



Planning Inspectorate  
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

## Hearing Transcript

|                 |                                          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|
| <b>Project:</b> | Lime Down Solar Project                  |
| <b>Hearing:</b> | Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Part 4 |
| <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)

00:00:06:22 - 00:00:37:11

Welcome back everybody. I make the time now for 36. Can I check with case team at the microphone. Issue has now been resolved. Excellent. Thank you very much. Okay. So I'm going to come to stop lying down first. But just to summarize what we got to, to just keep just refresh everybody's memories. Um, we had been talking about highway improvement areas, and the applicant had confirmed that works would be confined to to verges. And they're providing plans showing that, um, and then Miss Reynolds asked to come in.

00:00:37:13 - 00:00:38:20

So over to you, please.

00:00:39:16 - 00:00:57:10

Celia Reynolds, stop lying down. It's just a very brief comment or question. Joining up some of the discussion we had this morning in relation to the traffic and transport, I understand the applicant is going to be providing it's measured lengths of the of the roads, which some of the HGVs are going to be travelling.

00:00:57:21 - 00:01:00:26

There's David, I'm sorry, there's a problem with the cameras.

00:01:02:14 - 00:01:03:14

Captions.

00:01:05:16 - 00:01:10:13

Okay. Could we just pause for 30s? Eric. Sorry to interrupt. Of course. Thanks.

00:01:33:21 - 00:01:43:21

I believe we are good to continue. So, um. Although. Sorry, I'm just seeing the screen. There we are. That's it. Sorting out Miss Reynolds, third time lucky. Over to you.

00:01:43:23 - 00:02:26:00

Third time's the charm. Thank you. Um, so, Celia Reynolds, stop lying down. This relates to the applicant's updated assessment of the width of roads. Um, one of the key concerns of residents, um, within the stop lying down group is if as stop lying down suspects, some of these roads are too narrow, how the applicant is going to deal with that. And obviously that does have knock on ecological consequences as to the possible removal of trees or hedgerow. So we would request and I'm not sure what stage this is appropriate, is that if those roads are found to be less than 5.5m, if the applicant could clarify what they intend to do in response, and if that possibly includes the removal of, say, hedgerow or trees.

00:02:27:09 - 00:02:57:11

Well, that's a good point. And I think perhaps the appropriate time is going to be when the applicant has that information and then you know exactly what works are going to be required. And I think that was really my understanding of what you would be providing for, Mr. Jackson said. That was my understanding that once you have that, yes, your intention is to stick to the verge. Of course it is that Mr. Darrell was saying, but actually, if the roads aren't wide enough, my expectation certainly was that you would be detailing those works required. It's my understanding.

00:02:57:13 - 00:02:58:06

Correct.

00:03:01:00 - 00:03:17:20

Uh, James, now the applicant. Uh, yes, that is correct. Um, just. But a note, just because it's not 5.5m doesn't necessarily mean that we were proposing to widen it, because it depends on the other elements of the assessment. For example, forward visibility.

00:03:20:05 - 00:03:39:22

No. Absolutely. And I think the once you have that survey information and perhaps at the time, once you submit the survey information, is it realistic for you to provide a commentary at that time of the works and then potential impacts and just would rather just to confirm that there would be no hedgerow tree removal? Is that an appropriate time?

00:03:51:27 - 00:04:09:18

Yes. That's something we'll be doing when we provide the plans. It'd be quite clear from the plans what elements it's affecting, for example, a verge or a hedge or a tree or whatever. Um, from the. We've already pretty much done the plans, and I can say now that it's all verge. Um, but we'll make that clear when we made the submission.

00:04:10:20 - 00:04:15:03

That's useful. Thank you. Stop! Down. Lane down. Miss Reynolds, are you quite content with that? That approach?

00:04:15:06 - 00:04:16:07

Quite. Thank you.

00:04:17:00 - 00:04:54:13

Uh, clever. The applicant was obviously just before we were, um, forced into having our break, and we were just talking about that particular corner and how we propose to navigate that corner. And I wondered if it would be helpful just in terms of the discussion of where the overrun would be if we if we clarified that in a bit more detail. Um, we've been able, um, we just found the relevant drawing and how the AI obviously you've got the HGV movements and then it was about how the ales would manoeuvre around this corner, and we just had a bit more information to provide in terms of the particular area of, um, uh, trees that you were concerned about.

00:04:54:17 - 00:05:08:17

And it might be useful if Mr. Daryl just explains how an AI will move maneuver around this corner so you have a bit of confidence as to how we can be satisfied that we wouldn't need to do any works to, um, impact on those trees.

00:05:11:18 - 00:05:19:25

Uh, yes. And just bearing in mind the time and other matters, I also want to attend to brevity as a skill, so. Yes, please.

00:05:21:19 - 00:05:55:14

James, now for the applicant. Essentially, we've chosen an ale vehicle that has two cabs, one at the front and one in the back. As you can see from the diagram on the left hand side, the aerial vehicle turns right and heads. Uh, that's actually, uh, west, the next south. Uh, and then it can just go directly north without doing any more maneuvers because it has a cab at both ends. And that's quite a common ale vehicle. And that way we've completely missed that corner. It does overrun on the other side, which is just a grassed area.

00:05:55:21 - 00:06:03:00

Um, but we they put down matting, probably some metal plating for the vehicle to run over. That's what they normally do.

00:06:05:17 - 00:06:18:02

Okay. That's helpful. Um, I don't have any more comments than that, but I do look forward to receiving those plans and commentary. Do either of my colleagues have a query on that point? No. Okay.

00:06:20:05 - 00:06:50:15

Uh, Wiltshire Council, before we move on, do you have any comments to make on those matters? No. Stop lying down. Okay. Now, I was going to ask a series of questions about field margins, but actually we've we've covered what I wanted to ask earlier on. So that was that was helpful. If I do have any follow ups, I'll put them into written questions too. Um, existing buildings. I was going to ask about that, but I'm aware that the Environment Agency had been hanging on very patiently, and so I'm going to move on to Onto watercourses.

00:06:51:08 - 00:07:01:08

Now this is directed for the Environment Agency, please. Uh, assuming they're still with us. Someone from the Environment Agency just indicate they're still on the call.

00:07:03:18 - 00:07:05:14

Yeah. Still here? Yeah, we're still here.

