



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Lime Down Solar Project
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 5 (ISH5) - Part 4
Date:	15 September 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.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:05 - 00:00:14:08

Thank you, everyone will now recommence this hearing. And I believe we're onto item 4.2.4,

00:00:16:09 - 00:01:01:02

Which is functional floodplain in linedown D. So the applicant is going to invited to explain how the outputs of its hydraulic modeling inform its conclusions regarding the extent and treatment of functional floodplain within Linedown D and how this has informed the design principles and parameters. This agenda item really kind of follows on from item four two point point one regarding the review of the hydraulic model for the Goulds Brook. So without going back into what was discussed earlier, can I ask the applicant to set out briefly how the outputs of this hydraulic modelling informed its conclusions regarding the extent and treatment of functional floodplain within Line Down D and how this has informed design principles and parameters? Thank you.

00:01:22:15 - 00:01:31:28

Josh Rugby on behalf of the applicant. Throughout the development the placement and the layout of the proposed development is

00:01:33:14 - 00:01:39:16

determined by the embedded mitigation that we have placed throughout within the

00:01:42:17 - 00:01:46:07

flood risk assessment and drainage ES chapter.

00:01:48:10 - 00:02:16:26

The functional floodplain we have modeled, so where there is material interaction between built development, therefore paneled areas with the flood zones we have undertaken full detailed hydraulic modelling to determine what the flood zone 3B extent is, because that's not provided on the available online EA flood maps or the data sets that they provide. So we undertook that, in order to be able to differentiate what the flood zone 3B extent was.

00:02:19:09 - 00:02:53:25

We've then applied those embedded mitigations which preference development outside of those flood zones, but where they cannot be taken out of the flood zones, then we have controls such as the freeboard that has been alluded to in other responses. Flood zone 3B, there's only a small amount of interaction with panels, and those panels have to be a minimum of six hundred mil. The lowest edge of those panels needs to be a minimum of six hundred mil above the one in one hundred plus climate change flood extent plus six hundred mil to provide that freeboard level.

00:02:58:22 - 00:03:18:10

Thank you. As a follow-up to that, you said in your D6 submission, REP six thousand and sixty, that the BES and substations have been sequentially located within flood zone one and no flood sensitive

electrical infrastructure is proposed within flood zone 3B. How is that secured within the DCO please?

00:04:38:18 - 00:04:41:00

Can we just try to find the correct

00:05:10:17 - 00:05:11:26

The various

00:05:16:10 - 00:05:35:24

measures in terms of heights etc are set out in the design principles and parameters. That was Rep four-forty three in terms of specifics in relation to substations, best areas, panels, etcetera.

00:05:36:21 - 00:05:58:17

That's helpful. Thank you. My next question was is it within Dine principles and parameters? But yes, it is. You've confirmed that. That's helpful. Thank you. Next question I have is, have you identified a list of plant and equipment for construction operation decommissioning is critical that to the operations that will not be located in flood zone 3B?

00:06:02:20 - 00:06:06:29

And I suppose as a follow-up to that, then is that secured the through DCO?

00:06:09:16 - 00:06:10:20

Josh Ripley on behalf of

00:06:10:22 - 00:06:26:05

the applicant. So electrical infrastructure located outside of flood zone 3B and is there a list? Sorry, that plant and equipment necessary for purposes of construction, maintenance and then decommissioning?

00:06:29:04 - 00:06:41:10

So it would be part of the management plans where the locations of the proposed equipment, stockpiles, things like that are all

00:06:43:07 - 00:06:58:22

located sequentially within the development and outside of FloodZone 3B where practicable. It's not always possible if we are constructing some panel areas to locate all plants and equipment outside of flood zone 3B. As part of

00:07:01:13 - 00:07:04:29

the construction environmental management plan there'll be or

00:07:05:01 - 00:07:05:16

there is

00:07:05:18 - 00:07:28:11

a requirement to store equipment outside of the flood zone there is a requirement to be aware of or for a flood response plan and things like that. I think the answer to the question is that it would be necessarily located outside of the flood zone unless it's being used and that it would be stored outside of the flood zone during operation.

00:07:28:18 - 00:07:32:26

Okay, thank you. I'll come around the parties now.

00:07:34:11 - 00:07:47:01

Without getting into the verification framework report we've mentioned, like I said we will come on to that, does the LLFA have any comment to make on what just you've heard just with respect to securing of measures etcetera?

00:07:50:10 - 00:07:51:28

Sorry the microphone. Thank you.

00:07:52:19 - 00:08:01:17

Sorry. With to regards 4.2.4 functional floodplain in London, I think that is,

00:08:03:19 - 00:08:35:20

I mean, the applicant should not cause any detriment to the floodplain storage, floodplain conveyance and overland flow routes should be maintained. That flood risk should not be increased elsewhere. I think that is very important. And in this regard, I think Environment Agency have got extensive knowledge base of the floodplain and how much floodplain compensation

00:08:37:07 - 00:08:39:21

applicants should provide. I think they will be the

00:08:41:21 - 00:08:45:14

we will defer to them in this regard.

00:08:46:01 - 00:08:50:08

Okay, thank you. With that being the case I will come to the Environment Agency please.

00:08:54:28 - 00:09:13:03

Phil itself from the Environment Agency. Yes so in the context of functional floodplain are the applicants correct and they've simulated the three point three percent so one in thirty year And you'll see this probability scenario within the hydraulic model to define the extent of functional floodplain. Our

00:09:13:05 - 00:09:13:29

understanding is that

00:09:14:01 - 00:09:48:05

the applicant is only proposing to place panels in that area. It will only be the panel legs that are placed in the functional floodplain. They've done an assessment of the volumetric impacts of those panel leg supports and the storage loss is negligible. They've done an assessment expected of impacts on water level. And again, that is negligible, sort of sub millimeter. So we're happy in that context. Obviously, there's been discussion around some of the model verification in terms of gauge data.

00:09:48:07 - 00:10:15:21

So there would be points there which relate to this point as well. So it'd be useful to see that. In terms of the sequential approach to the site layout during the operation operational phase, sort of happy with that. And note the points the applicants raised around the construction phase in terms of sequentially site and things like construction compounds outside of the functional floodplain. But we do recognize there would be a need to have plants within that area during construction.

00:10:17:07 - 00:10:42:03

Yeah, that can be dealt with through an emergency response plan. We're content in that regard. And we do have a comment to make, which is a later item on the agenda with regards to the siting of a substation within Line Down C. But yes, I think we're broadly content in terms of definition of functional floodplain, storage loss and impacts from the leg supports. So I'm content that that's been adequately assessed.

00:10:44:05 - 00:10:47:11

Thank you. That's helpful. I'll come to stop limedown, please.

00:10:48:07 - 00:10:52:05

Cecile Reynolds, stop Limedown, and we don't have any further comment on this.

00:10:53:06 - 00:10:56:12

Thank you. I do have a point to raise.

00:11:00:00 - 00:11:12:25

Can you signpost to me where in the design principles and parameters that's located please? Because I've been through that document several times and I don't recall seeing that within there.

00:11:15:09 - 00:11:32:27

And I don't recall seeing some of these matters, I don't recall seeing something similar in the KEMPI that they outlined construction environment management plan. Perhaps in the first instance, this project, would it be possible to signpost where that is in design principles and parameters, please? In

00:11:33:09 - 00:11:35:07

terms of the location of the BES?

00:11:35:09 - 00:11:38:25

In terms of Or the storage of materials.

00:11:38:27 - 00:11:42:25

In terms of keeping the BES and substation out of the functional floodplain.

