. Uh two is where the Mytton inspector's decision is discussed.

00:30:23:28 - 00:30:31:24

Yeah. Thanks for clarifying that, because I think the the rep three information that came in also has annex D for Mr. Bamber. So when we refer to NXT.

00:30:32:04 - 00:30:35:12

Um, yes. So that was referring to one I've just given you the reference spot. Yeah.

00:30:35:14 - 00:30:42:13

Perfect. Thank you. So before I come back to the applicant on that, um, please. Mr.. I'd like to go to the council. We might as well hear the other positions in the round.

00:30:42:17 - 00:31:20:19

Um, Odette Shelby, Wiltshire Council I mean, we agree with the general point made by lime down that there will be significant impacts to the Cotswolds national landscape. And they're an inevitable result of siting a proposal of such significant scale here. And as the essay is undoubtedly aware, the council's overall cases that, at least in large part because of the impacts on the CNL. It can't support the ground of consent, but from a high res perspective, the council is satisfied that the routes selected are suitable in the context, and it's not part of the council's evidence that there's a radically better different solution in terms of construction routes.

00:31:20:22 - 00:31:29:26

The concern is more as regards how to manage the traffic appropriately on the rural routes that are going to be required, given the siting of the scheme.

00:31:30:01 - 00:31:31:01

Okay. Thank you.

00:31:33:12 - 00:31:35:09

Mr.. Leah, did you have anything to add?

00:31:35:13 - 00:32:05:17

Yes. I was to say, I think I would concur with Mr. Ballmer's view that it's it's, um, it's the best of the alternatives for the best in big inverted commas, in the sense that we still have, um, a very narrow, narrow construction route from Shettleston northward to line down C, uh, A to C, and we still have, um, you know, effectively a very narrow route from the A49, certainly to the west of Dyson Roundabout, all the way up to Bradfield Cottages.

00:32:05:19 - 00:32:16:16

So our concerns are they're not ideal. We are concerned about, um, the width of those roads and places. The opportunities for two lorries.

00:32:16:18 - 00:32:17:03

Will.

00:32:17:05 - 00:32:29:18

Come on for that. Mr. Lee, later on in the agenda. Okay. Um, so at the moment I'm just looking at the routes as opposed to the particular bits of constraint on the routes. Um, but we will certainly come back to that.

00:32:29:21 - 00:32:30:06

Okay.

00:32:32:01 - 00:32:34:23

Mr. Darrell, um, if you want to respond.

00:32:34:25 - 00:32:37:24

Yeah. James. Darrel, for the applicant. Um, tranquillity now.

00:32:37:26 - 00:33:03:03

Has already been submitted. So I just want to confirm that because, um, stop lying down. That's saying it hasn't. I think there's a further tranquillity note to be provided by the landscape consultant. Um, I've never said that. It's not highways related. What we do is we feed the traffic, flows to the landscape consultant, who then does a tranquillity assessment and that's totally normal and acceptable.

00:33:03:09 - 00:33:10:18

So it will include issues of transport, tranquility. Note that subsequent tranquility.

00:33:10:20 - 00:33:11:06

Note

00:33:13:04 - 00:33:22:16

a clear project for the applicant is going to consider noise, which obviously comes from the traffic. So it's look looking at it will include the element of

00:33:24:15 - 00:33:30:23

impacts of traffic on tranquility as a consequence of noise being created. Yeah.

00:33:32:10 - 00:33:53:27

James Darrel for the applicant. And then just to confirm, I think it's actually 15km in the canal and 11km of that is A and B roads. Um, and then Stockman Down gave an example of a residential development cited in the kennel, which is a 500 unit development which would lead to a permanent increase in traffic in the kennel. So it's not comparable.

00:33:55:24 - 00:33:56:22

That's it.

00:33:56:24 - 00:34:10:29

Okay. Thank you. If I go on to some other parts on this, is anybody have anything else they've just wished to add at this point in time? I'm not moving off this item. Um, I've got some specific construction route locations I just want to go through.

00:34:15:19 - 00:34:52:06

No. Okay. Um, so I just want to go on to some specific construction locations, of which I have queries. Um, and just to put the IPS Wiltshire Council and stop lying down at ease. Whilst I might not be coming on to things like the Fosse Way, particularly at this point, or Bradfield um, cottages, they will feature later on. Um, so could we show on the screen please the applicant's team? Um, app 150 which is figure 13-5 and that shows the main aisle construction routes to the solar PV sites.

00:35:01:02 - 00:35:33:29

Thank you. Um, I'm going to cross refer with this plan. So keep this plan on the screen. Um, but I just want to say that the PDF page 121 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan or Oct EMP, as I'll keep referring to, which is rep three 108. Um, that particular plan in the Oct EMP details the AIL construction routes, um, as well to the solar PV sites, but they are numbered in the Oct.

00:35:34:01 - 00:36:06:07

EMP is routes 1 to 4. Now, as we can see from what we've got on the screen, um, the route numbers are not stated. So it's a tad frustrating. But in essence, the orange route to lime down A to C is route one in the map. Now, ordinarily the route starts, as Mr. Darrell said, at the M4 junction 18. It would then take the A46 north to the B4 040 at Old Sodbury, before taking the B4 039 towards Littleton, Alderton Road and Fosse Way.

00:36:07:02 - 00:36:38:13

Um. However, on page 122 of the Oct MP again Rep three 108, he states that after leaving the M4 junction 18 on the A46, instead of travelling north to Old Sodbury and taking the B4 040, an alternative route would take vehicles from the A46 to the B4 road A39 via Acton Turville Road and

Taunton Road, and it would follow that route in essence to the Fox and Hounds pub at Acton Turville um at the junction of the B4 road 39.

00:36:38:26 - 00:36:50:03

Now, could the applicant just show that alternative route with their mouse for others to follow on that plan that we've got on the screen, because it isn't shown in any colour on that screen?

00:37:13:12 - 00:37:14:01

I could see a little.

00:37:14:03 - 00:37:16:06

Cursor coming on their little cross.

00:37:21:24 - 00:37:27:28

So instead of taking that orange route, the alternative route. You could just move your mouse across.

00:37:30:21 - 00:37:55:03

Okay, great. So can everybody see that movement of that mouse? That's the alternative route that's suggested in the map. Now, the same route, um, is listed as the alternative in the reverse direction. And I just want to understand why an alternative route is required. And at what point in construction planning would the decision be made to use the alternative?

00:37:58:04 - 00:38:29:13

James Tower for the applicant. Um, the alternative route was initially put in there to give the haulage company, um, uh, basically another option. Um, as we ran through the detail of it, we ended up concluding that actually, really the orange route is the most suitable. Um, but it's in there because what happens is, um, when you go to apply for the special order, obviously you'll have a haulage company involved. They need to determine exactly the vehicle type that they're using. Um, and to give them a bit of flexibility.

00:38:29:15 - 00:38:33:21

We put in an alternative route there, but the main route is the orange route.

00:38:34:03 - 00:38:34:18

Okay.

00:38:34:20 - 00:39:05:09

So I think it might be helpful then, if it is to remain as an alternative route that it's actually shown on the plans, um, as an alternative route, because at the moment that's sort of lost in the detail in the TMP, because it isn't on. It isn't in the OC on. The console is not annotated on the construction route plans in the OC. TMP is not annotated on this figure that we've got on the screen, and it's not in the transport assessment in appendix 131 either. So it's just there in writing.

00:39:05:23 - 00:39:19:05

Um, and if you're intending to rely upon that as an alternative route to think it needs assessing, um, and it needs to be shown quite clearly, um, so that the council and others at least have an understanding that it could be used.

00:39:30:24 - 00:39:47:04

Uh, the applicant, um, yeah, we're going to take that point away and, um, confirm if it is going to remain as an alternative. Then we will add it to the plans as requested. And, um, if the decision is that it's no longer required as an alternative, then we will update the text to confirm that point.

00:39:47:06 - 00:40:18:29

So at the moment I'll leave it as an action. Um, but I want to just stay on this particular route. Um, there is a weight restriction on Torment and Road. When I was on my unaccompanied site inspection, um, in Acton Turville, just pretty much outside the post office at the entrance to Torment and Road, there are two signs indicating vehicles. Over 7.5 tonnes were prohibited from using that road. Now, I don't know what the weight of your construction vehicles are when they're laden and unladen, but I imagine they're over seven and a half tonnes.

00:40:19:12 - 00:40:29:06

Um, so if that's the case and it is intended, this is an alternative route. I just wonder what provisions are in the DCO to allow the applicant to ignore those restrictions.

00:40:31:26 - 00:40:42:03

Yeah, the restriction is except for access. So you can have larger vehicles through there if it's agreed with the highway authority in the first instance. So the restriction is except for access.

00:40:42:05 - 00:40:57:18

So it's accepted. I'll come to the council in a moment just to understand that that is the position. Um, but I just wanted to be clear that we were aware that there was a restriction of weight. So, Miss Shelby or Mr. Laird.

00:40:58:06 - 00:41:03:24

Um, Odette Shelby, Wiltshire Council, I'm not sure. We're not sure if the answer to that. It might be outside.

00:41:04:27 - 00:41:05:13

Gloucestershire.

00:41:05:15 - 00:41:07:06

Welch's area.

00:41:07:11 - 00:41:12:03

So we need to put in an Q out and first written question. Our second written question out to so close.

00:41:12:05 - 00:41:12:20

Yes.



00:41:12:22 - 00:41:13:07

Okay.

00:41:13:25 - 00:41:47:07

Uh, Clare, for the applicant, obviously the the applicant would need to demonstrate that the road was suitable for the vehicle at the time that it was proposed, if it was going to utilise that road as part of the approval of the final comp, it would obviously need to demonstrate that the road was suitable and there were obviously, um, requirements in there for uh, pre and post construction survey work to be undertaken. So in the event the road was used, there are further actions that would be the responsibility of the applicant, um, to demonstrate that it was a suitable route to use in any additional works that might be required.