00:07:05:25 - 00:07:29:06

Brilliant. Thank you. And thank you for hanging on. So I note the Environment Agency's Deadline three submission document rep 3146. It appears to show matters involving fish species, watercourse crossings, ecological assessments and aquatic invertebrates as being as agreed. Does that mean the Environment Agency raises no objection or concerns to these matters?

00:07:36:15 - 00:07:37:26

Yes. That's correct.

00:07:38:19 - 00:08:11:01

Thank you. Now, I note the matter of watercourse buffers remains under discussion In the later statement of common ground, and this relates to a discrepancy in the buffer zones in relation to various documents, where we appear to have figures of different figures, we have one eight metres, ten metres and 15m. Throughout the documentation, and I just wondered if I could have an update from the the applicant on this matter please. And then I'll come back to the Environment Agency.

00:08:27:27 - 00:08:47:15

Peter Timms, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. Um, so just to confirm that the the scheme there is embedded, um, buffers from watercourses. Um, these will be a minimum of eight metres, um, uh, from any, any sort of watercourse. Um, but will be waiting.

00:08:47:17 - 00:08:48:17

Could you speak louder.

00:08:48:19 - 00:09:20:05

Please, sir? They will be. So these buffers. There'll be a minimum buffer of eight metres from any sort of watercourse, um, ditch or stream. Um, um, they will be wider where the sensitive watercourse, um, requires it. Um, and there is a discrepancy in, in the documents. But, um, for example, where we do, um, we do, we do say secure ten metre buffer where, where we have identified, um, a large number of waterfall signs and a waterfall population.

00:09:20:16 - 00:09:53:14

Um, and again, um, a, uh, yeah. Um, wider still from, uh, um, where um, this isn't explicitly a buffer, but we do we do say in our the outline ecological protection mitigation strategy that, um, uh, where there's a possible risk of, um, biosecurity issues. Um, mainly referring to, um, watercourse. Um, uh, potential for spreading of invasive species.

00:09:53:16 - 00:10:13:15

So that's, um, sort of Himalayan balsam and, um, crayfish plague. Um, that's washed down areas will be, um, a minimum of 50m away from somewhere. Uh, potentially those potential. Um, there's potential for, for impacts arising from that, um, to, to prevent the spread of, um, non-native, invasive species.

00:10:14:20 - 00:10:24:01

No. Thank you. If I ask the Environment Agency just to comment on that, please. Does that address your concerns or do you still. Are you still seeking further, further detail?

00:10:25:10 - 00:10:56:05

Uh, Josephine Bouchard Humphreys, environment agency. Um, yes. The applicant has, um, clarified what they mean by the different the varied, um, buffer meter width. Um, we made a comment, um, in the first, um, examinations regarding our request for, uh, ten meter buffers. Strips, um, on all watercourses, including, uh, ditches. Um, this is for several reasons.

00:10:56:07 - 00:11:12:03

Um, ecological and also water quality. Um, but, uh, this has to be an advisory from our perspective as, um, biodiversity net gain is not mandatory yet for N6. So that was only an advisory. Um, we can only make that an advisory from our perspective.

00:11:15:25 - 00:11:30:23

So taking it away from being in terms of protection of species and watercourses, what buffers what is there a buffer zone then that the Environment Agency seeks. And is that consistent with what the applicants just described?

00:11:32:13 - 00:12:05:10

Um, so the applicant has proposed an eight meter buffer for lower sensitivity ditches and watercourse. Um, and the Environment Agency would prefer to see ten meters from the bank top. As that's usually our standard baseline. We request to protect riparian habitats, maintain wildlife corridors, bank stabilization, avoid species disturbance, etc. so we maintain that we would prefer ten metre buffers on the including the ditches. Um, but that's up to the applicants to discretion. As as you said, being is not mandatory at this stage.

00:12:09:23 - 00:12:13:00

So yeah. Sorry. I'm just I'm just not following. So

00:12:14:21 - 00:12:26:14

taking being away out the conversation. So it's just about just about protection of watercourses and environments and species. So I'm not looking at being just at the moment. So

00:12:27:29 - 00:12:48:21

purely in terms of protection of watercourses ditches etc.. And then and also then protection of species. Is that, is that a ten metre buffer that you you because you reference bang. And like I say, we're not looking at Benji just now. I'm just looking at protection of environment. What buffer is it then you would seek?

00:12:49:20 - 00:12:52:07

Apologies. Um, ten metres. Correct. Yeah.

00:12:52:09 - 00:13:08:27

So ten metres. Is that so? I'm going to come back to the applicant then, because the applicant is proposing eight metres in places. Unless I misheard, what's the rationale for eight metres when the Environment Agency is saying actually ten metres is what they would, they would seek.

00:13:12:16 - 00:13:43:07

Peter Timms on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. So um, eight metres is from any sort of ditch at um, uh, any sort of watercourse, including ditches, um, which I believe I may have to defer to my, um, hydrological, um, colleague, but, um, that's consistent with the EA, um, flood risk activity permit guidance. So, um, that eight metres is um. From a hydrological standpoint.

00:13:43:09 - 00:13:45:12

Um, uh,

00:13:47:01 - 00:14:17:17

in terms of its slightly touching on being again, but in terms of, um, what's considered the riparian zone, which is the, the um, width of, of the bankside habitat associated with the watercourse. Um, the bag guidance states that, um, it's five meters is the riparian zone from a ditch, and it's ten meters from a, um, a stream, um, you know, a a stream or a river.

00:14:17:19 - 00:14:26:22

Um, and we are, um, we are, uh, a buffer zone or at least ten meters from any, um, any stream or river.

00:14:28:10 - 00:14:42:29

So, and, and and thank you to your colleague who's brought this up on the screen. That's helpful. So what you've identified as lesser, less sensitive watercourses. Um,

00:14:44:15 - 00:14:57:14

and yes, your bench mentioned lower sensitivity ditches and watercourses where no higher sensitivity criteria are triggered. You've got your rationales there. Eight metres is sufficient. Where does that eight meter figure come from?

00:15:15:17 - 00:15:35:27

It seems, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I understand, uh, eight metres is the, um, is where you. Within eight metres, you would be required to get an environmental agency flood risk activity permit. Um, I may have to take this away and defer to my hydrological colleague, but, um, I believe that's where that's come from. The air meters.