00:11:59:28 - 00:12:02:03

Claire project for the applicant. So the

00:12:03:28 - 00:12:14:29

design principles and parameters document secures the location of the beds within the relevant work number on the plan, which is outside of the

00:12:18:14 - 00:12:24:26

area of flood risk. Then there are some other measures in there relating to other parts of

00:12:26:16 - 00:12:36:09

apparatus within page ten, which is table two point two, which relates to the BES, the design principles and parameters. Then it has

00:12:37:28 - 00:12:55:17

some wording in there in terms of the zero point six meters above the zero point one percent annual exceedance probability in relation to locations of conversion units, parameters and things like that. There is some wording on that point in there

00:12:59:21 - 00:13:06:06

on the mounting structures point and then the location is where it's located.

00:13:08:26 - 00:13:12:28

Bear with me one moment, I'm just looking to see if there's another reference as well.

00:13:16:26 - 00:13:36:09

Yeah, so those are the references in that document. Then in the outline construction environmental management plan it's page twenty seven and page twenty eight, which was Rep six-twenty nine, which has that wording in relation to temporary stockpiles and materials and plant and where they'll be stored.

00:13:39:08 - 00:13:48:24

It may be that if we can have a look and see whether there is a need to put a more specific reference in the design principles and parameters.

00:13:50:17 - 00:13:51:15

Think that would be

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

please. Think that

00:13:59:23 - 00:14:33:19

would be useful for everybody's understanding to have that in the design, to have that in the document to be explicit that these things will be out with within flood zone one or out with flood zone 3B. That

would be useful. I get the point with respect to some of the solar panels and the freeboard, understand all that, that's fine. But just with respect to the sighting of the Bears substation, I think the design principles and parameters document needs to be a bit more explicit because I have to admit I missed that and I'm fairly familiar with this document.

00:14:35:02 - 00:14:38:03

Perhaps there's a section point deadline seven,

00:14:40:24 - 00:14:45:11

Thank you very much. Unless there's any more comments to make on that item, I think we can move on.

00:15:05:06 - 00:15:08:26

Yes, think we can. Sorry. Yes over to Mr Singh please.

00:15:08:28 - 00:15:35:12

Yes, I think it's important flood zone 3B, the applicant should like in addition to what you pointed out, I think they need to have a proper protection plan in terms of not causing too much disturbance in that area because they have got different programs like drilling, HDD, and

00:15:37:07 - 00:16:12:01

surveys, intrusive surveys, as well as stationing plant, stationing like soil mounds, know, planning such as well, that should not be done in that area. So I think what we need is a proper policy with regards to flood zone 3B the that capacity and the floodplain structure and the morphology that needs to be maintained, the river function should be maintained

00:16:13:07 - 00:16:18:10

so that we are having a proper functional floodplain?

00:16:19:28 - 00:16:53:02

Yes, thank you. I think the applicant picked that up from my questioning. Design principles and parameters document needs to reflect that, but equally the construction environment management plan and then the operational management plan with respect to maintenance works and the decommissioning strategy probably also needs to reflect protection of flood plain 3B as well. We do come on to substation wind down C1 discussion later in the agenda. Ms Broderick, if you want to come back on that before we move on.

00:16:53:04 - 00:17:26:04

Just in terms of those measures in relation to storage and plant materials, quite there a lot of wording already in the outline, Kemp, in relation to that. I know we're going have a further discussion on management plans, but what I would suggest is that if additional wording is required, then please can Wilshire Council provide what they would like added to that plan. We're keen not to have another plan. It can already be included within this particular plan and there's already a range of measures in there which we think achieve the purpose that Mr Singh is looking for.

00:17:26:06 - 00:17:50:05

But if you would like some specific wording added to that plan then we do really need to be at this stage in the process given the particular wording to consider. And then we'll obviously look at including it. But we think that the management plans themselves do include and achieve the protections Mr Singh is looking for. Specific comments on the wording are welcomed but it's quite hypothetical at the moment.

00:17:50:13 - 00:17:52:17

Yes, would agree with that. We

00:17:54:13 - 00:18:31:13

close in six weeks, something like that. Yes, I know there's a discussion around to be had, the management plan, the verification framework, I understand that. But I think there does need to be perhaps some further detail from the LLFA or further commentary from the LLFA on the plans as they are. I know there's an issue about fitting them all together, etcetera, etcetera, and the practical points of monitoring and so on. But I would like to see perhaps further discussion around that offline between the LLFA and the applicant to try and bottom out those issues.

00:18:31:25 - 00:18:33:18

Think for the examining authority,

00:18:35:26 - 00:19:08:02

insofar as possible, we are looking for the protection of flood zone 3B and to keep fixed plant out of the substations and the beds, etcetera, out of flow areas to maintain Greenfield runoff rates, prevent buildup of water, etcetera. I imagine there might be more eloquent ways of putting it from Mr Singh to the applicant, but I imagine there's discussion around that to be had. So can I ask that that goes into your statement of common ground if it isn't already, and that matter is updated for deadline seven?

00:19:11:22 - 00:19:20:22

Thank you. I'm going to move on now to item four point two point five. This relates to the ordinary watercourse between the fields D twenty two and D one.

00:19:22:08 - 00:19:55:15

So I'm going to invite the LLFA to set out its position on the ordinary watercourse between these fields, including any implications for drainage design and flood risk assessments or consents. I'm really looking for an update with where we are following the submission of Deadline deadline six. And to understand if there is anything outstanding from the first round of examining authorities written questions, FHW one point one two subsection three.

00:19:55:20 - 00:19:57:18

I will pass over to the LLFA.

00:20:01:17 - 00:20:41:10

The council understands that watercourse between fields D twenty two and D one forms part of the local ordinary watercourse network associated with the wider Gosbrooke catchment. The council's interest is ensuring that the detailed design maintains conveyance, internet connectivity, and watercourse function and existing flow routes and that no increase in flood risk arises. The council

notes that the scheme incorporates watercourse buffer zones and watercourse protection measures will be secured through the design principles and parameters, water management plan, and associated issue controls.

00:20:42:02 - 00:21:18:19

The council will also expect appropriate maintenance access to be retained where required. Any interaction with the water course should be subject to an appropriate approval and control process through DCO and associated management plans to ensure that flood risk, drainage function and environmental interests are protected. The council does not currently consider the watercourse to represent a fundamental constraint to development provided any interaction with the watercourse is appropriately addressed, designed and managed through detailed design process and associated approvals.

00:21:21:13 - 00:21:25:13

Thank you. I'll come to the applicant to respond.

00:21:27:17 - 00:21:28:21

Mr Ripley?

00:21:30:09 - 00:21:46:03

Josh Ripley on behalf of the applicant. The watercourse between D22 and D1 has been considered throughout our development. There's a reason why there's a separation between D22 and D21 on the proposed plans.

00:21:47:26 - 00:22:08:04

It's an identified existing drainage feature and is subject to the scheme's embedded walls cause protection measures in the same way that any other walls cause and ditch would and does and has. The design principles and parameters that REP four thousand and forty three require existing drainage corridors and conveyance to be maintained and protect walls courses from inappropriate development.

00:22:10:26 - 00:22:15:24

I could talk through the principles of the drainage for the BESS and

00:22:18:27 - 00:22:52:13

the substation if the EXA is minded at this stage, but essentially the buffers and watercourses and the measures that are controlled throughout the scheme ensure that the watercourse, its flow route and its hydrological function are maintained throughout. If any proposed crossings, there's two proposed crossings shown on the drawing at the moment, but they would be subject to the same relevant controls and approval processes contained within the protective provisions for the benefit of the LLFA in the draft DCO,

00:22:54:09 - 00:23:01:05

six thousand and five. And then I believe we've been in detailed discussions about

00:23:02:21 - 00:23:27:28

potentially disappearing the ordinary watercourse permitting regime to ensure that we're working through the number of crossings efficiently. So the protective provisions within the DCO provide the relevant mechanism that Wiltshire Council requires order to maintain control over that watercourse and its maintenance responsibilities and requirements.