00:41:47:09 - 00:41:47:24

Sure.

00:41:47:26 - 00:42:14:25

I mean, it's a moot point if the if it is an alternative, it's coming out of the scheme, but it is probably something if if at the next deadline you don't confirm that. We'll probably put a question out to South Gloss on this anyway. Um, okay. So could we now come off this plan and show PDF page 51 of the. Oh sorry, we've got hand up on the screen. Um, I don't know who it is.

00:42:15:10 - 00:42:19:19

That shall be Wiltshire Council, I think that's Kevin cheerleader who is with Wiltshire Council.

00:42:20:03 - 00:42:21:28

Sorry it's too late. Hello.

00:42:22:00 - 00:42:40:04

Wiltshire Council. Thank you very much. Um, yeah, just I like to clarify a point. Even though the route is within South Gloucestershire, I believe any traffic regulation order that says except access is to, uh, access within the site is not for through traffic.

00:42:41:00 - 00:42:56:28

Thank you. That was my understanding too, which is why I think I would need a question to South Gloss, but appreciate that. Thank you. Um, so could we share then? Page 51. The PDF, page 51 of the TMP, which is rep three 108 on the screen, please.

00:42:59:10 - 00:43:29:18

Great. Um, so for the main HGV route to lime down A to C and the ale route, one that we've just been discussing, if construction vehicles take the dedicated route and not the alternative route that we talked about. Um, it would go north on the A46. Mr. Darell said it would go to the Old Sodbury. Um, part of the A46, and turn right or east onto the B4 road for the transport assessment.

00:43:29:20 - 00:44:01:11

Rep 3065 states on page 12 that the B4 040 is a two way single carriageway road. I think that's true for most of its length. Um, at the location where the construction vehicles would join the Be 404 row.

However, it is one way in the opposite direction. Um, so it might be helpful on that image that's on screen just to go to the section of, um, of Old Sodbury.

00:44:04:00 - 00:44:11:00

To zoom in a little bit there, pretty much to the far left hand side of that plan.

00:44:21:27 - 00:45:11:28

Bit more, bit more. Keep going until we can see that red blob. Yeah. So that little red section there is your highway improvement works. And that I understand is the one way section of that part of the road, but it isn't one way in your favor going towards the P450. It's it's the contraflow. Um, so can you just explain to me, my panel members, what measures would be required to facilitate the use of this one way street as a contraflow for construction vehicles, and specifically what it means for vehicles that are coming in the westerly direction who don't have an option to go to the Old Sodbury traffic light because they're prohibited, they have to take this red section.

00:45:12:00 - 00:45:15:24

So I just want to understand what happens to those vehicles.

00:45:16:14 - 00:45:47:02

James, now for the applicant. So, um, the AI 1 vehicles that we're talking about, um, will access London A, B and C, um, as four of those for each ale movement. There'll be um, the licence requirement will include the traffic management measures, but it's likely that that area of road will be temporarily suspended to allow the vehicles to to run through the vehicle. The timing of when that happens could be late at night. Could be, you know. Um, it won't be in a peak hour.

00:45:47:06 - 00:45:58:02

Um, it could be very early in the morning to minimise any impact. But all of that gets agreed and signed off with the license that's required to actually move the Transformers. Um, so.

00:46:00:05 - 00:46:21:20

At that time, all appropriate notifications will be made to the Highway Authority and the local police force. Um, the route will be planned and agreed with the local authority and the police force. Stakeholders along the route will be notified of the date and time of the movement. Vehicles will be clearly marked with appropriate plates and lighting, and vehicles will be escorted to the altered order limit so they get escorted to the order limits as well.

00:46:21:22 - 00:46:58:27

Can I just check? We'll come on to this tomorrow. Um, but what? The notice periods are in the DCO for notifying of those works and how members. how much notice members of the public have because I mean for members anybody that this is a busy junction. So if you're coming along the be 440 to go west or go north at the A46 and you're prevented there. And albeit you were saying these are small numbers of movements of aisles. Um, but how much notice do people get to know that they then can't travel to this junction because they cannot take the northerly part of the B4 road for, because they are prohibited.

00:46:58:29 - 00:47:10:05

So James Dale for the applicant, um, I'll ask Clare to help with that answer. But in terms of, um, the management of that road, it's a rolling closure. So it's not it's not fully closed for the whole.

00:47:10:07 - 00:47:28:03

No, I appreciate that. But that section where it's one way is closed to those oncoming vehicles and they have no alternative because they cannot take the the northerly fork there because they are prohibited. Cars are prohibited from the northerly fork to the traffic bikes. They can only take the red bit shown there.

00:47:35:24 - 00:47:37:28

I'm just trying to understand the notice. Period.

00:47:48:21 - 00:48:10:07

We can double check the actual notice procedure under the Ale licensing process that Mr. Dowell is mentioning. The intention is that it would be the, um, it's the standard process for ales that would be used not there aren't it's not provisions in the DCO in relation to Ale movements. The applicants confirmed it will follow the standard um licensing procedure. Okay.

00:48:10:09 - 00:48:18:12

Ale might come to the council and ask them if they know what that notice period is. If not, it's okay because we'll put it in writing.

00:48:18:22 - 00:48:22:19

Shelby, I'm just wondering if Mr. Cheerleader who's online knows the answer to that.

00:48:24:26 - 00:48:30:10

Um, sorry. Um, one of my team deals with them. I can check and come back to you.

00:48:30:12 - 00:48:36:15

No, that's all right. I just thought if we knew today, we would answer it. But the applicant will come back and confirm. So thank you very much.

00:48:38:05 - 00:48:47:29

Okay, so, um, could we next then display, uh, PDF page 148 of the temp, please. So it's.

00:48:53:07 - 00:48:59:16

So this is a section of the jib or the jib. Somebody wants to tell me if it's the jib or the jib.

00:49:00:18 - 00:49:01:13

It's the jib.

00:49:01:15 - 00:49:33:15

Before I offend people, it's the jib. Okay. Thank you. Um, now, this shows a swept path figure of an abnormal load carrier at the jib on construction route one. Um, what I see from this swept path is that the ale carrier is tight on the boundary line, with the property shown as Furze Farm, which is the corner property. Um, And would oversell The Verge outside the Salutation Inn in both directions.

00:49:33:17 - 00:50:04:24

Now what I noticed on my USC, my unaccompanied site inspection, was that the property, known as Furze Farm, has a stone wall with established, attractive planting in front of it, which would seemingly be impacted by an ale vehicle. The narrow footpath in front would also seemingly be impacted. Now, as I turned that corner in my own vehicle and I was certainly only in a car, there were parked cars outside the Salutation Inn on that right hand side, and that is where I parked.

00:50:04:26 - 00:50:43:19

Got out and had a bit of a walk around, and if there were cars parked there, obviously that would be an impact or an impediment to the ale. Now, I guess from what you've said, Mr. Darrell, is these ales are planned in advance, those there would be no vehicles able to be parked in that location that would interfere with the ale movement around that corner. And you can clarify that in a second. But I really more interested at particularly at what happens to Firs Farm, their property boundary. Um, and has any dialogue been undertaken with the owners of Firs Farm? Because this ale movement is pretty much right on top of that property.

00:50:45:19 - 00:51:18:00

James. Now for the applicant. Yeah. The public highway boundary at that location goes all the way up to the wall. Um, there's planting, and it looks like a front garden that's been planted in the public highway there. So it is usable as public highway ale vehicle. Um, as it's running along its route, they'll employ measures such as, um, special type of matting, overrun matting, which is usually a metal matting. So it will it will damage that planting. Um, but that then it will be returned back to its original condition.

00:51:18:02 - 00:51:25:08

I'm not sure whether all the planting would be returned back to its original condition, because it's private planting in the public highway.

00:51:25:10 - 00:51:41:09

So has there been any dialogue with the owners of First Farm? If you don't know that now, I'm happy for you to come back on that. But it seems to me as a property that's particularly affected, just given the proximity of a vehicle of that size coming right on top of that property boundary.

00:51:43:12 - 00:51:48:28

Miss Broderick. Do we know if there's been any dialogue with the owners of First Farm Club?

00:51:49:06 - 00:51:51:24

The applicant. And we'll need to check. We don't. That's fine, I'm afraid.

00:51:51:27 - 00:51:52:22

Come back on that.

00:51:54:29 - 00:52:01:21

Okay. Next, I want to come on to Gritstone Crossroads. And that's PDF, page 149 of this document, please.

00:52:05:20 - 00:52:51:16

Okay, so construction vehicles on route one, they arrive at Gritstone Crossroads and have to turn left into Alderton Road. The construction traffic management plan describes the works required here is no more than the temporary removal of stop sign due to vehicle over sale of The Verge. However, I note there's no swept path provided for this left turn in this document or any other document that I could find. Um, finger SP 21 of the Oct MP, which is shown on the screen here, shows a right turn at its junction towards Yat and Kino um, or a left turn from Yat and Kino um, but not a left turn out of that unnamed road into Alderton Road.

00:52:51:26 - 00:53:12:18

Now I did here on the accompanied sight inspection, where in fact the applicant's team will have heard it as well. There was a gentleman that, um, we caught up with right at the end of that inspection that said there would be a notable loss of tree cover in this location, and it would be helpful for the applicant to explain what's intended to take place at Gritstone Crossroads, because I'm still unsure.

00:53:14:10 - 00:53:14:25

Uh, James.

00:53:14:27 - 00:53:40:27

Now for the applicant. So as you as you've correctly said, it's a left turn, essentially, from the unnamed road opposite the street, turning left into Alderton Road that will overrun the curb. We have got swept path of that um, which was submitted at deadline three, so it was omitted from the previous report. Um, it should have been in there, but yeah, obviously we've done that.

00:53:41:01 - 00:53:47:17

Can you tell me where that swept path document is that plan D3?