00:15:36:26 - 00:16:09:14

I'm happy for you to take that away. Um, you know, I think actually it's better if you do take it away. Um, because you mentioned they're about about flood risk, but we're talking about sensitivity of water courses. So, yes, I think I need probably a bit more understanding from you in terms of how you've set that buffer and why you've set that eight metres. But I am going to bounce back to the Environment Agency once more for comment. Now the Environment Agency. You've heard Mr. Tims rationale behind what they've said and it's on screen, which is helpful.

00:16:09:28 - 00:16:23:00

Do you have any comment to make on that? Because we I have been advised that it's come from um, sorry, you did say the document. Um, so can you just repeat the document reference? You said it was from one of the the EA flood risk.

00:16:24:08 - 00:16:58:19

Uh, for the applicant. So, yes, my understanding is that the eight metres is is not an ecology LED buffer. It is a hydrology LED buffer. So, um, it is uh it within works within eight metres trigger a requirement for other types of consents or permits from a hydrological perspective. So it's that is where the eight metre figure comes from. It hasn't been derived because there's an ecological requirement for eight metres. But the buffer exists from a hydrological perspective, which then accommodates what Mr.

00:16:58:21 - 00:17:08:17

Tim was saying, which is it's five metres is the riparian area. So it's greater than that. But that's because we've applied a hydrological buffer basis here.

00:17:08:19 - 00:17:14:27

If you applied a higher buffer to going into hydrology. No thank you. I understand this project. That's helpful. So

00:17:16:12 - 00:17:20:28

the ecological buffer would normally be five meters because the riparian environment. Is that correct.

00:17:22:05 - 00:17:33:03

Um that is correct. From, from ditches. Um and but uh larger watercourses, sort of streams. Um and rivers. It's ten meters from those.

00:17:33:05 - 00:17:43:20

No thank you, I follow. Okay, now I'll pop back to the Environment Agency, please. You've heard what the applicant said. That's helpful. That's clarified matters for me. But where these figures have come from. Can I come back to you, please, for comment?

00:17:45:04 - 00:18:21:04

Justine Boucher. Humphrey. It's something of an agency. Um, yes. We understand where the automated buffer zone has come from. Now, thank you for clarifying that. Um, but we we still stand. We prefer to be ten meters from an ecological point of view, even if it's not within the riparian zone, as it's multiple different interdisciplinary reasons such as bank stabilization, um, editing wildlife code, maintaining wildlife corridors. Um, but that is just standard advice we, um, give to every single project, um, regardless of the watercourse, we prefer ten meters.

00:18:21:06 - 00:18:30:09

But as I said, this is an advisory, and, um, we can't enforce this legally, if that makes sense.

00:18:31:00 - 00:18:36:12

No, that does make sense. Um, it's a preferred as opposed to a mandatory limit. So



00:18:38:09 - 00:18:52:03

in terms of ecology then an ecological protection is the five metres sufficient for a lower sensitivity, lower sensitive ditch and watercourse.

00:18:54:28 - 00:18:56:18

Sorry. That's to the Environment Agency.

00:18:58:04 - 00:19:04:03

Um, no, five meters is too short in our perspective.

00:19:04:26 - 00:19:35:10

No. Okay. For deadline four, please. Could the Environment Agency give me a bit more detail on sort of what you've just said? Actually, um, with a bit more detail as to why, um, the, the five metre riparian, um, barrier isn't a buffer isn't sufficient. Why eight metres isn't sufficient. I know where that that's come from. That is helpful. And why ten metres is preferred. It's helpful for me to understand the the rationale behind those things.

00:19:36:10 - 00:19:37:22

Yes, we can do that.

00:19:38:05 - 00:19:38:29

Thank you.

00:20:18:15 - 00:20:36:22

I'll clarify my my my request. The Environment agency. So could I have more, um, more, um, a bit more detail on the ten meter buffer requirement. Please take the other figures out of the equation. Just those requirements that you're asking for. I think that's probably a bit clearer.

00:20:38:10 - 00:20:38:25

Thank you.

00:20:38:27 - 00:20:39:22

Very much. Thank you.

00:20:39:27 - 00:20:41:00

Great. Thank you.

00:20:44:03 - 00:20:44:21

Now.

00:20:47:03 - 00:21:01:11

I think at that point, once the applicant sees that information, probably worthwhile in triggering a response and justification and taking that forward in terms of watercourse buffers, do does does the council have any comment to make on that?

00:21:06:08 - 00:21:34:22

Um, not particularly, but I'd probably concur with Emma Fisher. Sorry. Which council apologies. Um, ten metres sounds sensible. Or I can see where the eight has come from. It's a hangover from flood defence consent days. And like Pete said, environmental permit. So that's why it's often applied to then allow for sort of Water vole burrows, which can be sort of up to six meters. So it sort of allows that. But apart from that, we don't have any particular comments to make. Thank you.

00:21:34:24 - 00:21:40:12

Thank you. Stop lying down. Okay. Thank you. Right. Um.

00:21:44:01 - 00:21:47:27

Coming back now to the Environment Agency.

00:21:51:01 - 00:22:20:02

No I'm not. I'm going to come to the applicant. So I know the Environment Agency's response to examining authorities. Question EB 1.2. And they're seeking the Environment Agency are seeking clarification regarding spot checks undertaken on watercourses within the cable route corridor and whether these follow standards survey protocol, as outlined by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, or Siim, for short and best practice guidelines. Can the applicant provide clarification on this, please?

00:22:23:07 - 00:22:46:18

Um, these terms on behalf of the applicant. Um, so the, the, the surveys that have been undertaken off in the Cape Route on watercourses has been, um, habitat suitability assessments. Um, um which for which do follow guidance for um for such surveys. Um, uh for waterfalls. Um, but uh, spot checks are.

00:22:49:07 - 00:23:21:05

Spot checks were basically as we were doing those surveys and, you know, we were looking at the banks. It was looking for any, uh, obvious burrows or field signs. Um, they're not in that that is not, um, in line with survey. What you need to do for a survey for waterfalls for this. Because, um, one reason being that, um, waterfalls, you, um, you, um, to to complete a survey, a detailed survey in line with the guidance you require. Two at least a minimum of two visits, um, spread out at different parts of the year.

00:23:21:07 - 00:23:33:26

So, um, in that, in that sense, the habitat suitability assessment which we have undertaken is in line with the guidance, but the detailed species surveys is not.

00:23:36:24 - 00:23:44:02

Thank you. I'll come now to the Environment Agency. So when you've heard the applicant's response to that, do you do you wish to come back on it?