00:23:30:07 - 00:23:32:10

No, that's helpful. Thank you. Mean

00:23:35:20 - 00:24:09:05

I am minded to I've I've read everything that's been submitted to date. I'm minded just to say let's get this conversation down in the statement of common ground and push it on but I see Mr Singh does have his microphone on so I wonder if he wants to come back on any point and then I'll come back to the applicant but ultimately I'd like, again I can't remember every statement of common ground word for it off the top of my head, but if it's already in there great let's move it on, if it's not let's add it to those discussions and see an update.

00:24:09:07 - 00:24:10:18

So Mr Singh please over to you.

00:24:10:20 - 00:24:11:22

Yeah thank you.

00:24:13:12 - 00:24:55:05

I would like to say that applicant says that they have got the disapplication. I mean, they will supply the provisions of the Land Runnage Act so that, and they will have the mechanisms in the draft TCO. But I mean, so far they haven't provided the mechanism within the draft TCO, how it will be secured. So I think this puts LLFA in a precarious position because until they provide those mechanisms, we cannot enforce the mechanism.

00:24:56:06 - 00:25:14:23

So I think before this application, they should provide a robust mechanism so that any dis application does not result in detriment to the watercourse functions, thereby causing flood risk to the downstream communities.

00:25:15:26 - 00:25:38:05

Okay, thank you. We have a session on DCO next week. I can't remember exactly what day. But I would be quite keen to see this matter fleshed further out next week at the appropriate hearing, which I think is the DCO hearing, and also to see the statement of common ground updated to reflect this matter.

00:25:38:12 - 00:25:48:03

Claire Bodrick the applicant, just to say that the protective provisions are included already in the draft DCO, they're in part nine of Schedule fifteen, and we had been led to believe that those were agreed.

00:25:49:23 - 00:25:55:18

Perhaps that position could be checked internally within Wiltshire Council because the mechanism is already there and it's been there for

00:25:55:20 - 00:26:04:23

a while. That was my understanding as well, the protective provision had been agreed. But it sounds like perhaps there might need to be a conversation for the council.

00:26:05:10 - 00:26:21:11

Yes, I think on a broader level there is an agreed provision, but I think the details of how it will be carried out, I think that is something which still needs to be agreed with the applicant. So because

00:26:24:24 - 00:26:52:26

we have been talking about it with Atkins who have provided us technical input in this regard. And based on our discussions, we didn't find the details of the provision, although at a higher level, is a mean, we have some provisions as to how things will be carried out. But how do we actually do those things? Think that is something you know, we need

00:26:52:28 - 00:27:02:22

to look into. Okay. Thank you. Ms. Shalaby, Ms. Prodrick, think the appropriate place to explore this matter further is next week at the DCO hearing.

00:27:04:07 - 00:27:06:17

Okay, right.

00:27:09:18 - 00:27:26:18

Just, okay, I think those matters just need to be updated within statement of common ground and we'll like I say we'll explore this next week at ECO hearing. Okay, I'm going to come around the parties before we move on to four point three. So with respect to the watercourse between fields E22 and D1,

00:27:28:18 - 00:27:32:08

I'll ask the EA because you're here. Do you have any comment to make on that matter?

00:27:34:04 - 00:27:37:02

I feel itself from the environment. Comment

00:27:37:04 - 00:27:38:03

to make. Thank you.

00:27:38:13 - 00:27:41:02

No, thank you very much. Ms Reynolds?

00:27:42:11 - 00:27:45:02

Silly Reynolds, stop line down, no comment from stop line down.

00:27:45:04 - 00:27:46:04

Okay, thank you.

00:27:50:04 - 00:28:05:19

Let's move on now to four point three, Assessment of flood risk and drainage line down C. Now this, this actually links back to item four point two four when we discussed functional floodplain in line down D.

00:28:08:05 - 00:28:09:13

So it

00:28:11:06 - 00:28:12:14

may be resolved shortly.

00:28:14:02 - 00:28:18:02

So I would just like to invite the applicant to explain the

00:28:20:13 - 00:28:51:09

location of the substation in Linedown C1 because obviously when we talked about the bears in our early discussion we talked about keeping the bears and matters out of the and such fixed plant out of the functional floodplain in Limestone D. But I note here this matter still seems to remain with respect to C1 in the substation, it seems to be unresolved. Can the applicant update me please where we are with respect to the siting of the substation in Linedown C1 please?

00:28:52:23 - 00:29:26:29

Josh Rigby on behalf of the applicant. The substation has been located with regards to the electrical design of the of the scheme but also minded with the flood risk that is identified and assessed within the line down C1 flood risk assessment and drainage strategy, which is REP six thousand and ten. Just to clarify a point, field C33 is located wholly within flood zone one as defined on the Environment Agency flood map for planning.

00:29:27:20 - 00:29:34:00

The more localized issue is the surface water flow route that generates in

00:29:35:23 - 00:30:04:21

a west to east pattern across the southern extents of the sites. The mapped flood depths along that route are predominantly shallow. On the Environment Agency stepped depth mapping, it's shown generally to be below three hundred millimeters and not exceeding six hundred millimeters. But once we've done a more detailed check on the zero point one percent or one year, one in one thousand year flood,

00:30:07:03 - 00:30:45:04

the predicted flood depths are generally around about the two hundred millimeter mark in the southern extent of the site. So when we were producing the reports earlier we didn't have or sites availability of the environment agencies updated NAFRA two surface water flood map and we did a comparison of that in the latest report and it shows that it doesn't materially impact our original assessment and the

flood depths are relatively similar, they are the same, around about that average of two hundred millimeters max.

00:30:47:00 - 00:30:56:04

As the design developed the indicative substation was moved further northwards within that parcel to pull it away from that surface water flow route.

00:30:59:05 - 00:31:17:00

Detailed design stage, once we have the actual layout of that development, the detailed design will be minded or will take consideration of that existing surface water flow route because they'll necessarily require some ground level changes to level the site at the northern end of the site.

00:31:20:13 - 00:31:53:26

If at that design stage, if any part is still interacting with that flow route, then we'll need to maintain the conveyance of that foot storage. And essentially we'll have to provide compensation or shape the site in order to maintain that compensation. So the final platform level and drainage arrangement will be confirmed through the detailed design stage and those measures are secured through requirement five within the detailed drainage measures secured through requirement eleven of the draft DCO.

00:31:54:16 - 00:32:06:28

On that basis we believe that the existing flood risk given it is in flood zone one and that the extent risk is a surface water flow rate which generates and that the levels, the depths of that

00:32:09:03 - 00:32:19:14

flow routes during that extreme zero point one percent event are manageable and that the risk to any proposed substation will be low.

00:32:20:20 - 00:32:29:23

Okay, thank you. Thank you for that. That's helpful clarification. I want to come to the Environment Agency now and considering what you've heard,

00:32:31:13 - 00:32:49:10

I note that you were at previous submission, you were looking for a new requirement to cover this matter, but actually considering what you've just heard there, would an update to the design principles and parameters document address your concerns?

00:32:50:23 - 00:33:25:17

I think yes, it's about being sort of consulted at that detailed design stage because yeah, we were concerned in sort of initial language of sort of where practicable, you know, what happens if, you know, a detailed design is located within the surf swat flow path and there's a loss of storage or impact on flow conveyance. Apologies. It's not my area of expertise and it was a comment raised by my colleague who unfortunately is unable to attend the hearing today. But I think what I've heard there is quite positive, but it's probably something we'd have to take away and provide a response in writing, I think.

00:33:26:04 - 00:33:41:08

The main thing is just having that mechanism to be consulted at the detailed design so that, you know, in the event that there is a loss of storage or impedance to flood flow that we can ensure that the appropriate mitigation is in place, there aren't any adverse effects.