00:53:51:11 - 00:53:55:10

We'll look it up and then I haven't got the reference in front of okay. I'm sorry about that.

00:53:57:15 - 00:54:34:09

Um, so yeah, again it's overrunning and that there could be, you know, metal plating or matting could be used in that location. Um, and then removed again for the normal HGVs. Also another point to make is there won't be any other vehicle movements. So you can cross over to the other side of the road. You know, you can use the total space that you've got there in terms of tarmac to make that turn. Because it's completely managed, um, in terms of normal delivery hubs, they don't overrun that kerb and we've got swept paths that shows that as well, which um, which I think was submitted then.

00:54:38:22 - 00:54:40:18

I'll give you the reference for in a second.

00:54:41:02 - 00:54:41:17

Okay.

00:54:41:19 - 00:54:53:26

Thanks. I just wonder if Mr. Threlfall or Mr. Jackson in the back row might be able to just allude to the loss of tree cover here that the gentleman on the company site inspection was referring to.

00:55:08:04 - 00:55:13:15

Mr. Threlfall for the applicant. Um, we believe the swept path will confirm that position, so we'll just get that out for you.

00:55:30:02 - 00:55:41:01

For Wiltshire Council just while they're looking up, if it's helpful. Um, Mr. Schrader has got the answer about the notice, period. I don't know if that would be, um. Yes, please. Mr. leader, do you want to explain that then?

00:55:43:26 - 00:56:05:05

Uh, yes, says Kevin Schrader from Wiltshire Council. Um, yes. Phoebe, uh, period is, uh, they've got to give two clear working days to a police and up to five days for the highway authority to check if there's any structures on that, that route, uh, that, uh, restrict, uh, the problem. Okay.

00:56:06:18 - 00:56:08:14

That's very helpful. Thank you very much.

00:56:11:00 - 00:56:12:12

I'll come back to the applicant.

00:56:14:03 - 00:56:53:28

Er the applicant. Yeah, we're just getting the relevant page. We didn't have that document pre-loaded, so it does take a little while for the document, um, to come up. But um, the understanding is that there are other features on that in that area, including, um, a telegraph pole which the applicant is not proposing to remove. And therefore there isn't going to be a need to remove any trees in that area. But hopefully once the drawing comes up and it's um, the reference is rep 3-066 and it's uh, which is the updated transport assessment, and it is apparently page 982 um, which forms part of annex J.

00:56:54:16 - 00:56:56:15

At 902 the PDF page.

00:56:56:17 - 00:56:57:23

I believe so, yes.

00:57:10:04 - 00:57:13:08

I'm assuming someone's trying to load that from the back.

00:57:13:11 - 00:57:14:09

We are sorry.

00:57:21:19 - 00:57:26:20

Just to just to explain why I wanted to have this loaded. Um. It's because

00:57:28:06 - 00:57:41:19

then I want to understand what features are shown on that swept path in terms of, um, from an ecology or a landscape perspective, not just a traffic perspective. Can we zoom in on that?

00:57:50:21 - 00:58:15:18

Okay, well, we'll park that for the moment. Um, I'll come back to that in a few minutes, because there's something I might as well move on. Um, and while you're trying to load that on a different one. Ready? Um, well, I'll just come on to the next, um, section I wanted to look at. So if we could display document app PP 150 on the screen again.

00:58:31:05 - 00:58:43:22

Is going to be a bit of switching between documents here, so I might as well get you ready because I'm also then momentarily going to ask you to then to move on from app 150 to app 151. So if you have both of them ready to go.

00:59:11:26 - 00:59:16:22

If we've got an issue loading that gritstone crossroads. Well, we'll just park it. Um.

00:59:17:01 - 00:59:39:26

Claire projects the applicant. Apologies. It's obviously the, um, there are a number of PDFs, and they're very large. And unfortunately, switching between that's causing issues on the, on the computer. So we're just trying to see whether we can switch between users so that one person can keep one PDF open. And then we can switch into somebody else who can share the screen to show another one. It's just the moving between yeah, sorry, that's causing the ripple issues. Apologies.

00:59:39:28 - 01:00:13:19

It's really only this section. Oh no, that's not strictly true. There will be a section that asks you to display documents, but most of the other documents I want you to to display later are just text based. So it should be a little bit easier. Um, so hopefully what we've got in front of us is app 150. I've always had to take my glasses back off. Um, this is the solar site's abnormal routes figure. Um, and I'm again looking at line down a and see alternative. Um, which I can't quite see on there, but I think it's a bit of a bright pink.

01:00:14:24 - 01:00:43:25

Now, that would be solar PV route two if you were looking at the same plan in the Oct MP. Now, can I just confirm with the applicant? It seems that I know the answer to this, but I just want confirmation that that alternative route line down A to C. Um, the Isles would go through Yate and Chenal. Is it yet. Am I saying that correctly to to local people. Kennel. Yatton kennel. Um so can you just confirm it does go through Yatton kennel that alternative.

01:00:47:22 - 01:00:50:23

Jamestown for the applicant. The purple route on the plan.

01:00:50:25 - 01:01:04:07

That's is it a purple route. It looks sort of pinkish. Yes. It comes down the A350. I think that's showing on there along the A4 20 and up. Looks like Yatton kennel.

01:01:14:05 - 01:01:15:06

Is that correct?

01:01:16:12 - 01:01:32:12

Yeah. So, um, that is to access, uh, access 109. Yeah. So it's M4 junction 17. 853 50 right onto Bristol Road, then up the B4 039 and then right into Falls Lane.

01:01:32:27 - 01:01:33:12

Right.

01:01:33:14 - 01:01:34:20

But the but the pink.

01:01:34:22 - 01:01:41:08

Or the purplish line appears to continue to go all the way up towards Littleton. So in essence, I just want to confirm that.

01:01:41:10 - 01:01:43:21

No, that's not correct. It's um. Well.

01:01:44:27 - 01:01:45:15

But it's certainly.

01:01:45:17 - 01:02:01:28

We're not correct. Sorry that that mapping is not very clear because it shouldn't be purple. So, um, so we've got ail access to the north which comes does come through gritstone but doesn't go south of the railway line. So it's two accesses I think one zero.

01:02:05:12 - 01:02:12:09

101 and 102. And then the other ale route comes from the south, which is via the A4 20.

01:02:12:11 - 01:02:14:06

That's the one I'm looking at. The one that comes from.

01:02:14:08 - 01:02:15:02

South doesn't go through.

01:02:15:09 - 01:02:19:00

Line, appears to go all the way up to Littleton. Yeah. On that.

01:02:19:02 - 01:02:26:23



My apologies. That shouldn't it shouldn't be a shame because it's coming from the south and then it stops at the at access 109.

01:02:26:25 - 01:02:46:29

So perfect. So if that is the case and it's not going through Yatton. Colonel, I'm, I'm pleased about that because there is a primary school in Yatton and I was going to ask you about that. So if it doesn't do that these plans need to be corrected. Um, just to make it a bit clearer. Um, but could we then go to app 151?

01:02:50:19 - 01:02:52:27

And I specifically want to look at the top of page four.

01:02:55:09 - 01:02:56:14

Of that PDF.

01:03:05:15 - 01:03:22:24

Clair project for the Atkins, and with the case team, be able to let Rosanna Horton give her permission to share her screen. She's joined online. Um, and she just needs permission, I think, to be able to share her screen. And then we've got two different people who can share. Thank you.

01:03:26:15 - 01:03:28:04

Uh, Rosanna Horton.

01:03:30:17 - 01:03:32:17

I think share rights have been given.

01:03:37:05 - 01:03:42:11

So it's page four, the top of page four. I'm looking for on that.

01:03:49:21 - 01:03:53:28

Yeah. So there's that purple line we can see, um,

01:03:55:15 - 01:04:26:01

coming over from the east and just coming to the top of that page. And then if we just scroll up, just page three to the bottom of page three, because the two plans link. Right. And stop there because that's I think, Mr. Darrell, is what you were saying is when you come from the South, it only goes as far as that construction compound at Fowles Wick Lane. Um, so what you're suggesting then, is the aisle load when it delivers what it needs to deliver to that compound.

01:04:26:03 - 01:04:32:25

It turns around there and comes, goes back the way it came. Doesn't carry up through Yatton kennel through to Littleton and.

01:04:34:12 - 01:04:36:13

Jamestown for that thing. Yes that's correct.

01:04:36:15 - 01:04:47:18

So can I then just check if there's sufficient manoeuvring space for an aisle load of of that type in that area.

01:04:47:20 - 01:04:53:27

James down for the applicant. Yes, we did check that. And there is um, but we haven't submitted a plan showing that. Would you like us to submit.

01:04:53:29 - 01:04:57:07

That, please? So we'll do there'll be an action for that.

01:04:58:25 - 01:05:00:22

Wonderful. Okay. So those are the

01:05:02:18 - 01:05:17:11

points along those routes that I wanted to just focus in on. Um, and so you can stop sharing at that point, please. So I want to come to either to the cancel or stop line down or any other interested party. You may have any comments on anything that we've just discussed?

01:05:20:16 - 01:05:21:04

No.

01:05:22:00 - 01:05:26:17

Miss Wiltshire Council. Not not unless Mr. Leader Online does. But no not okay.

01:05:29:19 - 01:05:30:19

No I'm not seeing Mr..

01:05:30:25 - 01:05:32:12

Oh no we haven't.

01:05:32:19 - 01:05:33:04

All right.

01:05:33:06 - 01:05:33:21

Thank you.

01:05:34:13 - 01:05:40:01

Okay. So we'll move on then to the next item on the oh Mr. Bamba.

01:05:40:04 - 01:06:03:13

Um yeah. Uh Bruce Bamba stop. Line down. Um, just on that, um, uh, the notice period for the ales. Um, I think that might just be part of the story, because there would need to be a temporary traffic

regulation order to close the roads. And I think the notice period for that might be different to the notice for the ale, but just to point that out.