00:23:45:14 - 00:23:56:24

Justine Boucher Humphries Environment Agency. Um, yes. My response is pretty similar with the first issue we raised. Uh, first, um, agenda item. Apologies. Um.

00:23:59:02 - 00:24:10:15

Yes, sir. Has the is the question to the applicant. Are you planning on doing any, um, detailed species surveys on the watercourse crossings, um, for example, for water bowls or otters?

00:24:12:08 - 00:24:14:16

I'm happy to pass that over to the applicant.

00:24:52:27 - 00:25:10:25

Peter Timms on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes, we would do, um, um, a as a as is um, uh, set out in the outline ecological protection mitigation strategy. We would do a pre-construction inspection for waterfalls to identify burrows. Um.

00:25:12:10 - 00:25:41:17

Uh, yeah. And we don't. Um, that may not potentially be within the exact, uh, you know, following these survey guidelines. Um, but that would be. You know, once, um, that inspection would help to, to determine what the exact, um, uh, location of, of sighting of, of the cable route and whether any further surveys then are, are required to, um, to be confident that, um, we are avoiding most of us in that case.

00:25:45:06 - 00:25:51:10

So, um, I'm happy to go back to the Environment Agency for further comment on that.

00:25:53:24 - 00:26:34:24

Yes. Um, Josephine Humphreys, um, so we have issue with the fact the applicant is not carrying out baseline data, set a baseline species surveys for the riparian and aquatic species. Um, we don't believe pre-construction surveys are enough to be able to enough time to put mitigation in place. For example, um, European protected Species Mitigation License, for example, for otters. Um, we prefer the applicant did baselines species surveys following the appropriate guidelines, uh, with the pre-construction surveys, um, on top of that.

00:26:35:08 - 00:26:38:04

Um, but that's our stance.

00:26:39:17 - 00:26:44:27

No thank you. That that's clear. I'll come back to the applicant for for comment on that.

00:27:04:18 - 00:27:37:16

Uh, for the applicant. Um, I think this might be a point. We just need to pick up again with the Environment Agency, because I think the applicant's position was that the approach had been agreed previously with the Environment Agency. But it sounds like maybe there are some additional requirements that the Environment Agency have raised just now. So perhaps if the applicant can take that away, obviously has regular discussions with the Environment Agency. Sorry. As part of the and as part of the discussion on the statement of common ground. So we just want to clarify exactly what's being asked for.

00:27:37:18 - 00:27:56:00

And then we can make sure that the management plans incorporate the correct requirements. But I think we're um, potentially hearing something different now than in previous discussions. So we just I think we just want to get clarity on that point, which we'll do outside of the hearing and then provide an update afterwards. Thank you.

00:27:56:06 - 00:28:06:25

Yes, I think that's a sensible course of action. Um. Thank you. Do we have any further comments on this subject before we we move on from Wiltshire Council?

00:28:09:04 - 00:28:32:18

Nope. And stop lying down. No. Okay. Thank you very much. Um, right. I'm going to to move on then. I'm. I'm pretty clear where we are with respect to habitats. Like I say, there will be questions on buildings, and there may be some questions on field margins and examining authorities. Second, under written questions. Um.

00:28:35:23 - 00:28:41:13

I'm just conscious of time as all and how much I still want to get through.

00:28:50:09 - 00:29:08:25

Right. I'm going to I'm going to make the decision to, um, move any questions I have on the approach to specific species, especially considering the discussion we had earlier about European protected species. Um, so I am going to move those to second written questions. Um.

00:29:10:28 - 00:29:40:21

We may revisit it in September for the second round of hearings, but I will have questions in our second round of queries. So we're going to move on now to item number 3.4 which is monitoring, which is something I sort of want to get to the bottom of. Now the applicant has set out their approach to monitoring. And very much as I understand it, using an ecological clerk of work works. We've touched on it earlier throughout the discussions. Now,

00:29:42:06 - 00:30:25:14

Wiltshire Council has raised a concern or seem to raise a concern to that with respect to their role within monitoring. Now I'm going to ask the council to ask the applicant to very briefly summarise your approach to monitoring with respect to habitat and species activities across the entire site. Now, this is we're sort of moving on, if you will, from the cable cable route construction areas. Um, just to be clear, so specifically, I want to know why, in the applicant's view, the approach they've outlined, um, using the eco is, in their view, the most appropriate approach and what role, if any, they envisage Wiltshire Council taking.

00:30:31:15 - 00:31:09:10

The big decisions on behalf of the applicant. Um so the ecological clerk of works would be um generally a construction phase. Um, responsibility. Um, and that person will be responsible for the targeted, um surveys and inspections of, of particular features. Um, pre-construction and then to be present where whereas identified that um a, a ecological clockwork clockwork need to be present

during certain activities or um or um for localised habitat clearance and um works affecting hedgerows and things like that.

00:31:09:12 - 00:31:41:03

Um, uh, the UK will be responsible for identifying where additional ecological inputs or measures might need to be adopted, um, to avoid certain things. Um, the ECA will also be responsible for, um, uh, for inspecting and checking, um, fencing where, where biodiversity protection fencing is being utilized to protect habitats or, or certain ecological features.

00:31:41:05 - 00:32:02:22

Um, and that um, in terms of, uh, I think that's fairly standard that, um, you know, well, uh, ecological and ecological watch and briefs are, um, you know, common, widespread, um, a measure and, um, yeah, that's that's why we've, um, adopted that.

00:32:03:17 - 00:32:04:22

Okay. Thank you. No.

00:32:04:24 - 00:32:53:22

Clare project. Just, um, in just to add in terms of the second bit, which was the role that Wiltshire Council. We're going to play with the other part of your question. So, um. Uh, section 17 um, or method statement 16, which is section 17 of the Outline Ecological Protection Mitigation Strategy, which was being referred to then? Um, as well as obviously those activities that Mr. Timms explained in terms of what the ecological clockworks was going to do. There is then another section which is 17.3, um, which requires the production of a quarterly report, which would then be made available to um Wiltshire Council so that they can, um, have a detailed log of the monitoring activities and it would have detailed any, um, any breaches and any remedial steps that would be taken.

00:32:53:24 - 00:33:22:08

My understanding is that the concern primarily relating to the role of Wiltshire Council was in terms of the costs associated for being involved in monitoring compliance rather than, um, necessarily be initially an issue with the provision of information. It was it was more to do with how they manage their resources, um, effectively, to, um, review the volume of material that would be generated by a scheme of this scale.