00:33:43:17 - 00:34:08:06

You for that. Mr. Rigby, mean, what I took there from the EA is that actually they are looking to be consulted on that matter to ensure that the flow conveyance of surface water isn't impeded. Is that something that can be built in to the submission? Or if it can't, can I have an explanation as to why not, please?

00:35:10:00 - 00:35:52:06

We'll take that point away just to make sure that it marries together. Obviously at the moment the Environment Agency are consulted on requirement eleven, that's already included there. We'll just, to the extent that they need to be consulted in respect to that particular design element. We're just going to see where where may be best placed to put that in in within the control documents. So we just want to double check it's not included somewhere and if it's not included then where it would be but we don't think that there's a there's not an I mean in principle issue with the employment agency being consulted to the extent that that scenario are very so that they could see see the impact.

00:35:52:08 - 00:35:56:23

We're just trying to decide where best to place that within the documentation.

00:35:57:15 - 00:36:06:09

That's helpful, thank you. I will just briefly come back to the environment agency. It seems like the applicant is quite content

00:36:07:29 - 00:36:41:25

to include you as a consultee on the matters, but it's just a question of the appropriate mechanism within the DCO within which to do that. I am aware that time is marching on within the examination. I have mentioned it more than once. Mean, useful would for parties if this could be within the statement of common ground and aim to resolve this with deadline seven, which actually from what you're saying, Ms Broderick, that's not an unrealistic target.

00:36:42:09 - 00:36:50:23

Okay, great, excellent. Okay, good. I'll come around. Does anyone have anything else they want to raise on this matter, Elifene?

00:36:53:05 - 00:37:13:08

Yes, I would say that based on the draft TCO, there is they have got some kind of mechanism using detailed design approach in the SEMP as well, OMP, SRMP. So they have got various,

00:37:16:21 - 00:37:49:19

like the management plan have got certain approaches which does look into how we can ensure that appropriate measures are taken to reduce the risk. But I think it will be useful to have, but from the council point of view, we need governance principles so that if things are not done according to, let's say, the requirements of various installation, so that the council can intervene.

00:37:49:23 - 00:38:17:13

So I think it is useful that there should be some kind of built in monitoring review governance and adaptive management principles within the draft TCO so that appropriate mitigation hazards can be discussed with the applicant to the satisfaction of counsel and other authorities.

00:38:19:18 - 00:38:20:24

Okay, you.

00:38:23:13 - 00:38:26:22

Yes, I'll come to stop lying down. Do you have anything you wish to add, please?

00:38:27:22 - 00:38:43:04

Celia Reynolds, Stop Limedown. Nothing further really except to make the sort of obvious point from Stop Limedown's perspective that if this had been sited within an alternative area it wouldn't be necessary to locate sensitive equipment within a field floods that regularly.

00:38:46:12 - 00:38:48:24

Would the applicant like to respond to any of those points?

00:38:49:06 - 00:39:17:20

Just in relation to the monitoring, the monitoring measures are included within the management which are secured. So there isn't a separate need to have a monitoring obligation on the face of the DCO because all of those requirements and obligations are contained within the management plans themselves. That's the standard position for for DCOs. So the applicant wouldn't be looking to include specific monitoring requirements because that details in the management plan. Understood.

00:39:20:09 - 00:39:28:01

Okay, I'm keen to move on to four point three point Sorry, Ms Rand.

00:39:28:18 - 00:40:11:20

Just on this point, Mr Seymour Williams has been in contact with Stop Limedown. While I can't speak on his behalf, what he's what he's indicated is that first he apologizes that he's not able to actually speak at this hearing. He's no longer available, but that he's keen to provide a written comment. And I I don't want to obviously promise him doing it by any certain time, but he's indicated that he would be able to do so in quite short order. So having said that, he would, I guess, appreciate the examining authority exercising their discretion to accept that written comment from him so that the applicant and the other parties can respond to it at deadline seven.

00:40:13:15 - 00:40:17:06

Yes, we'll convene on that point.

00:40:18:21 - 00:40:21:03

Sorry, bear with me, I'll discuss just with my colleague.

00:40:32:18 - 00:41:01:14

Okay, Just discussing matters of procedure with my colleague. So yes, what I would suggest is either he submits it now and we'll consider whether it's a post hearing submission because he was down speak today or if we consider that to be a deadline seven submission. But yes, we'll give specific instruction before the close of the hearing. I mean, on the point of farm, Farley's

00:41:24:24 - 00:41:26:17

Okay what I'll do then is

00:41:29:09 - 00:41:34:27

move on because we have the applicant's written submissions regarding Farley's farm.

00:41:36:22 - 00:42:07:10

Okay but actually no, hang on. Can I ask applicant then to explain what assessment has been undertaken to understand and address flood risk at Farley's farm, including any assumptions, discussions with network rail and proposed mitigation of management measures? Now I would have invited Mr Seymour Williams, the owner of Farley's Farm to come in as well but he's not here. If the applicant can provide a response to that then at least Mr Seymour Williams will have an opportunity to review the video back and he can respond thereafter.

00:42:07:13 - 00:42:08:29

Over to the applicant please.

00:42:09:28 - 00:42:36:11

Josh Rigby on behalf of the applicant. The applicant has, following the written representation, specifically considered the topography mapped surface water pathways and drainage features around Farley's farm. The existing mapping, flood mapping corresponds to a local low flood point and the EA's online mapping closely matches the flooding that has been reported in that particular area.

00:42:38:06 - 00:42:50:16

Our understanding is that it's an existing drains and conveyance issue associated with local culverts and the railway infrastructure that predates the scheme and is an existing issue.

00:42:52:21 - 00:43:22:18

Therefore whether or not we will have an impact kind of hinges on whether or not we will increase surface water runoff from the scheme, I think is the key question from all of the questions that has been coming out today. Assessment that is it wouldn't. The solar fields remain predominantly permeable and vegetated. Existing ground levels and drainage pathways will be retained. The permanent cable infrastructure fully is is predominantly buried and the ground is reinstated following construction.

00:43:24:18 - 00:43:43:10

I won't go through all of the different measures that are protected and provided for within all of the different management plans because that is for another time. But accordingly, if surface water isn't increased from the site and that is our position, then the potential impact on Farley's farm is,

00:43:45:08 - 00:43:50:18

the proposed development will not have an impact on the existing flood issue that is being experienced.

00:43:52:06 - 00:44:22:07

With regards to Network Rail, there has been engagement with Network Rail regarding the wider scheme, interface and protective provisions. The applicant understands that the works currently being undertaken relate to piling strengthening of the embankment and do not relate to existing drainage measures. Using our channels of engagement, we've asked for clarity and specific details of exactly what they're proposing, but this is an issue that is out with the application boundary.

00:44:26:14 - 00:44:27:25

Okay thank you.

00:44:31:20 - 00:44:41:13

I'm going to respond to the applicant first and then I will come round the parties. Thank you. This issue isn't covered in the statement of common ground with network rail.

00:44:43:01 - 00:45:08:08

I think it would be useful if it was. So can I ask that you take that away and it's we've obviously had discussions with network rail and if that statement of common ground includes that discussion it's just dear enough, Herbert, and what you've just told us with respect to what's happening, their works, how that's impacting matters, etcetera, etcetera? That would be useful to flesh out our understanding of this issue.

00:45:21:20 - 00:45:24:19

Claire Bosch of the applicant. We can

00:45:26:05 - 00:45:56:14

probably see if we can get confirmation from Network Rail that their current works that they're undertaking are not drainage related works. However, I'm not sure we're going to get Network Rail to confirm in a statement of common ground that their infrastructure is the cause of flooding issues to Mali's farm. I imagine they'll be very reluctant to put something like that in writing. So that first point in terms of we can see if we can get confirmation as to the current works that they're doing at that particular the site.

00:45:56:16 - 00:46:01:26

But I imagine that realistically is all we are going to be able to achieve in a written statement of common ground.