01:06:03:27 - 01:06:14:18

Thank you. Um, so action for the applicant then to can still provide that information about these notice periods and what needs to happen in what sequence.

01:06:18:00 - 01:06:25:21

And that's not strictly just limited to that section of the P450, but anywhere else where there may need to be some form of closure.

01:06:26:27 - 01:06:40:18

Uh, for the applicant just to specifically in relation to ales, though, that we're discussing here, because obviously other road traffic regulation measures are covered in the, in the draft. Yeah that's correct. Yeah. So just in respect of air. Yeah. Thank you.

01:06:41:01 - 01:07:21:01

Okay. So we'll come on to the next item on the agenda which is construction traffic and HGV forecasting. Um, so I want to focus on the overall HGV numbers at this point and not increases on particular routes. And the reason I say that is because we're at such a disconnect. I feel, with the parties in the room on the overall numbers, that then if we start looking into the detail of, you know, 190% increase on one route and 250% increase on another route or whatever, we're so far apart on the overall numbers that I think that's almost something, a discussion that we need to have maybe later on in this examination.

01:07:21:03 - 01:07:50:27

So I really just want to focus upon the overall HGV numbers. Um, as I said, there's considerable disagreement over the overall forecasted figures for construction TVs between the applicant and stop lines, and particularly, um, specifically table four in stop line downs transport report, which is rep 1172, considers that a realistic estimate of HG moving HGV movements over the two year construction period is close to

01:07:52:15 - 01:08:30:03

813, as opposed to 26,086 movements predicted by the applicant. I'm not aware that the council has attempted to forecast numbers, but I note they have raised concerns over some of the underlying assumptions which support the applicant's HGV prediction table predictions in its tables 1312 of the Transport Assessment and Table 1320 and yes, chapter 13. So I'm going to come to the applicant first. Um Mr.. For Mr. Darryl, to enable you to counter some of the points raised by stop line downs transport expert Mr.

01:08:30:05 - 01:08:51:15

Bamber. But before I do that, I do want to express something of a frustration with the applicant. His response to stop Lime Dan's written representation, um, failed to respond in detail to some of the technical appendices that were provided by that IP. Now, in the case of transport, Mr. Bambi's expert report stretched to 58 pages.

01:08:53:13 - 01:09:24:15

You only responded to a summary version of that appendix. Um, now, I do note that the applicant in Rec 3133 responded to stop line downs deadline two transport submission in fuller detail. And that was rep 2051. And within that you did provide some additional commentary on Mr. Bambi's original 58 page assessment. But I think given the polarized positions on transport impacts, it would be more helpful for the essay to have received a full rebuttal of that document.

01:09:24:25 - 01:09:39:00

Um, so I will, however, now come to the you the applicants to explain the key points of difference in the HGV numbers and why you believe that we, as the WSA, should prefer your appraisal as opposed to that of stoplight downs.

01:09:40:14 - 01:10:21:23

James. Now for the applicant. So to begin with, um, I need to make clear that we, uh, our numbers and bill of quantities and everything else were derived by providing draft layouts to a contractor and the contractor, then providing us a breakdown of the different deliveries and amounts and weights and things like that. That is pretty standard practice. The reason for doing that is when we get to the detailed construction traffic management plan and the detailed design stage of the project, if we get to it, um, then as more details known, then you go out to contractors and tender for the process.

01:10:21:25 - 01:10:35:17

So they would then at the detailed stage be providing numbers as well, which we would then check and cross-check against our TMP. So it's important to use contractor numbers in the first instance as much as possible. Um,

01:10:37:15 - 01:10:39:06

in terms of uh.

01:10:43:10 - 01:11:15:16

The so if I go through sort of our numbers and stop line downs, numbers so we can see what the differences are, um, and the backgrounds to it. So we made an initial allowance for 600,000 solar PV panels which, which is we allowed 1200 deliveries for that. Um, and that assumed 500 panels per HGV. Now, the reason why it seems 500 panels for an HGV is because we used a smaller shipping container.

01:11:15:18 - 01:11:43:14

It's still 40 foot, but it's not what's called a high cube container, which is about half a meter higher. Um, with a high cube container, you can fit 720 panels per delivery. And that's something we we know because we've got that from the manufacturer. Um, and so that would actually allow for, uh, 864,000 solar panels with the same number of deliveries. Um,

01:11:45:06 - 01:12:15:24

which is a density of around 1842 modules per hectare. Um, the stop line down calculations assume 4308 deliveries. Um, and they don't spit out the mounting structure deliveries. So I'm just sticking to the panel deliveries, and I'll get on some obstructed deliveries in a minute. Um, but assuming the

mounting structures make up 31% of the stop line down deliveries, because that's what our contractor has told us. It's around 31%.

01:12:16:11 - 01:12:17:01

Um.

01:12:19:06 - 01:13:06:24

That's 1336, um, which is around 2971 panel deliveries. Assuming a high Geu container that would result in 2139. Sorry, 2,139,000 panels. Um, whether that's realistic is, um. Well. To determine whether that's realistic, we've looked at the MPs in three, um, paragraph, which indicates that 2 to 4 acres will be required for each megawatt of output, with 50MW of generation requiring 125 to 200 acres, or 100,000 to 150 000 panels, equates to.

01:13:07:02 - 01:13:13:12

So can I just check if you're reading details out of rep 3133?

01:13:13:14 - 01:13:34:17

I am reading some of it, yes. Yeah. But essentially the bottom line is they've um, their panel numbers are sort of 1.5 times what you'd expect for the area that we've looked at. And the area that we've included is 469 hectares, which is the area that is fenced. So it's the energy producing area on site.

01:13:34:27 - 01:13:35:16

Okay.

01:13:35:18 - 01:14:01:07

Okay. So there's a huge overestimation in terms of stop line downs, panel deliveries in terms of mounting structures. Again, we were provided information from the contracts and that includes weights and delivery numbers. And that was based on draft layouts. Um, and that initially assumed 25 tons per HGV. And then we reduced that to 21 tons. Um.

01:14:03:12 - 01:14:36:26

So, uh, again, the mounting structure is, uh, deliveries are overestimated and the SLD counts. Um, the solar PV panels in the majority are secured via metal posts driven into the ground rather than concrete footings. Um, stop lying down. I've included some amounts for concrete footings. It's not a not a huge amount. Um, but essentially we, as it says in our documents, um, concrete footings would be in place. Um, if there's a need for archaeological protection.

01:14:36:28 - 01:14:58:03

So, in other words, don't stick something in the ground, stick it on top if it needs to be protected. Um, in terms of waste. Um. Stop lying down. Accounts just don't include any compaction of waste. Um, the TMP does include a compaction unit, which is common for most construction sites. Um, but essentially

01:14:59:26 - 01:15:12:16

the, uh, the, the combined compaction factors about 32%. So that reduces the amounts quite significantly and reduces the trips compared to what stopping down have included. Um,

01:15:14:03 - 01:15:47:21

then it comes on, then we come on to the areas for the substations in terms of the compounds. So there's a massive overestimation in terms of the areas. Um, so we've assumed 38,000. And that's based on the line up that 30 38,000m<sup>2</sup> based on the layout. Um, stop lying down. Assume 42,500, which overestimates the trips. Um, also, there's quite a lot of that surface or a proportion of that service. That may not be hard surfaced. So, um. But we've we've assumed that all is the one through two substation.

01:15:48:02 - 01:16:04:21

Um, stop going down. Assume 9000m<sup>2</sup> for those. And we've seen 3455. So that's the actual area from a layout. Um, so again, that doubles the number of trips for the one, three, two substations. Um,

01:16:06:16 - 01:16:39:10

the best area. Stop now and assume 5500 zero square meters. I think they're taking the areas from the yellow areas shown on the on the plan, but actually that's an area which it would be located. The actual area of the compound is going to be smaller than that. So we're talking 27,000m<sup>2</sup> instead of 55,000m<sup>2</sup>. So again that's doubling it. A lot of these things are doubling the numbers in the slide counts. Access tracks. Um, stop them down. overestimate the depth of the the best access track.

01:16:39:12 - 01:17:02:04

So they put it down as 0.5 in the documents. It ranges from 0.2 to 0.5. But that's just totally that's just, um, depending on ground conditions. So a California bearing ratio, which looks at how much the ground can be compressed. So we've assumed which is a fair assumption, 0.3. So but their assumption double essentially doubles the trips again.

01:17:02:06 - 01:17:20:13

Can I we carry on at that point a stop lying down just not looking at the worst case scenario. If you've put down a 0.2 to 0.5, but you're working on a 0.3, then that's not the worst case scenario. So you can come back to that in a moment.

01:17:20:15 - 01:17:33:25

But I'm happy to come back to that now. I mean, it's it's it's an average isn't it. So some maybe 0.5, some maybe 0.2 to assume they're all 0.5 is not a realistic worst case. It's unrealistic. Worst case.

01:17:33:28 - 01:17:36:01

Oh, I'll be coming to stop lying around and

01:17:38:00 - 01:17:42:20

go from their perspective in a moment. But I'll come back to you, Mr. Darrow. Sorry for interrupting.

01:17:42:27 - 01:18:11:22

Uh, yeah. James Darrow for the applicant. Um, in terms of, uh, we've got a quite a large number of trips under what we call general fencing and landscaping. Um, and that includes a lot of things which stop lying down have also included. But they've added that on. So they've sort of double counting, if you like. Um, so if I just tell you what the general fencing and, uh, landscaping section includes.

01:18:13:10 - 01:18:44:27

Um, so our assessment includes a number of compounds. So, um, the total number of compounds, compound servicing motives, uh, compound construction, um, and additional wood, plastic, paper and cardboard waste. And then a percentage of spoil taken off site, and that percentage is 10% of 139,666m<sup>3</sup>. Um, and that comes from, um, that came from the contract.