00:33:23:06 - 00:33:47:13

Yes. Miss Brodrick, you've hit the nail on the head. That's exactly what I, I sort of wanted to come to with the council, just to bottom out your concerns. Um, and just as Miss Broderick laid out, is that one more of you have an issue with the the applicant's proposed proposal for quarterly reports and the iCal covering that, or was it more a question of the potential burden on the council?

00:33:51:01 - 00:33:51:16

A debt.

00:33:51:18 - 00:33:52:03

Shall be for Wiltshire.

00:33:52:05 - 00:33:53:13

Council. It's the latter.

00:33:53:15 - 00:33:54:07

Primarily.

00:33:54:09 - 00:33:56:18

That the verification required.

00:33:56:20 - 00:33:57:05

For.

00:33:57:07 - 00:34:03:01

That amount of information, um, is not a trivial matter, and for the council to do their their.

00:34:03:03 - 00:34:03:21

Job properly.

00:34:03:23 - 00:34:08:23

That is going to be a very significant effort on the council's behalf and it will require funding.

00:34:10:27 - 00:34:33:07

So let's explore this a bit further. You've. No, no, there aren't any concerns with respect to the the principle of what the applicant is proposing in terms of monitoring, but it's the assessment of that information, the burden that place is on the council. Is that correct? Yes. Okay. So coming back to the applicant then practically what do these quarterly reports look like?

00:34:42:28 - 00:35:05:25

On behalf of the applicant. Um, quite what the monitoring reports looked like. Um is difficult to answer at the minute. It depends on, you know, what, um, the particular, uh, tasks or activities that take place and what the findings and whether there have need to be any sort of remedial actions taken. Um, but that's, that's what the monitoring report would set out, Essentially.

00:35:05:26 - 00:35:12:09

Okay. So let me let me approach the question a different way. Wiltshire Council, what do you envisage would be required.

00:35:14:12 - 00:35:45:25

Emma Fisher for which Ken. So um, yes, as as my colleague alluded to, it's the volume and it's the verification of the information. And, um, it would entail site visits as the scheme progresses. Obviously it's a 60 year lifetime. It would be a case of, at the appropriate junctures, actually ascertaining on site for ourselves that what has been proffered is going to be created or proposed in terms of habitats, and everything else is actually what's happening on the ground.

00:35:45:26 - 00:36:03:23

So there would be an element of verifying it for ourselves, as well as obviously reviewing the information that's submitted to us at intervals and given given the size of the scheme and the complex nature, obviously it's not going to be, you know, it will be quite resource intensive over the lifetime of the development of the scheme.

00:36:04:11 - 00:36:17:11

So in terms then of of funding that resource, I'm guessing what that looks like as a section 106 agreement for X amount. Do we know what X amount could be.

00:36:27:23 - 00:36:59:27

Shall be Wiltshire Council. We haven't come to a figure yet. It's we've been raising the principle so far and haven't had a response from the applicant on it, but we are looking at that internally and are trying to come up with a figure. And the same issue arises in respect of the BNG monitoring as well. Um, because obviously that that is being provided, notwithstanding not being a statutory requirement, it's a policy requirement and the applicants committed to doing it. Um, and in that respect, the same issue arises in terms of being monitoring costs.

00:37:04:16 - 00:37:06:22

I'll be happy to pass over comment to the applicant.

00:37:06:28 - 00:37:49:00

Claire Broderick, the applicant. Thank you. Just to clarify, the applicant has said it will contribute to the costs of that monitoring. What is being discussed is the mechanism by which that payment is made. There is, I believe, a meeting going to take place next week to discuss what that will look like. Um, section 106, as you've mentioned, is one mechanism for doing it. Planning performance agreements are another mechanism for doing it. Planning performance agreements obviously have a further degree of flexibility associated with them that a section 106 agreement doesn't, particularly for, um, uh dsos, where variations to section 106 agreements need to be approved by the Secretary of State.

00:37:49:02 - 00:38:21:10

So there is an advantage, the applicant would suggest, to potentially having this, um, covered by way of a planning performance agreement that creates flexibility for both the applicant and Wiltshire Council that may not be, um, achievable, particularly where um, perhaps the amount of the costs isn't necessarily known. At this point in time, it would be difficult for the applicant to enter into a section 106 agreement that didn't provide a particular figure, whereas obviously you can have more flexible discussions in respect of planning performance agreements.

00:38:21:12 - 00:38:21:27

Okay.

00:38:21:29 - 00:38:27:12

Okay. Thank you. I'm going to have a think about that and then pass over to my colleague, Miss Labour.

00:38:28:20 - 00:39:04:15

Yeah, thanks. Um, I just wanted to come in on the issue of section 106 agreements because I, I'm sure the council is aware that if we if section 106 is the way that the council wishes to go, if we don't have a signed agreement before the end of the examination, it isn't entertained by the Secretary of State. Now, having been on other dsos, section 106 are a thing on other dsos for councils to recover their costs of monitoring um enforcement, even dealing with complaints during construction where the enforcement teams will receive more complaints of vehicles and noise and all the rest, and will have to investigate.

00:39:04:17 - 00:39:34:19

So it's not unusual for councils to seek section 106 funds. And a lot of these funds, a lot of the payments or rather charges, they probably won't know over a scheme of a lifetime of 60 years. But there could be provisions written into that where you get intervals, where you reassess those, those figures, um, over the lifetime of the scheme. So it doesn't mean that you have to go back to the Secretary of State for a revision to that section 106 agreement. But there are ways within an agreement that those costs could be reassessed.

00:39:35:00 - 00:39:51:13

Um, so I don't want to close the door to section 106 for planning performance agreements, because planning performance agreements are just essentially a different form of a contract, but then is not tied to the DCO. Um, so I think section 106 agreement should remain on the table for those discussions right now.

00:39:53:00 - 00:40:18:04

Uh, yes, that's noted and correct in terms of including provisions in there for review mechanisms. That's that's well understood. I think the issue is we haven't been provided with any figures yet from Wiltshire Council, so it's quite difficult for us to confirm we would enter into a section 106 agreement that didn't have any figures in it at all, and was just an open, um, an open obligation to meet monitoring costs.