00:46:02:18 - 00:46:32:09

Thank you, one can but try. If we can try and flesh out some of this matter in a statement of common ground, that would help enhance our understanding of where the issues are coming from. Obviously Mr Sima Williams will watch back this video, assume, and he will be aware of these discussions. And like I say, we will revert back to stop lying down before the close about the best way for him to interact with this hearing.

00:46:33:27 - 00:46:36:11

Mr Singh, you wanted to come in on this point?

00:46:37:22 - 00:47:34:13

Yes. I think it's very important that any properties or communities which are directly downstream of the applicant site and are currently experiencing flooding, this flooding is likely to be exacerbated if the applicant does not have a proper monitoring and verification framework because as mister Rigby himself pointed out that you're not the properties are at low lying areas and if any property is in a low lying area and in the upstream areas, if the runoff goes on uncontrolled, it is likely to worsen the existing flooding.

00:47:34:27 - 00:48:08:03

So I think this is why the importance of hydrological monitoring is very important. And it's also I would suggest to the applicant that identify similar properties which are, you know, like immediately downstream of the current site and are in a low lying area which receives runoff from the applicant site to be identified

00:48:09:26 - 00:48:21:24

properly. And the monitoring plan should include such properties so that the people who live in those properties are safe?

00:48:22:06 - 00:48:29:02

I think what the applicant is saying is that their proposals, are not causing flooding off-site.

00:48:35:01 - 00:48:51:16

That's their position, isn't it? That's what you're saying. Mr Singh, if you think that the evidence is showing something different, then that's something we need to get in front of the examination for deadline seven. Yes,

00:48:53:23 - 00:48:55:13

I'm not saying

00:48:57:15 - 00:49:04:09

that they are not like, I mean, their approach to flood management

00:49:06:21 - 00:49:09:24

is not strategic. That's what I'm saying. Because

00:49:11:11 - 00:49:13:16

without having a strategic approach,

00:49:15:04 - 00:49:20:29

we cannot manage flooding effectively for such a large site. I think

00:49:21:01 - 00:49:25:21

Sorry Mr Singh, are we straying into hydrological verification framework discussion here?

00:49:26:05 - 00:49:28:28

Yeah, because this Okay,

00:49:29:00 - 00:50:02:01

so sorry, if we are then I will wrap up this agenda item and we'll move on and park that discussion for the hydrological verification framework. So with respect to this particular item at Farley's farm, do you have anything you wish to add? No more things to add. Okay, thank you very much. We will obviously come back to stop lying down once I've confirmation with my colleagues how best to deal with that. I'll come back up to the any other matters part of the agenda about that, don't let me forget.

00:50:02:03 - 00:50:10:19

Sorry, I'm so sorry to cut across you, I believe Professor Skeffington had a point to make in SLD's capacity on this point.

00:50:10:22 - 00:50:13:06

Oh no yeah of course yes I was going to ask

00:50:14:22 - 00:50:16:00

Professor Skeffington.

00:50:16:02 - 00:50:57:05

Yes just to say that obviously as Mr Rigby said, if they don't believe that the panel areas cause any excess runoff then the situation at Farley's Farm will be essentially the same as it is whether the panels are there or not. Whereas in our case we believe that they do, then it does increase the risk. And just to say that if you just look at the area then the farmhouse itself is built on the well drained Sherborne series all but the land around is on the two of the soil series which are vulnerable to excess runoff.

00:50:57:07 - 00:51:00:13

That's why we get runoff in this sort of little

00:51:02:02 - 00:51:11:20

dip in the limestone and why I think you know there may well be a of more runoff if the scheme is built.

00:51:12:26 - 00:51:17:05

Okay thank you. I'll come to the applicant if you wish to respond at any point.

00:51:19:07 - 00:51:52:27

Josh Ripley on behalf of the applicant. I think the controlling mechanism of the flooding particularly at Farley's Farm is a culvert inlet and outlet. I think we saw when, it we went on the walkabout to, on the, visits to Farley's farm. There's a restriction at that particular point from a culvert and that is why the surface water is retained behind it in a slightly lower paddock which is essentially acting as an inlet and outlet for what is acting like a pond during significant rainfall events.

00:51:56:24 - 00:52:41:03

Thank you. It would be useful I think in your post hearing submission just to comment on the point raised with respect to Farley's farm being built on the free draining soil type and then the less porous soil type being surrounding that and then the potential for ponding on that land, as I understood it, Professor Skeffington. Thank you. And just to confirm that you wouldn't be just to explicitly confirm that as far as you're concerned, and again, this is what I've taken from what you've just seen today is you wouldn't be causing greater risk of flooding off-site than that was currently is maintaining Greenfield rates, etcetera, that you wouldn't be contributing to that ponding that's being experienced at East Far Farm.

00:52:41:06 - 00:52:48:26

I mean equally we will be seeking to give you an opportunity to respond to Mr. Seymour Williams' submission as well.

00:52:50:19 - 00:53:26:08

Okay, I'm going to move on. Four point four impact management hydrological verification framework. I would just like to come around the parties because I'm conscious of time and other matters that we need to come on to. We could potentially move this item to Thursday under the management documents, but there's no point doing so if the people we need aren't going to be in the room. So I'll come around the parties and if I just can just check who is going to be with us on Thursday please.

00:53:26:11 - 00:53:27:26

Can I come to the council first?

00:53:27:28 - 00:53:32:23

Odette Shadowby, Wilshire Council. Mr Singh said he is able to come on Thursday so that's possible.

00:53:33:02 - 00:53:34:08

That's helpful. Can I come

00:53:34:10 - 00:53:40:22

to stop limedown please? It's silly, Ronald, stop limedown and Professor Skeppington is also available on Thursday to comment on this.

00:53:41:04 - 00:53:49:04

Terrific. If I come to the Environment Agency, are you down to attend on Thursday please? I can't recall the attendance spreadsheet off the top of my head.

00:53:51:26 - 00:53:55:26

Laura, address from the Environment Agency. Yes, confirm that we're attending on Thursday.

00:53:56:20 - 00:53:58:29

Thank you very much. Will it come to the applicant?

00:54:07:16 - 00:54:16:20

Relevant members of the applicant's team will be here on Thursday. However, would be useful in terms of, obviously, note on that agenda item, the specific question.

00:54:18:11 - 00:54:41:06

What we're seeking to understand is specifically what measures the council are looking for that aren't already incorporated within the management plans. Just reiterating that point I made before, I don't necessarily want another document that's got another name if the measures are already covered. We would really like to deal with specifics rather than

00:54:43:03 - 00:55:02:26

obviously Butch Council has provided a list of topics that they think could go in such a plan, but our view is those measures are already included, so we're trying to specifically understand what is missing from the existing mitigation measures and it would be useful if Mr Singh could be familiar with what's in the existing management plans for that discussion.

00:55:02:28 - 00:55:36:07

Thursday's agenda is already packed. I'll ask the council if you can come armed and ready with that information about what is missing and then we can get that resolved there and then and we can explore further what's required, whether it's further detail in existing plans or if further detail within the mitigation route map, which pulling everything together or indeed explore other means that may be open to parties to resolve that.

00:55:36:09 - 00:55:51:25

I would like parties to come to that hearing armed and ready so we can tackle that head on and get that resolved. I don't think I can give a clearer indication than that's an instruction to parties.

00:55:55:13 - 00:56:10:09

I'm content to move actually on and I would like as I change the agenda, I'd like to move on to four point six first, which is water quality water framework directive. And on this one

00:56:12:05 - 00:56:33:16

I'm really looking for an update with respect to discussions on the water framework directive matters. I'm going to come to the environment agency first and I'll come to the applicant and then come around the parties if they've got anything to add. If I can ask the environment agency, please, could you provide the XA with an update as to where we are with respect to the

00:56:35:02 - 00:56:42:29

water framework directive and if we need to have anything within else the outlined construction environment management

00:56:44:14 - 00:56:53:19

plan relating to mechanisms for the assessment of thermal impacts and microcycling of the cable route. Over to the EA please.