01:18:44:29 - 01:19:06:27

It's also included in the waste chapter, although they assume that all of that is taken out, which is, um, a slight misreading of what the contractor said when they gave it to us. They just said, this is the this topsoil. Some of that could be taken off site. Um, but most of it will be stored on site. Uh, it's not going down of assumed 5% storage on site. We've assumed 10%. Um.

01:19:13:12 - 01:19:30:23

Uh, so. Yeah. So but standing down have included the general fencing and landscaping numbers, and then they've gone on to include the bits that that were already in there. For example, as I've said, the compound, the compound servicing, um, the spoil. Um, so it's double counting again.

01:19:31:20 - 01:19:32:21

Okay, so.

01:19:32:26 - 01:19:33:11

I.

01:19:33:13 - 01:20:07:16

Want to just take you back to the first statement that you said when you started off your summary. Um, you said you've made an allowance of 600,000 panels. Um, but then you go on to talk about 864,000 panels. I think it'd be helpful if we go back up to paragraph 2.1.7 of the document you've got on the screen, not that not the table, but paragraph 2.1.7, because I'm just confused here.

01:20:11:00 - 01:20:41:20

I think I mean, it just could be the way I'm reading, the way it's drafted. Um, so this particular paragraph aims to show stop line downs, assessment of the numbers of panels by area. And that number of estimated deliveries is substantially overinflated. I mean, in essence, this is what this paragraph is doing. Um, and you suggest that even if the entire fenced area that could contain solar panels was filled with panels, this would only result in 1,390,800 panels.

01:20:41:22 - 01:21:20:14

And I heard you say that, um, we can see it here on the screen. Um, so if that's the number that would result and that's being laid and that's being delivered. Um, if you use the entire fenced area, which you say is unrealistic, clearly that is substantially lower than stop line downs. Figure of 2,000,150 440,000 panels. But if the 1,003,983 398 oh, you can see the number on the on screen if that, um, number is unrealistic, what it doesn't tell me is what is realistic.

01:21:21:08 - 01:21:41:22

So if 600,000, which was the figure you started with, is the realistic number? Um, it would have helped me if that was clearer. But then, of course, you go on to talk about those numbers, the 600,000 and the 864,000, in the next paragraph. And forgive me for rambling, but I just sort of need to work this through. Um.

01:21:44:23 - 01:22:10:11

Paragraph 2.1.8, which we can all see there, says if a standard HQ containers are used, then £600,000 will be delivered. But if high cube containers are used, then 864,000 panels will be delivered. But surely the delivery numbers in my head, the delivery numbers shouldn't be based upon the number of panels required should be based upon the panels required, not the size of the vehicle that could deliver them. So what am I missing?

01:22:12:09 - 01:22:14:00

What am I not understanding?

01:22:18:04 - 01:22:49:14

The applicant. So the numbers used in the original assessment were based on an indicative design of the number of panels, which is why you've got that, um, 600,000 number. As part of this exercise, we were trying to establish, um, how we could get to, um, understand the figures that had been put forward by stop lying down. And so as part of that exercise, obviously the indicative design within the panel area includes lots of elements, not just the panels.

01:22:49:16 - 01:23:24:24

So you've got access routes, you've got your converters or your distribution switch rooms, you've got spacing between the panels and all those sorts of elements, which led to the indicative design to give you that 600,000 panel figure. We then to try and sort of, as you say, come to a maximum worst case. We then assumed that, well, if you if you disregarded all of those other elements in your scheme which we know that are required. But if you were saying, well, if you covered absolutely every area within work, number one with panels.

01:23:24:26 - 01:23:49:13

How many panels could you technically fit within that space? Um, and that's where we got to that 1,390,800 figure. Um, so we were demonstrating that even if you disregarded all of the other elements within the scheme, you still didn't get to the number of panels that stop lying down were creating. So that's the first paragraph. Yeah.

01:23:49:21 - 01:23:50:06

I follow.

01:23:50:08 - 01:24:21:02

That part. So the second part, um, we were trying to demonstrate how many panels you could bring in with the number of movements that we had, um, considered. So we were trying to demonstrate was that if you used a standard container, they would be able to bring in, um, 500, uh, panels each. And that gives you your 600,000 panels, um, figure. However, it would be possible to bring in a greater number of panels with the same number of movements if you used a different vehicle.



01:24:21:04 - 01:25:03:12

So what we were trying to say is if you, the applicant is not trying to limit the number, necessarily limit the number of panels in any way, it's saying that you would be able to bring in more panels with the same number of movements if you utilized a different vehicle configuration. So it was it was trying to give a demonstration of what would be the sort of the maximum number of panels you could bring in with the number of movements that the applicant has allocated. And we were trying to sort of, uh, get to the biggest number we could, I suppose, to try and make, um, a comparable between the assessment that we've undertaken and the assessment has stopped lying down, has undertaken.

01:25:03:14 - 01:25:36:23

So we're trying to see how we could get to the maximum figures, um, that you could take into account for our particular assessment and still demonstrate that it didn't it was still very far apart from the figures that stopped lying down had been using. We were also mindful that that if you change the figures in or some of the numbers in a transport assessment, then that sometimes has consequences for some of the other chapters. So we also we were conscious at the same time that we were doing a response on the, um, comments made on transport.

01:25:36:25 - 01:25:48:12

We were also responding to some of the technical work that have been submitted in response to climate change calculations. So there was an alignment as well between the figures being used and the responses to both of those.

01:25:48:14 - 01:26:00:27

So documents the 1200 figure then of movements is a fixed figure. Is that what you're saying? So there would be no more than 1200 HGV movements.

01:26:00:29 - 01:26:38:22

Clare project the applicant. So these are the figures that have been used for the purposes of the assessment. The applicant isn't proposing um, so that those are the figures that have gone in the have been used to calculate the table that is within the outline construction traffic management plan, albeit Mr. Darrell can explain that whilst we've got those figures, we've then done other things to incorporate, um, allowances. So we've used rounding up and then there's been an application of a 50% uplift to get to the figures that then go in the um outline construction, um, traffic management plan that have been used for the purposes of the assessment.

01:26:38:24 - 01:27:21:14

So just to finish the point about the how we've arrived at of our figures, we're saying we've tried to take the maximum number of panels that we think that you could fit, and then we've still applied a 50% uplift on our traffic movements, and we're still far lower than the stop line down figures. So that's, I suppose, that particular point, the separate point that you have just raised is in terms of how the total number of movements is controlled when we actually come to build the project. So when the applicant submits their final construction traffic management plan, um, it will need to update the table four, which is set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management plan.

01:27:21:16 - 01:28:04:03

There could be some differences in those figures when it comes to doing the final detailed design. And at that point in time, the applicant would need to demonstrate that if there are changes to those figures, there aren't any materially new or different environmental effects from those assessed in the, um, uh, in the transport assessment that was submitted with the DCO. So obviously, these are the figures that have been put forward as part of the assessment, but the final figures for each of those elements, for each of the sites, the substation, the beds would be finalised at the detailed design stage and then that would be signed off by the um local planning authority in consultation with the relevant highway authority.

01:28:04:05 - 01:28:15:25

But it's in these figures. The figures here are based on, obviously, the outline design and in the individual figures for each of the sites, and how they total could be slightly different than the final design.

01:28:15:27 - 01:28:30:12

Okay, so irrespective of the HIV numbers, what are either of those figures? 600,000 or 864,000. Do they even get close to the potential number of panels that you would need?

01:28:50:11 - 01:29:22:27

Um, Clare, project the applicant, um, the applicant considers at this stage that it would be a design that would include more than 864,000 panels. Is is unlikely based on the current technology that's available in the way that you would need to space the panels within the site. So we're confident that the that the numbers that are shown there reflect the realistic, um, configuration of the site, albeit obviously we haven't done the detailed design.

01:29:22:29 - 01:29:23:17

Okay.

01:29:23:19 - 01:29:28:08

Um, I believe your transport assessment was based upon

01:29:29:26 - 01:29:44:15

fixed panels because you could fit more onto the site if you use a fixed panel array as opposed to tracker panel. So those numbers are based upon fixed panels. So if you use tracker panels it could be less clear.

01:29:45:04 - 01:29:46:08

Yes that's correct. Okay.

01:29:46:22 - 01:30:12:13

Thank you. Um, Mr. Darrell, you and you said that you provide details of the indicative arrangement to a contractor. And I in that document that we just had displayed, I kept seeing the words provided by a contractor in multiple areas. Um, can you just give me some detail of the.

01:30:14:00 - 01:30:14:15

The.

01:30:14:19 - 01:30:25:07

Contractors that you're referring to? I mean, what's their experience of developing solar farms of this scale and trying to understand how they derive these figures?

01:30:28:26 - 01:31:13:03

We'll throw four for the applicant. So these figures come from an engineering procurement contractor that has worked on schemes of varying different sizes. Um, they were acting in a consultant capacity on this basis, but using real time figures. Now we're transitioning at Island Green Power as a developer, transition into becoming an IPP independent power provider. So at the moment now we have quite a circular way of referring what we're putting into assessments going back through the contractor process. So at the moment these numbers are being checked through our design and contractor in-house at this point, as well as obviously being provided in the first instance from somebody who is experienced in providing these numbers and these feed into a bill of materials, which we've then used to inform the assessments.

01:31:13:05 - 01:31:22:22

Okay. So. So in essence, these contractors have developed solar schemes of this scale so that they understand how many panels you might fit in in a space. Is that what you're. That's what I'm trying to get to.

01:31:22:24 - 01:31:23:20

Yeah, precisely.

01:31:23:22 - 01:31:25:09

Yeah. Okay. Um.