00:40:18:06 - 00:40:50:15

And absolutely, I would echo the applicant's position there. I mean, they can't issue a blank check over monitoring, and the council is going to have to do some pretty rapid work on trying to justify its costs. And, you know, if you know those costs now of what it costs for you for the council to fund an officer to go out and do those surveys, it's a bit like when you've got archaeological surveys, you know what it costs an archaeologist for the council to go out and be on site. You know, when those sort of surveys are taking place, you must have similar ideas of those costs. And that's your starting point. Obviously, index linking is a way forward.

00:40:50:24 - 00:41:08:21

Um, obviously it's got to be suitable cost. It's got to cover not just the basic salary cost. It's got to cover the other things. But I think you must already have some of that. And the sooner we can get that to the applicant, you know, the more the discussion can progress. So I would urge the council to do a bit more work on that, please.

00:41:09:04 - 00:41:40:24



So shall we Wiltshire Council? Absolutely. The difficulty is until very, very recently, there was no response at all from the applicant to our request to the principal of this issue. So we hadn't progressed those discussions in that way with the detail, because it wasn't understood until literally very recent weeks that there was any positive response from the applicant about this. But now that that is on the table and the applicants are willing to enter proper discussions, we will move forward as quickly as we can with them to get some agreement on that.

00:41:40:29 - 00:41:43:22

Wonderful. Thanks, Mr. Love. I can hand back to you. Thank you.

00:41:44:17 - 00:41:54:17

No thank you. That sounds like things hopefully that can move that issue on. Okay. In terms of monitoring. Do we have any further comments to stop lying down Please.

00:41:56:02 - 00:42:26:17

Celia Reynolds, stop lying down. I'll just make one point and then turn to Mr. Valerie. Um, we note from the Olympe that there's the monitoring strategy is set out, and it includes bird surveys and monitoring of the bird populations across the solar PV sites, both within the array and the potential mitigation areas, and that bird populations will be compared to the baseline bird survey data. And I suppose our question is if in the event that those don't tally up.

00:42:26:19 - 00:42:38:08

So this proposed enhancement doesn't work of these additional fields, does the applicant have any proposals as to what they would do with that information at that stage. And then sorry Mr.. Valerie.

00:42:38:15 - 00:42:41:03

So you're asking about adaptive management.

00:42:41:05 - 00:42:42:11

Yes, exactly.

00:42:42:13 - 00:42:42:28

And.

00:42:44:26 - 00:42:47:05

Nicholas. Valerie for stop lying down. If I.

00:42:47:07 - 00:42:48:05

Could just expand.

00:42:48:07 - 00:42:49:03

On that.

00:42:49:05 - 00:43:19:15

Um, Skylark of Skylark mitigation has definitely been one of the sort of the central aspects of the proposals mitigation strategy. It has involved the removal of solar panels from entire fields and the

like. I would the reason why I stress monitoring for skylark and birds in general in particular, is because this isn't simply a long term enhancement target or just a comparison of like for like this is the actual mitigation strategy being proposed. It is not replacing like for like the amount lost.

00:43:19:17 - 00:43:50:04

It is rather the applicant is proposing enhancing these retained or designated sections further to allow for the retention of a greater number of nesting skylark. Now this is very different from just managing for habitat quality. In particular. I think particularly enlightening case in the site is lime downy, where in the bird surveys it mentions a much lower number due to tolerant, more mature hedgerows and more mature trees along the boundaries and smaller site scales. So this would.

00:43:50:06 - 00:44:09:24

I'm the reason why I'm emphasizing this is because the monitoring is effectively the mitigation that will be in place. It very much crosses over, and it is a very heavy investment for a 60 year period. So I would very much like to stress that this is factored into the sort of overall costs, times and efforts that are being willing to be put into this especially.

00:44:10:18 - 00:44:30:09

No thank you. I did pick up on that actually, and had we had the time, I was going to go into nesting birds. But I'm really pleased you've mentioned that because actually, as you've as you've mentioned it, I'm going to pass that over to the council. Sorry, the applicant for comment. Well, I take a sip of water and I'll pass it over to the applicant for comment on that, please.

00:44:32:28 - 00:45:06:25

Peter Timms, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. Um, we do we acknowledge the monitoring, um, of those the skyline mitigation areas is will be key. Um, the the proposals are the of the sort of habitat types we are intending to provide in those areas. Um, are are in line with, you know, published guidance on on um suitable and optimal habitat for skylarks. Um, but the monitoring will, you know, that will, um, identify uh, uh.

00:45:09:18 - 00:45:46:09

Trying to comparing before and after it can be difficult, especially with skylarks. Um, because, um, they, you know, they, they can be influenced by lots of different factors, um, you know, rotational, um, farming practices or the weather or any particular or weather conditions, any particular one year. Um, but as I say, we though the the proposals are to provide um, suitable habitat and the fields that that habitat will be provided and have been chosen um specifically for meeting a number of criteria, but um, a key one being the large size of them.

00:45:46:11 - 00:46:25:24

Um, then the open, um, you know, the open nature of them, um, which, um, skylarks are particularly reliant on. Um, but the monitoring, you know, monitoring, outline monitoring strategy in the outline landscape and ecological management plan, um, has been noted, does include, um monitoring for birds in those mitigation areas. And uh, the yeah, I can say absolutely if they're noted that, um, that, uh, there needs to be a sort of change in management or, you know, to provide sort of slightly different, um, vegetation structure or something like that in those fields, then that will be, that will be adopted.

00:46:29:29 - 00:46:41:00

So I think it would just be quite silly around stop lying down. It would be really helpful if we could have that set up somewhere in a document. What the proposals are for adapted management strategies in these enhancement areas,

00:46:42:18 - 00:47:12:24

specifically because the applicant is relying upon these enhancements to justify what would otherwise be adverse effects to Skylark and in Mr.. To paraphrase for Mr. Valeri there promising a lot from being able to remove a lot of fields where skylark are, you know, currently happening to a smaller area and then deliver even more Skylark it. I think it does just raise Mr. Valerie's eyebrows just a little bit as to what they're suggesting they'll be able to do.

00:47:13:04 - 00:47:23:22

No, I think that's a that's a fair request. And actually it was something I say I had in my notes beforehand. Is that something the applicant can provide? I'm not necessarily saying for deadline for.