00:56:59:09 - 00:57:03:21

Hi, it's Susie Mateson on behalf of the Environment Agency.

00:57:06:01 - 00:57:33:22

We've reviewed some documents which were submitted at deadline six by the applicant that helped to address this matter. This includes Rep six thousand and twenty nine which is the updated outline construction environmental management plan. This document now includes details of a groundwater monitoring plan that will be implemented and the latest version of chapter nineteen ground conditions,

00:57:35:13 - 00:58:28:09

sorry I just want to find the reference, REC five zero G6 does state that the micro routing of the cables will ensure that no potable supplies I. E. Source protection zone one or sensitive groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems will be within fifty meters of the cables. A hydrogeological risk assessment will be completed if the plan is to locate cables within fifty meters of these receptors and the need to complete the hydrogeological risk assessment if any previously unidentified risk groundwater receptors emerge during detailed design, is detailed in the Outlying Construction Environmental Management Plan Rep six thousand and twenty nine, and that will be carried out in consultation with the Environment Agency.

00:58:28:19 - 00:58:47:24

So we feel that this and the groundwater monitoring plan that has been proposed are sufficient for us to resolve this issue. These documents were obviously submitted and we have responded to them but haven't I don't know if the applicant has seen those responses yet.

00:58:49:17 - 00:58:51:05

That is helpful, thank you very much.

00:59:13:14 - 00:59:25:21

Dan Maher for the applicant. We welcome the additional comments from the Environment Agency and we will ensure that the SoCG is updated to reflect the new position.

00:59:29:09 - 00:59:41:10

Thank you. That's helpful. I'll come around the parties now to see if anyone has anything they wish to add. I'll come to the LLFA first please on the matter of Water Framework Director.

00:59:41:15 - 00:59:49:13

I'd actually be at the Bush Council. I think broadly we're happy to leave this matter to the Environment Agency, so nothing further from the LLFA.

00:59:49:15 - 00:59:51:15

Thank you. I'll come to Stop Lime Down.

00:59:53:26 - 00:59:58:04

Silly one on Stop Blind Down, Professor Skeffington would like to contribute to this point.

00:59:58:06 - 01:00:31:24

Richard Skeffington for Stop Blind Down. I do have a bit to say here, as I said before I spent twenty two years working as an environmental scientist in the power industry. So I do feel that your

colleagues and the EA have been a bit short changed here because there's a lot known about heat production by underground cables and that's because it's a serious issue for cable operators. The hotter they run the less efficient they get the more they're prone to breakage and faults.

01:00:34:18 - 01:00:44:16

So the default is to bury them at nine ten millimetres. The reason for this precise measure is that it's three feet which is what it was before.

01:00:46:09 - 01:00:47:15

And then there's where

01:00:49:01 - 01:01:10:23

there's things like agricultural operations and have seen it suggested that includes under BMV land it should go down to one point two meters or even one point five meters. And the dpu build them the hotter they get. So the issue and the issue here is groundwater heating from the cable.

01:01:12:23 - 01:01:20:12

I thought I would do a little quick back of the envelope modelling because I thought it's never going to be significant

01:01:22:00 - 01:01:47:13

for this type of project where the power flows are fairly modest through the cable. But you can't really do it properly because you need to know the specifics of the cable before you can do it. However for what it's worth the solar farm output produces a rise in temperature of about zero point two degrees in January and about a degree in June.

01:01:49:22 - 01:02:01:13

But there is another issue here which is also being skated over a bit and that is that the applicant proposes to use XDPE cable

01:02:03:03 - 01:02:37:13

which is different from the vast majority of national grid cables that exist. They're mostly fluid filled cables in which cooling fluid is pumped along the cable and every kilometer so there's a heat exchange system which vents the heat into the atmosphere. So in this case since we're building most of this area in one sort or another of groundwater protection zone this not using this system can be regarded as a benefit because the risk of fluid leakage is eliminated.

01:02:38:00 - 01:03:01:13

But the inevitable downside is that the cable will run hotter than what it did before, and what it would have done with a cool system. So what this is going to mean is it's not just groundwater heating but the primary route for the exit heat is upwards to the ground surface.

01:03:03:06 - 01:03:15:14

So what this will inevitably mean is that the area of the cable will dry out sooner if we're in a drought period. So in like the drought we've just had as the areas comes down into

01:03:17:26 - 01:03:39:04

dry conditions it will happen sooner over the cable, possibly two or three weeks sooner. And the extent to which this will happen is very difficult to judge because there's so little experience of these cables at high voltages. Voltages. So that's an issue I haven't seen mentioned but the

01:03:40:26 - 01:04:06:26

issue of drying of above national grid cables, ordinary national grid cables over the years it's been sort of accepted as acceptable because you know it's tolerable. Mean yes the same things will happen they dry out earlier but you know in terms of normal farming practice it's not making a huge difference. Here I'm not sure we know so there'll be more heat loss.

01:04:08:16 - 01:04:16:11

The applicant will always certainly be modelling heat production in the cable himself because he wants to make sure that the cable is stable.

01:04:17:28 - 01:04:21:26

possibly an opportunity to assess the

01:04:28:15 - 01:04:29:12

issue further.

01:04:33:29 - 01:04:34:25

Essentially

01:04:36:15 - 01:04:50:19

we were balancing two environmental effects. We have a beneficial effect on the lack of cooling fluid in groundwater protection zone but we've got more heat to get rid of down the line with the cable.

01:04:52:24 - 01:05:02:28

That's very helpful, thank you. I will be coming to the applicant on this point but I will come to the Environment Agency first please to provide comment on what Professor Skeffington has just presented.

01:05:05:05 - 01:05:52:25

Cece Bateson for the Environment Agency. Yes, the issue of heat in groundwater is an emerging topic, although Professor Skepticton right that there were were been instances of cable heating for many years, but heat as a pollutant in groundwater has only been recognised in the last in about three years ago. So it's an emerging topic and the guidance around it is limited to what we have for ground source heating and cooling systems and the initial check for whether those are acceptable is for them not to be located in source protection zones one and other sensitive groundwater and surface water ecosystems.

01:05:53:05 - 01:06:27:24

One of the main factors that will influence whether there is an issue with heat from cables is whether they are in contact with groundwater. So that would be one of the issues that would be looked at with the micro sighting. So I think with the information that the applicant has provided, it's enough for us

to be able to say we're happy that this issue is resolved and we will have the groundwater monitoring plan to assess whether any there are any impacts.

01:06:29:00 - 01:06:35:18

Thank you. That that's helpful. As part of your post hearing submission, can you provide that commentary please?

01:06:40:07 - 01:06:41:08

Yes, I can.

01:06:41:10 - 01:06:41:25

Thank

01:06:43:11 - 01:06:49:26

you. I will come now to the applicant if you have anything further you wish to add on that point from Professor Skeffington.

01:06:50:24 - 01:07:13:29

Dan Marf, the applicant. We welcome Professor Skeffington's comments and obviously acknowledge his experience in this. In terms the potential environmental benefits of different cables, that's part of the design process. We'll go through the hydrogeological risk assessment that's secured in the camp. We'll consider that and cable selection will be part of the solution applied.

01:07:14:21 - 01:07:21:08

Thank you. Professor Skevington, you've heard from the EEA, you've heard from the applicant, anything further you wish to add?

01:07:23:15 - 01:07:54:14

Not really, no. You know yes I acknowledge both those things I mean I just wonder from the EA because on one other application they it was a National Grid the eastern link or something like that. The National Grid said well there wasn't going to be a groundwater heating problem because there wasn't any groundwater and which would raise a hydrologist eyebrows and I was just wondering if how the EA defines groundwater in this context.