01:31:28:10 - 01:31:55:29

In in our first written question, TT 1.6. Um, it was to do with how much monitoring is done on other solar schemes of construction traffic. Um, the the answer, um, that we received said suggested that transport figures for other solar farms cannot be verified because that monitoring isn't necessarily undertaken. Um,

01:31:57:17 - 01:32:27:22

so to how much reliance does the applicant place upon the transport figures in other solar DCO applications when they're estimating their own? I'm just wondering if your contractor that you're using to provide these figures. A similar contractor that has provided those figures for other solar schemes which are not being monitored for there, some are not even constructed, and others that are, for example, like a Cleve Hill, which in terms of the scale of of this scheme is possibly commensurate.

01:32:27:24 - 01:32:37:06

But if nobody's been monitoring actually how many HGV movements did occur? I'm just wondering how much reliance we can place upon upon the contractor figures.

01:32:37:27 - 01:33:19:17

Er the Atkins. So as you've recognized in terms of actual examples of schemes of this scale, um, in in England, Cleeve Hill is the only built out, um example of that. How however, obviously all of the components that are required for a solar project are similar, whether the scheme is an under 50 megawatt project or a much larger project. So the the nature of the materials required, um, is well known and can be scaled up, um, depending on what's up, what's required. I just want to make clear what we're saying is not that the traffic wasn't monitored on those projects, but that information isn't publicly available, so we're not able to provide it as part of our responses.

01:33:19:19 - 01:33:22:25

But I didn't want to suggest nobody monitored. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

01:33:22:27 - 01:33:43:27

Traffic movement. And likewise, I didn't mean to imply that they weren't monitored, but so I suppose on that basis, then the transport figures that are in other applications, which may be dsos, they may not be they may come under the Planning Act regime. They're probably the best we've got to go on in terms of estimating these numbers. I mean, is that the case.

01:33:44:07 - 01:34:16:14

Er Clare budget for the applicant. Yes. And that's been the approach taken on Island Green Power's previous projects. So the same approach was taken on Cottam and West Burton which have been consented, and Green Hill is awaiting determination. A similar approach was, was taken to that and it has um, two other projects, uh one in examination to one examination two due to start examination soon. So it's a lot of work has gone into developing these numbers across the portfolio of projects that Ireland Green Power has.

01:34:16:16 - 01:34:49:19

It is also in the process of building out West Burton. Um, so the project so it is um, doing that next stage of work in terms of the actual detailed design and having to, um, procure contractors to carry out those works. So internally within IGP there, there is a lot of knowledge that is being used to validate the approach being taken on the projects that are going through the consenting process to make sure that what we are seeking consent for is is a viable for a viable project.

01:34:49:21 - 01:34:56:01

It's not in the applicant's interest to, um, get consent for something that can't actually be built out.

01:34:56:16 - 01:35:06:06

On that basis. Then can can we come to table two in Mr. Bamber transport assessment. And it would be helpful for it to be displayed. It's rep 1172.

01:35:08:13 - 01:35:15:13

Um, it's page 18 of that document. I think the PDF page is the same. Be helpful for us to have that on the screen.

01:35:27:11 - 01:35:59:27

Okay. Thank you. Um, so Mr. Bamber has produced this table. Um, and it compares lime down with several other consented solar farms, except in Green Hill, which is in recommendation stage. And

some of these, as you say, West Burton, um, Green Hill are similar schemes for IGP, um, specifically the solar work areas and the HGV deliveries that were put forward in the examination of those other solar farms. That's what this table is demonstrating. But given you didn't respond to Mr.

01:35:59:29 - 01:36:09:17

Bamboos D1 submission in full. I just wonder if you could now explain why Line down is expected to generate JVs at such a low rate compared to those other schemes.

01:36:10:04 - 01:36:17:03

James. Darryl. For the applicants. Um, that's because he's used 748 as the works here, and it should be 469.

01:36:19:06 - 01:36:21:08

On the bottom. On the bottom row.

01:36:22:02 - 01:36:23:15

James. Yes.

01:36:23:17 - 01:36:24:10

Thank you.

01:36:25:12 - 01:36:44:28

Okay. That's helpful. I don't need to display that. Stop lying down. I can count to that in a moment. So there's just one other matter before I move to stop lines and to come in on this. Um, and that's, it's HGV uplift that keep hearing about keep hearing about 50% uplift. Um.

01:36:48:05 - 01:36:50:27

There's and I'm.

01:36:50:29 - 01:36:56:28

I don't wish to imply that we're using an uplift of brush off IP concerns with HGV assessment, but

01:36:58:27 - 01:37:10:17

For example, any increase in conversion units is not assessed, but paragraph 2.1.18 in rep 3133 says this would be captured within a 50% uplift.

01:37:12:05 - 01:37:40:23

No specific allowance is made for delivery or movement of construction machinery, but paragraph 2.1.19 says the 50% uplift would accommodate these deliveries. The 50% uplift is also said to account for the removal of spoil and building compound areas. And that's paragraph 2.1.22. And I just therefore want to ask the question whether the uplift applied is actually lower than 50%, because some of those movements should have been calculated in the first instance and not rely upon an uplift to cover them.

01:37:41:08 - 01:38:12:01

So James Darren, for the applicant, yeah, I think for example, the conversion units, um, I think we had 68 in there. Um, and if you look through the application documents at the moment, it says there could be two on each site and it could be 166. Um, that's because the draft layout that we gave the contract had 68 in it. Now, it's not actually that many more trips to, you know, going up to 166. But the point here is it's not just a 50%. And I think we probably used overused the 50% thing because there's lots of buffers that we've included in our assessment.

01:38:12:03 - 01:38:43:24

And really that's what I'm saying is we've got quite a large amount of buffers in our assessment. We've assumed all access tracks are aggregate construction when some were not. And it will obviously depend on ground conditions at the time. And actually if you look at a built out solar farm, if you just look at a Google view of it, you'll see that a lot of the tracks aren't actually aggregate. Some of them are, and some of them aren't. We've assumed that they all are. Um, we've assumed that things like the density, um, aggregate density to ten per cubic meter, but it's actually more like 1.5 to 1.8.

01:38:43:26 - 01:39:20:28

That would significantly decrease the trips. So we've gone through it. You know, this is a this is a again, a buffer. Um, we've assumed, um, as I said, standard container for panels. We've assumed a 20 foot container for the best that doubles the best trips. We've assumed the 400 kV substation gets built over six months, which was picked up by Scotland down. But that was intentional because what it does is it increases the peak. So that is another buffer. Um, in fact, the 400 kV substation will be built over a longer period, probably, I don't know, 18 months or something rather than six months.

01:39:21:00 - 01:39:51:18

So what you mean is what you're getting is a higher amount of trips in a shorter time. Um, we've also assumed that all sites are built out concurrently, so they're all built out at the same time. And then that and the peak day happens every single day. Um, we've applied obviously, this 50%, we've included rounding. So there's ten, which doesn't sound like much, but actually it really starts to uplift the HGV numbers. Um, and as I said, we've assumed yeah. The add that that the peaks are actually eights.

01:39:51:20 - 01:39:58:16

So and essentially that means that that peak occurs every single day for two years, which is not likely.

01:39:58:21 - 01:40:09:17

Okay. Thank you. All right. Um, Mr. Gazelka. Um, I'll come over to you now with Mr. Bamber, um, to counter any of that.

01:40:09:21 - 01:40:15:22

Of course, madam. Because I can stop lying down. Um, of course, madam. I'll let Mr. Bamber go for it, so to speak.

01:40:17:19 - 01:40:39:01

Thank you. Uh, Bruce Bamber, stop lying down. Um, quite a lot to unpick there. Um, let's see how I get on a couple of points of fact. Um, the 748 is the work's area. Uh, one. Um, so it is that comparison is a like, for, like, comparison. Um.

01:40:42:11 - 01:41:14:15

Mr. Darrell has informed me that if you look at or the layout, if you just look at the fields or the area that is, um, Completely covered by panels that would be 469 hectares. I accept that is less than the whole of um, works number one area. Um, but when I've done that comparison in terms of HGTV's per unit area, that has been looking at the works number one area for those other, um, developments as well.

01:41:14:17 - 01:41:46:14

So it is a like for like that, that doesn't explain the difference. Um, a couple of other points of fact. Um, in my calculation, um, I used a 0.3m depth for the construction access tracks, apart from those leading to the, uh, the best and the 400, uh, or the substations, those tracks that carry the, um, abnormal loads which the applicant has identified as requiring to be, um, thicker.

01:41:47:04 - 01:42:11:12

Um, Mr. Daniel also pointed out, or he stated that I had made an allowance for concrete footings. I haven't um, there's I've assumed no concrete footings at all. Um, I mean, these assumptions are set out in my calculation, that is, in appendix D, um, it's page 73 of the PDF. If you if you want to look at that.

01:42:11:14 - 01:42:12:15

Can you just say.

01:42:12:20 - 01:42:16:26

Which document reference this is given this appendix D has come up. Yeah right.

01:42:17:24 - 01:42:18:09

Do you have.

01:42:18:11 - 01:42:18:26

That.

01:42:18:28 - 01:42:19:13

Yes.

01:42:20:23 - 01:42:26:23

Yes. Um. Apologies, madam. It's um, so it's in the, um, written representation, which if I get.

01:42:27:03 - 01:42:27:18

One.

01:42:27:20 - 01:42:31:19

17272. Yeah. That's it there before me. Okay.

01:42:31:21 - 01:42:32:07

Thank you.

01:42:34:01 - 01:43:06:00

Right. So, um, just starting with the more going back to that, the solar panel numbers, um, we have met, um, to have a discussion, um, and to try and sort of overcome some of these differences. So we have managed to, um, uh. Um, reduce the distance between us in some areas. Um, and I'll just mention a few of those, um, in a minute. Um, we did talk about the number of HGV deliveries per unit area.

01:43:06:02 - 01:43:37:12

Uh, Mr. Tamil provided this 469 hectares value. Um, if we take the, um, the ratio of total area, um, um, to the area that is actually panels, which so essentially it is, um, 4.5m panels with 2.5m between them. If we apply that ratio, um, we come up with a figure, um, of 301.5 hectares.