00:47:24:05 - 00:48:05:07

Earlier project the applicant. So sorry. What we were just discussing was the level of detail that could be added to the outline plan versus what level of detail would go in the final, uh, management plan. So, uh, liaising with Mr. Timms, that level of information is intended to go in the final management plans. We will take away a point to consider whether reference to it could be included within the outline management plan such that. Then that obviously requires the final plans to address that issue. I don't think we have the detail at this particular moment in time that could be added to the outline plan, but we may be able to add a reference to it that then would ensure that the final plans included that level of detail.

00:48:05:14 - 00:48:23:18

So if we can take away that action to consider how best placed to reflect that position, as Mr. Tim said, the the intention would be to to monitor it and to make changes to that habitat, should it be not functioning in the way that it was designed to function. It's just we just need to give some thought as to where that wording goes.

00:48:23:20 - 00:48:35:01

Absolutely, yes, I'm in agreement with that, Miss Brodrick. But just to test my understanding, I think we need to need a commitment to the adaptive management and the outline plan, certainly what we need to see.

00:48:41:07 - 00:48:42:01

Yes. That's noted.

00:48:44:07 - 00:48:48:29

Okay. I'm going to move on from monitoring. Unless anyone's got anything else to say about.

00:48:49:16 - 00:48:53:19

Shelby Wiltshire Council. It's something Wiltshire Council has raised in their response and we'll be fully supportive.

00:48:53:21 - 00:48:54:06

Of.

00:48:54:08 - 00:48:54:23

That.

00:48:55:10 - 00:48:56:25

No. Terrific. Thank you.

00:49:00:05 - 00:49:30:05

I'm going to move on now to item 3.5 biodiversity net gain. And I'm going to touch on this briefly because my my notes all generally refer to the 11 observations raised by Wiltshire Council. What I would like to see. And that's that's the reason that Wiltshire Council's written representation as document rep 1138.

00:49:30:28 - 00:49:37:01

Um, and there are 11 observations. It's paragraphs 6.39 to 6.82.

00:49:38:27 - 00:50:13:27

Where I'm going with this is that the applicant has committed to providing biodiversity net gain as if it was already a requirement as it's already mandatory. So you're sort of pulling it forward, if you will, and saying we will provide it as if it's it's already mandatory. So for me, that also includes then being being confident as examining authority in the methodology in your approach. But I have 11 very detailed observations from Wiltshire Council.

00:50:14:21 - 00:50:46:13

What I'm going to do, first of all, because I'm not necessarily following observation once I'm going to come to Wiltshire Wiltshire Council and ask them to give me a bit more detail on observation one so I can fully understand it. But what I'd like to see thereafter are our observations. 2 to 11 are in the statement of common ground, whether that's appendix to that under PNG methodology or something like that. Happy for parties to determine how they present it.

00:50:47:18 - 00:51:01:12

But certainly if we can add that Welsh. Are you quite happy with that approach? With observations 2 to 11, if we add that to a statement of common ground, because let's say the examining authority needs to be confident in the methodology.

00:51:03:07 - 00:51:09:05

So in the first instance, can I just ask Wiltshire Council observation number one

00:51:11:02 - 00:51:26:07

is, is your concern with this relating to the approach adopted by the applicant and consistency with the Rochdale envelope in terms of worst case scenarios, what we were discussing earlier with the surveys. Okay.

00:51:28:09 - 00:51:41:06

No that's fine. I understand that that was a lot easier than I thought. Um, I can come back to the applicant on that, but I feel it might be going over all ground that we discussed under the first under item 3.1.

00:51:53:00 - 00:51:56:28

Excuse me. I'll stop lying down. Could you just repeat the document number?

00:51:57:13 - 00:51:58:25

Of course it is.

00:52:03:00 - 00:52:07:18

So it's Wiltshire Council's written representation and it should be rep 1138.

00:52:09:00 - 00:52:10:10

And it shall be Wiltshire.

00:52:10:12 - 00:52:11:27

Council just while the applicant.

00:52:11:29 - 00:52:14:16

Are looking at that and especially says one further observation.

00:52:14:18 - 00:52:15:10

On observation.

00:52:15:12 - 00:52:15:27

One.

00:52:16:11 - 00:52:17:15

Oh, please. Yes.

00:52:20:03 - 00:52:52:09

Um. Thank you. Ironically, I hadn't actually included that in my notes for today, because that is one of the observations that I feel the applicant has responded to in a way that I felt was more robust than some of the other observations that I've, I consider are still very pertinent and outstanding. But that one, they did give a response that if I remember rightly, my apologies, I'd have to go back through what I said. Um, they did provide a response that I felt did cover it off a little bit more suitably. And then the other observations they still stand for immensely.

00:52:52:12 - 00:52:56:17

But but it is still worth obviously getting clarification. Of course, if you if you wish to do so.

00:52:56:19 - 00:53:28:29

No, that was my understanding from what I'd read in the in the submissions. Um, I think observation one perhaps, I think I think we discussed that sort of Rochdale envelope approach a lot today, and I feel like we've probably done that to the nth degree, and we are where we are with it. Observations 2 to 11 I don't think we would resolve those today necessarily. And that's why I'm suggesting we pop them into a state, into the statement of common ground. Are you are we do we agree with that? I mean, if you want if the applicant wants to come back on anything.

00:53:29:01 - 00:53:35:00

Observation one beyond what you've submitted, I'm happy to hear it, but I think we've probably done it.

00:53:37:03 - 00:53:39:13

On behalf of that, I can know nothing further to add on.

00:53:39:27 - 00:53:49:26

And we're quite happy to add that 2 to 11 in the statement of common Ground. Yes. Ideal. Is there anything from stop lying down beyond what you've submitted about being.

00:53:50:14 - 00:53:52:03

The only one and stop lying down? No.

00:53:55:23 - 00:54:30:08

Okay. This does actually bring me on to my final agenda point. Um, 3.6 grazing. I'm hoping this is a quick one. Right? So if I can ask the applicant, there are various references in the documentation about potential for sheep grazing. However, there are an equal number of references. I haven't counted them. I'm assuming to know sheep grazing now as I understand it, because in response to examining authorities question LSF 1.12 sheep grazing is not being relied upon.

00:54:30:27 - 00:54:35:29

Can the applicant clarify the position with respect to sheep grazing.

00:54:38:10 - 00:55:12:06

A collaborative napkin. That is correct. So we're not relying or committing to sheep grazing as part of, um, the proposal. So the assessment has been taken on the basis that the sale of PV sites would be managed through mowing and cutting rather than grazing. However, um, there is the potential for sheep grazing. So if, um, there are a people who would like to graze their sheeps within the area, then that can be facilitated in grazing of sheep.