01:07:56:01 - 01:08:05:10

I'll come back to the EA on that point actually. I'm quite happy for you to respond to that query from Professor Skeffington please.

01:08:07:12 - 01:08:09:18

I probably probably won't won't go to

01:08:09:20 - 01:08:28:25

the whole legal definition of what groundwater is. Sorry, Susie Waits before the Environment Agency. Yes, I'm aware that there are other DCO applications where heat has been considered and we do assess each application on a site specific basis.

01:08:31:00 - 01:08:54:07

Thank you. Again I think just post hearing submission cover that off just please and respond to Professor Skeffington. That would be useful to move the issue on. Thank you. I'm quite content to go back to item four point five now unless any other parties wish to comment on this issue. Okay, I'll move back up my script to four point five.

01:09:04:21 - 01:09:43:25

Okay, so item four point five integration of SUDs and landscape. Now we did discuss earlier about natural flood management and I don't want to repeat what we've already discussed, but I would like to invite applicant to explain how suds have been integrated with other aspects of the development such as open space, green infrastructure, etcetera, to ensure an efficient use of the site. I'll also ask the applicant to explain how the design principles and parameters respond to paragraph 5.8.15, bullet point eleven, part six of the overarching national policy statement for energy or EPSE N1.

01:09:44:07 - 01:09:49:11

I will ask the applicant first of all to explain their approach to SUDS integration. Thank you.

01:09:51:27 - 01:09:54:07

Josh Rigby on behalf of the applicant. From

01:09:56:21 - 01:10:31:03

the start the scheme an appropriate sorry, the scheme takes a proportionate approach to suds because there are two quite different drainage conditions across the development. The first is the land beneath the solar panels, which we have discussed at length. Those areas remain predominantly permeable and vegetated, and rainfall is not collected into a conventional sealed drainage network. The managed ground therefore continues to provide the source control through diffuse drainage, surface roughness and attenuation with infiltration where ground conditions allow. For that reason, the applicant is not proposing engineered suds across every panel field.

01:10:32:04 - 01:11:10:09

Adding basins, pipes or formal drainage beneath the arrays would provide little additional hydraulic benefit in those areas and would introduce additional disturbance and infrastructure into the land, which is intended ultimately to return to agricultural use. The second condition is the positively drained infrastructure, principally the substations, the best and associated hard standing. Those areas do create defined drainage catchments so the flood risk assessment and outline drainage strategy suites REP four thousand and twenty one to REP four thousand and thirty six and REP three thousand and sixty three commits to formal SUDs and establishes the hydraulic and water quality performance that those systems must achieve.

01:11:11:03 - 01:11:45:01

What cannot sensibly be fixed now is the final size, type and location of each potential SUD component. The final infrastructure layouts, hard standing areas, contributing drainage catchments, levels and discharge arrangements are not yet known. And those are the inputs needed to size and locate the drainage features properly. The commitment is therefore fixed now. While the engineering geometry follows a detailed design stage, the final drainage scheme is secured through requirement

eleven of the draft DCO, REP six thousand and five, must be substantially in accordance with the outlined drainage strategies.

01:11:45:28 - 01:12:17:18

That detailed design stage is also when the blue green infrastructure benefit can be maximized. Where practicable, aboveground features such as swales, basins or ponds can provide attenuation and conveyance whilst also delivering water quality treatment, vegetation, habitat and landscape benefits. That is how the scheme responds to NPSEM1. The design principles and parameters, REP four thousand and forty three, establish the overall green and blue infrastructure principle. The drainage strategy has established where soots are required and what they must achieve.

01:12:17:20 - 01:12:40:02

And the final drainage design then coordinates those features within the landscape and ecological design once the actual engineering layout is known. The fact that the final SUDs cannot yet be drawn, fixed size and location does not weaken the commitment. It avoids prematurely fixing a feature before the information needed to design it properly and effectively is available.

01:12:43:27 - 01:13:20:29

Okay, that's helpful. That sort of sets the scene for my follow-up question. Have a series of follow-up questions admittedly. We've reviewed the outlined drainage strategies and we noted new annexes and most strategies called outlined drainage sketch. So I've got a few follow-up questions about those. What I'll do for the benefit of the room, I'm going to ask a series of questions to the applicant and then I'm going to come around the room thereafter. So you will get an opportunity to comment. So my first question, Mr Rigby, so the outline drainage strategies explain that such as swales, detention basins, ponds, etcetera.

01:13:22:07 - 01:13:32:08

As being feasible. However, the outline drainage sketches do not reflect the reflect these options. I appreciate what you've what you've just said about detailed design.

01:13:34:17 - 01:13:46:26

These sketches, they only refer to porous and permeable surfacing only. Should these sketches be reviewed to allow for other options be considered and reflect SUD's integration within landscaping and ecological measures?

01:13:49:11 - 01:14:21:14

Josh Ripley on behalf of the applicant. The sketches are purely to show, and the calculations are purely to show that a drainage scheme is feasible within that area. Like I said, there's so many ways to design drainage effectively, but we won't be able to effectively do that until we know things like the contributing area, catchment, the size attenuation of that you require is a calculation based on the hard standing area that's contributing to it and the discharge rate at which you're allowed to discharge from it.

01:14:21:17 - 01:14:57:24

Without knowing the contributing area, you cannot know the exact attenuation benefits. You also an effective SUDS drainage system retains water as close to where it's captured as possible. So

individual pond features or swale features that accommodate for the entire attenuation requirement for a potential development, whilst it is a feasible SUD solution, it's not always optimal solution that could provide those blue green benefits that we are trying to achieve throughout the scheme.

01:14:58:09 - 01:15:38:00

So the sketches aren't necessarily vague. They show an area that could be implemented on the scheme, not necessarily what will be implemented at the scheme, but we are constrained by the level of detail that we have. I think if we start showing features on plans that are essentially guesstimates of what could be within those schemes risks us kind of walking ourselves down the cul de sacs and not being able to achieve optimal drainage system for these schemes.

01:15:38:07 - 01:15:42:02

So the key principle is that we're agreeing to the principles of

01:15:43:20 - 01:16:00:09

the discharge rates and the attenuation volumes that are required as well as the additional provisions for fire water provision at the best site. And that has all been agreed in the SOCGs and the consultation that we've had with the consultees such as the LLFA and the Environment Agency.

01:16:02:21 - 01:16:04:06

Okay thank you.

01:16:12:13 - 01:16:17:19

Gaitman, can you just clarify my understanding? It might be because it's late in the day.

01:16:20:15 - 01:16:26:15

Those measures, how are they secured through the detailed design? Just refresh my memory please.

01:16:33:05 - 01:16:56:15

Josh Rickey on behalf of the applicant. The detailed drainage scheme is secured through requirement eleven of the draft DCO, which requires it to be substantially in accordance with the outlined drainage strategy and approved before the relevant parts of the scheme commences. The additional measures within the BES are within the outlined battery safety management plan and is separately secured throughout requirement six.

01:16:58:22 - 01:16:59:28

Okay, thank you.

01:17:04:08 - 01:17:11:28

But my second question is actually about rainwater harvesting and watering landscaping and ecological enhancements.

01:17:14:20 - 01:17:51:02

We need to be careful, we tread the line here and don't end up straying into areas that we are discussing on Thursday and potentially Tuesday. But in your response to XQ2 FHW two point two subsection eight, you explained that rainwater harvesting has been reconsidered as a potential

supplementary measure and could be considered at detailed design for supplementary uses, including landscape establishment. The latest strategies do not show updates regarding this. So can you explain how you will use rainwater harvesting support landscape establishment and how that would be secured through the drainage strategies please?