01:43:37:29 - 01:43:41:00

Um, if we then divide that.

01:43:41:03 - 01:43:42:27

So tell me that dimension again.

01:43:42:29 - 01:43:44:00

So, uh.

01:43:44:14 - 01:43:45:17

The hectare dimension.

01:43:45:19 - 01:44:22:21

A 301.5 hectares of actual panels themselves. So, um. Each panel, according to the scheme description, is 3.1m<sup>2</sup>, 2.4 by 1.3. Um, so we end up dividing that area by the panel area with 972,581 panels. So that's, that is taking the, um, the area that I've been provided with for panel coverage using all the applicant's assumptions.

01:44:22:28 - 01:45:06:18

Um, we come up with a figure that's over 50% higher than the 600,000 that the applicant has used. And obviously, if that is, if that is the correct figure, then obviously that uplift should also be applied to the mounting structures. Um, if we look at the, um, the possibility Of using larger containers. The high the high cube containers. Even if we assume that every one of those panels is delivered using those, um, we still end up with, um, 1351 JVs rather than the 1200.

01:45:07:06 - 01:45:41:27

Um, now I'm trying to be, um, reasonable in trying to understand the, um, the dimensions and the parameters that the applicant has put forward. But at the same time, I'm conscious that we do need to look at a likely worse case. And if we are always looking at, well, we could bring every single panel in a larger container. In reality, that might not be the case. The supplier may not have those vehicles. Um, so I do not think it's reasonable to assume that they would all come like that.

01:45:46:19 - 01:46:06:04



Oh, yes. So if I, if we assume that, um, on that on that basis, all the panels came in, uh, containers of 500 panels per vehicle, we would have 945 HGV's, um, rather than the 1200 that the applicant is putting forward.

01:46:10:08 - 01:46:25:25

Um, okay. Now, if we just if we're looking at the various elements that have been taken into account because this isn't the majority of the movements of the of the movement to other elements of the site. Um,

01:46:27:22 - 01:46:33:26

in terms of waste, uh, we got conflicting information. Um.

01:46:35:27 - 01:46:44:00

Where the waste has been allocated to the general category. And whether the waste includes spoil. Um,

01:46:45:20 - 01:47:22:20

to begin with, the applicant didn't mention the need for compactors on the site. Um, so I acknowledge that with compactors, the number of TVs for waste would be reduced. Um, but at the same time there, it seems to have been acknowledged now that there would need to be waste. Um, that wasn't allowed for in the first assessment to be taken away from the site. Um, the applicant has also accepted. Now, I believe it's correct that the best units. Um, they are too large to be transported individually, so they would be split into two.

01:47:23:06 - 01:47:53:15

Um, otherwise they would all constitute abnormal loads. Um, now, only 425 deliveries are allowed for in the, um, calculations thus far. Um, if that splits into two, we then have 540 deliveries just for those that element. And that doesn't take into account the other, um, uh, structures or components that would also have to come to the site as part of the best.

01:47:55:11 - 01:48:37:13

One of the largest, um, contributors to the HGV movements, um, is to do with the foundations for particularly the best, uh, the substations, um, and also, uh, for the conversion units each the conversion units around the site will need to be on a concrete base. Um, now, the applicant has assumed a depth of 0.3m. Uh, average depth. Now, um, I made an assumption about the area of the substations and the best, um, based on the worst case dimensions in the scheme Description.

01:48:37:27 - 01:49:15:20

Um, we have got indicative drawings of those parts of the site. Um, I'm happy to reduce my areas to be consistent with Mr. Darrell's. Um, but I'm not a content that we would have an average of 0.3m depth on all those components. Um, the substations have to support extremely heavy, uh, components, not only that part of the site that is supporting it, but also, um, the, uh, the equipment required to move those components around the site.

01:49:16:08 - 01:49:16:29

Um.

01:49:19:06 - 01:49:54:21

There would those, those parts of the site that were not concrete are likely to be gravelled. They wouldn't be just bare earth. If we're looking at the, um, the actual space occupied by those structures. Uh, and there's been no allowance for any of the drainage requirements for the best, there would need to be containment for fire water, which can require quite a large quantity of gravel and suitable systems, so that if there is a fire, then the water can be contained and then safely disposed of.

01:49:55:09 - 01:50:20:04

I've had a look at the, um, um, the fire, um, um, in what's called Bywater strategy. Um, that doesn't provide any useful volumes that I could use to make some kind of assessments for that. Um, but I would expect that requirement to require a lot more concrete structures for containment.

01:50:22:15 - 01:50:58:24

Um, so my conclusion is that, um, there would there is currently quite a large underestimate of movements associated with those, uh, foundation structures. Now, another element that hasn't been looked at are all the other structures associated, particularly with the substations. You will have seen the indicative drawings of the substations at the moment. As far as I can see, the only thing that's been or things that have been taken into account are the foundations and then the abnormal loads, the transformers that sit there.

01:50:59:00 - 01:51:14:02

Um, there is a lot more electricity, electrical equipment and supporting structures, um, within those parts of the site. And I can't see anywhere where those components have been allowed for in movement.

01:51:18:19 - 01:51:56:12

Um, the applicant has suggested that there's been an overestimation, overestimation of movements associated with access tracks and that some of those would not be, Um, formally constructed to a normal standard. I mean, looking at the site layout. There's lots of parts to the site that are not directly accessed with access tracks. So, um, my reading of that is that they have identified parts of the access routes that would need to be properly surfaced with, um, a decent thickness of aggregate and surface.

01:51:56:25 - 01:52:24:29

Um, those other parts of the sites where um, access could be undertaken for maintenance, um, by smaller vehicles. That's not been that's not part of these calculations. Um, and then finally this element of general, uh, movement, which Mr. Dowell said allows for, um, the compound surfacing, um.

01:52:27:10 - 01:52:57:17

Waste and then 10% spoil being removed. Um, it does also include the landscaping. Mr. Darrell didn't mention that. Um, and I've done the calculation based on compound sizes that are consistent with the latest drawing that's been submitted as part of the responses, um, to comments that have come in, uh, which shows a 50 by 50 meter compound.

01:52:58:04 - 01:53:32:20

Um, I don't think that's big enough. It doesn't show all the things that you would need to have on a compound. I think it would need to be a little a little bit bigger than that. Um, at a minimum. Um, so I've allowed for 50 by 60m. Um, if we just look at the number of compounds that are required, the figure that the applicant has put in, uh, for the general category of HGV, HGV movement, um, only covers the, um, the the the surfacing, the aggregate for the surfacing of those compounds.

01:53:32:22 - 01:53:48:17

Nothing else. Well, it wouldn't even cover that. So, um. Whereas the applicant is suggesting that this general category encompasses easily all the other elements of the site. Um, I don't believe it does.

01:53:50:27 - 01:54:27:16

Um, on the 50% uplift point, um, initially that 50% was used to represent a worst case day. It was used to represent, um, the fact that there is a variation, a daily variation in activity. Um, and that is reasonable to assume because we want to look to see what the worst case would be. Um, if we're now looking at the 50% uplift not applied to the daily variation, but to allow for the things that haven't been properly allowed for.

01:54:27:19 - 01:54:52:03

Then we lose the allowance for the day to day variation. So we should be if we are going to say, well, actually the number of TVs is 50% higher, um, or could be 50% higher. Then we also need to allow for the day to day variation so that we can start to identify what the adverse transport impacts of that would be.

01:54:55:11 - 01:55:31:19

So I should say we've had the meeting. There's queries been raised. I am expecting more information to be provided. Um, I'm also um, uh, proposing to produce an updated estimate of HGV movements. As things stand at the moment, um, it is likely to be lower than my first estimate, but, um, I suspect it's going to be something like double what the applicant has suggested to date, but I wait until that arrives.

01:55:31:21 - 01:55:43:07

But that's the kind of order of magnitude that I expected to show. And then obviously I can circulate that and then we can discuss that. And if there needs to be any tweaking, then I'm happy to do that.

01:55:43:09 - 01:55:43:24

Yeah.

01:55:43:26 - 01:56:03:21

Can I ask? Um, when you do that reassessment and we, I, we don't have the opportunity to discuss the individual routes today and particularly the uplift of HTB numbers on those individual routes, because we are still at a polarized position. But will your updated assessment look at those individual routes?

01:56:04:00 - 01:56:04:16

Yes.

01:56:04:25 - 01:56:13:16

You know the route through gritstone, how many HGV will then be added to that route and and so on? Or are you just still going to look at the headline figures?

01:56:14:12 - 01:56:57:25

Well, I've got a spreadsheet that, um, an element of which all elements of which I've put in the, uh, the appendix D document, um, that produces that converts the headline figures into the daily, daily movements on those particular links. There are some problems with particular. This is probably something we will cover later. But for example, Littleton, um, because it provides access to, um, two cable access points and there's compounds there, then, um, there's going to be some parts of the site that are going to experience more vehicle movements than others.

01:56:57:29 - 01:56:58:17

Um,

01:57:01:03 - 01:57:29:15

I don't, I, I think what I will do is produce something that shows how the if I come up with a larger figure, I will produce, um, a plan that shows how what the implications are of that on the various parts of the network. Yeah. Um, if there's those queries that I'm not in a position to answer, I can only sort of highlight, um, where I might have concerns that there might be more impact at these other sensitives.

01:57:29:17 - 01:57:34:16

That would be extremely helpful. Thank you. Um, Wiltshire Council. Um, miss Shelby.

01:57:34:21 - 01:58:07:21

Odette Shelby for Wiltshire Council. Um, so, as you've understood, the council hasn't done the detailed calculations that Mr. Banbury and the applicant have. But if I could just state the overarching position briefly, I think that would still be helpful. So the applicant has stated this morning that it's not in their interest to get consent for something that can't be built out. But obviously, the reality here is that there isn't a proposed control on HGV movements. So, um, I mean, in other cases, I've done a recent quarry appeal where there is a condition controlling HGV movements.