00:55:12:08 - 00:55:16:13

Um, it takes place across solar projects, across um, across the country.

00:55:16:15 - 00:55:18:01

What on.

00:55:18:04 - 00:55:18:19

Um.

00:55:18:21 - 00:55:19:06

Line.

00:55:19:08 - 00:55:54:12

Down there isn't, as I understand it, um, the area is not being actively grazed by sheep necessarily at the moment as compared to other schemes where you already have, um, tenant farmers with sheep that could then bring their sheep back again once the solar project has been created. So there are. We are aware of other solar DCS that may have made more, have made positive commitments to sheep grazing on the basis of the particular circumstances of their project. But for this particular project, we aren't committing to sheep grazing, but we maintain that it's a possibility and that sheep could be grazed within the panels.

00:55:54:15 - 00:55:55:10

Okay, so.

00:55:58:16 - 00:56:03:20

How does the flexibility for sheep grazing fit within the DCO or is it not?

00:56:05:21 - 00:56:13:28

Because as I understand it, if you start grazing sheep there, would that then have an impact on sort of the foraging, for example, for skylark and bats?

00:56:18:09 - 00:56:59:12

Peter Timms on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. So, um, any grazing that does take place would need to be in accordance with the, the outline Landscape and ecological management plan. Um, and we do. In that document we do. We do give options that we do say that the grassland management, um, can, um, can be, uh, managed through with cutting alone or potentially with grazing. The point and the point of that is to demonstrate that the sort of biodiversity objectives of management and the sort of habitats you want to establish and create, uh, can be achieved either through cutting or grazing.

00:57:00:05 - 00:57:30:07

Um, where you do, um, where grazing is, is used as a management tool. Um, you there would need to be, um, a restriction, um, sort of, um, you need to make, uh, to ensure you deliver the habitats you're intending. You need to make sure you, for example, um, rotate the grazing so you can avoid, um, in particular, in particular areas, you avoid the flowering season of plants. Um, and, um, yeah.

00:57:30:09 - 00:57:45:11

And, uh, and also you might use it, you tend to use a lower stocking density than you would otherwise if you're purely for them, sort of, um, food production, um, or agricultural uses. You could use a lower stocking density of sheep in that instance. Um,

00:57:46:28 - 00:58:15:07

um, yeah. So the point basically is that, um, if grazing is used and as I've said, there's no there's no reason why it, um, why it could not be used. Um, but the, the, any, any use of it will be, will have to um, uh, be be done in the context of the outline landscaping or ecological management plan to ensure that the, um, the habitats are created. Um, as, as set out in that document. Okay.

00:58:15:11 - 00:58:28:22

As part of your post, hearing submissions as an action point. Can you give me what you've just said about sheep grazing and how it's compatibility with the management plans and the The aims of

00:58:30:10 - 00:58:41:21

the aims of the foraging, habitat, etc.. Can you just give me a bit more? I know it's not being relied upon, but it keeps being brought up and I just want to make sure that if in the future,

00:58:43:06 - 00:59:03:02

the IGP or whoever was operating site decided that we're going to pop some sheep on there, they're going to do their thing. That that is an option, which then doesn't create an additional burden on sort of on anybody in terms of the administrative side of things, and that sheep grazing is compatible with what we've been talking about for the ecological enhancements and landscape, etc..

00:59:04:24 - 00:59:14:16

Yes, we can add some wording to explain how sheep grazing could be controlled such that it would be compatible with the other, um, mitigation measures.

00:59:14:18 - 00:59:18:08

No, that was the idea was project. Thank you very much. I'd be happy with that.

00:59:52:00 - 01:00:27:09

I asked Mr. Love whether he wanted to ask a question, which I had posted in our internal dialogue. Um, but it's in relation to that grazing note which Mr. Lovers asked you, Mr. Timms, to to sort of draft for us. Um, the query I had was whether grazing sheep grazing would have any implication on your hydrology assessments. Now, you may very well need to defer to your hydrologist, and therefore it may not be something you can pick up in your note, but it is something that we will revisit.

01:00:27:16 - 01:00:30:18

If you're not able to get a response on that.

01:00:33:04 - 01:01:12:27

Clever step. Ironically, we let our hydrologist go when we finished talking about watercourses, so I don't have an answer available now, but we will, um, provide um, when we provide our response, we can comment on that particular point as well. Um, and we'll also clarify the, um, the areas in which sheep grazing would take place, which is in between the panels rather than in the other areas necessarily, that are being proposed. So, um, there are particular areas of the site that obviously are dedicated for a different purpose, and it's not necessarily that sheep grazing would take place there, but we can provide some greater clarity on that.

01:01:12:29 - 01:01:14:16



In, in in the note.

01:01:14:18 - 01:01:40:20

And the reason I asked about hydrology was because there's obviously lots of dialogue amongst IPPs and within the evidence basis already. About potential flooding because of drip lines in panels and so forth. And obviously if grazing is happening in those solar fields. Then my question around what the implications are for your hydrology assessments is relevant, so I'll just leave it there. Thanks.

01:01:43:08 - 01:01:49:17

Thank you, Miss Lieber. Do we have any comments from interested parties for the council from. Stop lying down with respect to grazing.

01:01:52:08 - 01:02:26:20

No. Okay. Thank you very much. That means we can move on to item 3.5. Any other ecology, ecology and biodiversity matters. I actually don't have anything further to to question. I'm going to defer a number of points to written questions to. So actually I'm going to move on to item number four which is review of actions. Now we have a number of significant number of of action points. So I'm not going to propose to read them out. I'm going to um given the substantial number of them, um, I'm don't propose to summarize them now.

01:02:27:00 - 01:02:33:26

Instead, once we've had a chance to review the action points, we'll publish them as soon as we possibly can following this hearing.

01:02:37:12 - 01:03:08:12

Which then leads me on to item number five, which is to close. So may I remind everyone that post hearing notes, documents and answers prepared in response to these post hearing actions should be provided by deadline for and 10th of July unless we've specified otherwise. And I want to thank all participants in today's hearings. It's been a long, intense day, but so thank you for everyone for staying the course. Um, I will now proceed to close the issue of specific hearing. Thank you for participating today.

01:03:08:14 - 01:03:13:14

The time is now 5:40 p.m. and I close this issue. Pacific hearing. Thank you.