01:58:07:23 - 01:58:49:03

Understand that's not what's proposed here and that's not what the council suggesting, but what it means is that the risk the council wants to avoid is a real one, and that's the actual movement significantly exceed what's been estimated. And I understand what Miss Broderick says, that obviously they can't, when they're discharging requirements, materially exceed the environmental effects. But when we're at the point of discharging requirements and the council doing that, rather than the examining authority examining in the detail we have today, given the timelines for discharge, the pressures on the council, and it's very challenging to assess seriously and the level of detail the numbers put forward.

01:58:49:09 - 01:59:24:26

And at the same way, the examining authority can over a period of months and months. So it is really important that this is right and that the examining authority has confidence that the figures are realistic and that they are precautionary. But for for all the points that that stop lying down have have made.

And so this is a real concern of the council. The council hasn't done the detailed calculations that Mr. Bamber has. And but having listened to what Mr. Bamber and the applicant have said this morning, the council, it remains very concerned and, and remains concerned that the, the concerns Mr.

01:59:24:28 - 01:59:40:22

Bamber raised hasn't haven't been fully resolved. So what we propose to do is is review um Mr. Banda's next submission that he's just identified and the council will respond to that in writing when it comes through and that the council is very concerned about this issue.

01:59:40:28 - 01:59:52:23

Thank you, Mr. Bamber. When do you think you submit that information? I mean, deadline for is the 10th of July next Friday, but are you thinking deadline five?

01:59:55:08 - 01:59:57:17

So when is deadline five?

01:59:58:03 - 02:00:00:11

I knew you would ask that. And I should have been prepped.

02:00:02:05 - 02:00:04:26

I should have had it. Somebody over there just said it.

02:00:06:00 - 02:00:06:27

Clever to the applicant.

02:00:06:29 - 02:00:11:08

Seventh of all, thank you very much. I should have had the rule A3 on my screen, didn't

02:00:13:05 - 02:00:40:06

I? I'm just conscious. We've got reserved hearings for September. This is not going to be resolved. There is still a polarization and we will need to revisit this. And I don't think necessarily written questions are going to get into the detail of this. So, um, it would be helpful to, to have it well in advance. But I don't want to put you under a ridiculous pressure for next Friday.

02:00:41:13 - 02:01:04:04

Yeah. Okay. Uh, Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. That. Stop lying down. Um, yes, I could do next Friday. Um, this is, um, a caveat that, um, I am waiting for some more information to come over from the applicant. Um, I can produce the best that I possibly can, given the information by then. Um.

02:01:04:18 - 02:01:35:05

I'm not keen to open up late submissions in examinations. We've been very clear that we don't want late submissions in examination because it just has a knock on effect to other parties, and certainly also to the Tsar. However, if there's a slippage of a couple of days on that, I would be inclined to accept a late submission from you. Um, and only you. So this is not a blanket late submission, um, acceptance here. Um, because I just think it would be helpful. Then we had the applicant would have

an opportunity by then, deadline five to provide a response. And then we know what we're going into in September.

02:01:36:12 - 02:01:49:04

Um, Danny Gazelka, stop lying down. Thank you. Madam. That's very welcome. And we will try our best. And if it if it isn't with you on Friday, we will say so and say give you full understanding of when in the next few days it should be.

02:01:49:06 - 02:02:15:01

Thank you. Um, so I want to come back to the applicant, um, whether they wish to defer to comment on that or a submission in writing, I don't really want another 15 minutes of refuting points, because we're also on a very tight schedule, and I can already see we're not going to get through the transport agenda. But if there's any particular point you wanted to raise. Um. Then I'm happy to hear them.

02:02:49:08 - 02:03:19:15

James doubtfully. Applicant. Um, yeah. We welcome that information and we'll provide a response, um, further to what's been said. Um, but obviously we're still focused on whether this has a minor or negligible or, you know, um, larger impact. And I think even with those the flows that, I mean, you can see from one meeting is, stop lying down slow. I've already dropped. So, um, we've got things in there. As I said before. Buffers like six month program for the 400 kV substation.

02:03:19:17 - 02:03:46:09

If that was stretched out to two years, then obviously that would reduce the total numbers of TVs on a daily basis. So it does come down to whether it's what the magnitude of impact is. Um, and yeah, so we can have a look at those numbers. I think we need to have another meeting with Stop Lying Down and with Wiltshire, who, um, from the sounds of it, are not doing their own analysis. So it's we need to speak to stop them down and Wiltshire, I think.

02:03:46:11 - 02:04:17:02

Okay. Um, Mr. Banbury suggested he's waiting on information from the applicant. That's really important. But whatever he's waiting on, he receives, um, because there is a tight turnaround for Mr. Bamber and that has a knock on effect. Are you responding a deadline five and then also to the council to appraise it. So whatever the delay is, if it could be, um, Unharmful. That would be helpful. Um, I think that's probably as much as I can say at this point on this item on the agenda.

02:04:17:04 - 02:04:19:23

Mr. Gazelka, did you want to just come back on.

02:04:20:00 - 02:04:50:09

Well, um, Daniel Gazelka, stop lying down. Um, two very small points. One, I did just wonder if it would help you to have some response from the applicant about that table to simply because the the basis upon which it was refuted is entirely wrong. Um, and at least even a line or two from the app, it might even, uh, help us understand when we're coming back next week. That's the ratio is one and two. It's a jury point. But the applicant is also indicating that it's not a set a reasonable worst case. So both parties are coming together. The jury point. But you know I've got to make it.

02:04:51:00 - 02:05:10:11

I clocked that in my head already. The second point, uh, Mr. Gazelka, um, I don't mind it being on the record, however. Um, but absolutely, because it was a question that I raised about that table, but I assumed the applicant, given that they're going to respond to the oral submission would be addressing that particular point. Um, so I yeah.

02:05:10:13 - 02:05:45:12

Clare project for the applicant. Um, yes. We will come back in writing just to confirm, um, the position and the figure. There's obviously a differential between the figure, uh, the amount of um, hectares where solar panels can be put and the, uh, hectares for the totality of work number one. And work number one also includes the cabling, um, between panel areas. So the figure, um, that Mr. Darryl mentioned was the area on the work plans that the panels and the converters and the sub distribution rooms could be located.

02:05:45:14 - 02:06:21:19

It didn't include, um, the area where cabling can take place so that that was the different the reason for, um, the difference in the, in the, in the figures being shown. So when we, when we were doing our calculations and talking about the maximum amount of panels that could be located, we were talking about the maximum number of panels that can be located within the work number that is just four panels on the works plans. I believe that the and there's a separate point about how that then relates to other projects, but it was just to confirm that the figure that Mr.

02:06:21:21 - 02:06:55:24

Darrell referred to, which was the 479.5 hectares, is for work numbers A to see, which is the panels themselves and the converters. It excluded work number 1D where we're only seeking the ability to put cables. We're not seeking the ability to put panels. There also excludes areas that have been allocated for um, sort of habitat buffer areas and those sorts of things. So I just wanted to confirm the, um, the rationale between the figure that Mr.

02:06:55:26 - 02:07:28:06

Darrell mentioned. Um, however, we will respond more fully on then how you compare it with the other skins because obviously I don't have the the equivalent figures. So for example, I know for West Burton, the work number one area that's quoted here is for um, again for all of uh, work. Number one, it's not just the panel area. The panel area is is much less, but I don't have all of the details for the other the other projects there. So it, um, it's probably appropriate for us to come back in more detail.

02:07:28:08 - 02:07:30:22

Obviously it will on that rather than doing the maths here.

02:07:30:24 - 02:07:31:09

But I want to.

02:07:31:11 - 02:07:35:16

Cover that was the reason that I just wanted to explain the reasoning for the difference in the figures though.

02:07:35:18 - 02:07:45:25

But I want to come back very briefly to Mr. Zuckerman, Mr. Bamber, um, if he wanted to clarify anything on that on the record now.

02:07:46:20 - 02:08:18:29

Chris Bamba, stop lying down. Um, I understand that point. Um, but the point that I made before is that this is a like, for, like, comparison. um, um, as it was, um, mentioned at West Burton, that is the whole of works number one area. Um, similar to lime down a whole of works number one area. So you we would expect, you know, a little bit of variation depending on the details.

02:08:19:05 - 02:08:25:16

Um, but as a, the general pattern, um, is obvious to see from that table.

02:08:25:18 - 02:08:26:04

Yeah.

02:08:26:06 - 02:08:26:29

Thank you.

02:08:28:10 - 02:08:53:25

Man. I'll stop by. I don't know if it would assist if the applicant because three of these schemes that we are comparing to are its own, albeit in different locations. Um, that's our reading of works number one for each of them, which we understand is like for like seven, four, eight. And the difference is at least on our assessment, are big. It may be that it can provide particular information about those schemes of their own, just because they're in a privileged position. Yeah. Um, and that might help as well.

02:08:54:00 - 02:08:55:28

I think I'm sure that's what you will be doing.

02:08:56:00 - 02:09:17:27

Yeah. Clare, for the applicant. Yes. I think we can comment on our own green skin. Obviously there are differences on those schemes, so there are potentially wider buffer areas on those schemes. For particular reasons. The cabling may be longer between solar PV sites on those schemes. So we can provide a narrative to explain, um, the reasons why the, um, the why there may be a difference.

02:09:17:29 - 02:09:48:04

I think we accept there will be some difference. It's just the extent of difference, um, is clearly where the issue lies. But I think we need to park there. Could we please have a ten minute break? Um, I know it's not long, but there's still a lot to get through. Um, so to come back at 1150. But when I come, when we come back, um, I don't want to come back to construction traffic for light vehicles. I'm conscious that I really want to cover highway user safety, and I think that's more pressing matter. So when we come back that we'll come straight on to highway user safety.

02:09:48:06 - 02:09:51:05

So just adjourn for ten minutes until 1150, please.