01:17:55:14 - 01:18:25:22

Josh Rigby on behalf of the applicant. So if we take a step back of why we don't consider rainwater harvesting as being an effective attenuation measure, it's because necessarily it's designed so that it's essentially a tank with an inlet at the top and an outlet at the top. So the point is to store water for as long as possible until it's necessarily used. The problem with attenuation is that you want it to be empty at the time that

01:18:27:08 - 01:18:30:26

you have a storm event so that it can provide that attenuation that you require.

01:18:33:08 - 01:18:45:26

And a rainwater harvesters tank fills up until the water is used. So when you get wet, unseasoned conditions, when you actually need that storage it's not available to you because it's already been filled by previous rainfall conditions.

01:18:47:16 - 01:18:49:19

With regards to using that water,

01:18:51:09 - 01:18:57:02

drainage strategies at the time have considered it as part of that overall drainage strategy, it could be used.

01:19:02:06 - 01:19:17:03

Operationally, would be used as and when necessary. It could be used as and when the person operating the site requires water for possible uses. During landscape establishment,

01:19:19:12 - 01:19:21:10

it depends on the sequencing of when

01:19:23:15 - 01:19:35:20

that drainage system has been implemented on the site and whether or not it is required to supplement. But I see no reason why it couldn't be used as soon as it's installed for whatever possible use,

01:19:37:08 - 01:19:40:21

either the construction team or the operations team require.

01:19:42:17 - 01:20:16:29

Okay, so I think the response to the second round of written questions FHW two point two subsection eight, I read the response fairly clear that you were considering rainwater harvesting and it was sort of back on the table if it were. But from what you've just said I'm not following that as is. So can just can I just get some clarity as to where we are with rainwater harvesting? Because I understand what you're

saying about compensatory storage and that filling up. I suppose in my mind, comp storage and rainwater harvesting are sort of two different things.

01:20:17:19 - 01:20:24:16

So if I can just get some clarification please on your approach to rainwater harvesting and if it's something you're sort of considering or not.

01:20:27:17 - 01:20:52:18

Josh, on behalf of the applicant. I think throughout we have considered always it as part of a drainage system that can be implemented if necessary. If the possible use is required during the operation then it will be installed. If it is determined that there's no use for the water then I'm sure there's a discussion to be had with the consenting authority about whether it is installed.

01:20:54:16 - 01:20:57:05

Yeah, I don't think we're removing it.

01:20:57:07 - 01:21:00:12

No, think that's actually clear. No I understand that.

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

And just remind me, if it's not, should it not be referred to in the drainage strategies, if it isn't already?

01:21:11:28 - 01:21:28:06

The drainage strategies are, they provide almost, they give an optionality so I wouldn't suggest that we remove any potential sub option until we get to the detailed design stage. Until we've got the design, until we know the levels, until we know

01:21:30:06 - 01:22:07:10

the specific operation on that site and whether there's any issues. Wouldn't take any of it off the table, which is why we provide the full SUS hierarchy, which is taken from Syria guidance, so that all SUS measures are included on there and then considered based on their proportionality and their usefulness potentially on the particular site as it sits. And that's why the vast majority of the SUDS options that we've considered are still there, because we want the designers to be able to have the freedom to be able to utilize those to ensure that they're achieving the requirements that we're committing to whilst also providing an exemplar drainage system.

01:22:09:29 - 01:22:44:02

Okay. The drainage strategy as I understand actually says that rainwater harvesting is not feasible. But I suppose from my perspective and going back to what you were saying about having the full list of suds and using some in combination, all of which I don't believe anyone would disagree with, but it's just the fact that it seems now to be taken off the table within a drainage strategy because it said it's not feasible. But from what you're saying it would be considered as part of in combination with other SUDs?

01:22:56:20 - 01:23:22:09

Josh Rigby on behalf of the AFCON. The wording within the trading strategy as I have it open at the moment is rainwater harvesting has not been considered for the proposed development. However, IMDRMD does not include a sustained non potable demand capable of receiving the runoff from the positively drained hard standing areas. I think what that means is we're not considering it as part of the attenuation system. So if

01:23:25:27 - 01:23:42:18

we determine that we need to provide x amounts of storage, we would not use rainwater harvesting to take off the required storage from that, if that makes sense. So we're not using it as part of the attenuation system but that doesn't mean it can't be part of the drainage system.

01:23:43:00 - 01:23:47:05

So is that clear then in the drainage strategies?

01:23:49:29 - 01:23:57:23

I mean if it's not it sounds like it should be an easy update because then it's something you start pulling together at the detailed stage.

01:23:58:08 - 01:24:09:05

Josh Rigby on behalf of that I think the fact we're discussing it means that it isn't so we'll make the necessary changes to clarify that point. Thank

01:24:09:07 - 01:24:34:17

you, Mr Rigby. Yes, I think we just need some clarification on that point and updated wording as appropriate in the drainage strategies. Thank you very much. My third question is regarding the applicant's discussion with the LLFA regarding how to apply the betterment rates when calculating the volume of attenuation needed. Can I ask the applicant to set out position its on this matter please?

01:24:45:19 - 01:25:25:09

Josh Rigby on behalf of the applicant. The calculation of discharge rates from hard stood areas is a relatively well understood methodology. So for all build development we would go through a similar process and Wiltshire's policies require us to restrict discharge rates and provide attenuation up to the one in one hundred plus climate change rate on that. So we are following Wiltshire's policies to letter and that is detailed within the drainage strategies and is secured through the

01:25:26:27 - 01:25:27:23

subsequent requirement.

01:25:34:12 - 01:25:51:10

Thank you. Okay, I'm going to come around the parties now. I'll come to the LLFA first. I mean considering those points I mean I think it was pretty the rainwater harvesting element I think was pretty clear. But I think with respect to

01:25:53:13 - 01:26:10:19

outlined drainage strategies and sort of subs integration in the landscape and the betterment rate without going over what we've discussed earlier in the agenda if you could briefly set out any outstanding concerns. Thank you.

01:26:14:19 - 01:26:19:10

Yes, I would say applicant that has like

01:26:21:13 - 01:26:23:15

with regards to the suds,

01:26:25:22 - 01:26:31:13

think are we talking about the multifunctional suds or the betterment?

01:26:31:27 - 01:27:02:16

Well, there were two questions in there. The first was about the SUDs and the applicant's approach in their outline drain strategies and how that fits in with the landscape. The second part of the question related to betterment. Bowen, let's keep it clear. I'll ask the question about the outline drainage strategies with respect to the integration within the landscape and then we'll come around and ask about strategy.

01:27:02:18 - 01:27:35:14

Okay. Yeah, with regards to the integration of such in the landscape, I think the applicant has not considered such in the paneled areas. I think that is not only a missed opportunity. I think it might have been useful to control flooding because flood management is a core responsibility of a new developer. And although they have provided

01:27:37:02 - 01:27:38:00

vegetation,

01:27:39:16 - 01:28:00:28

but vegetation alone may not be sufficient to manage flooding because as we can see, there might be a lot of problems when it comes to vegetation establishment or enough irrigation of the vegetation during drought years. So

01:28:02:23 - 01:28:17:03

what LLFA would have expected the applicant to have integrated such with the landscape of the paneled areas so that instead of,

01:28:18:26 - 01:28:41:21

if we don't expect the applicant to have large areas of the paneled areas to have like exclusive sites, But as the NPPF state that they encourage multifunctional sites where you can have infrastructure, where you can have amenity, ecological

01:28:44:06 - 01:28:49:24

aspects within the design of such. So I think that would have been

01:28:51:09 - 01:28:57:09

an approach which LLFA would have liked to see in their application.

01:28:57:12 - 01:29:22:24

So just as a point of clarification for me when we discussed in quite a lot of detail and at length earlier in the agenda about the grass sward and its operation and yes we also discussed the implementation and management etcetera etcetera but are we saying that the grassy sward isn't sufficient? Are you saying you want to see more suds?

01:29:22:29 - 01:29:34:19

Yeah, I mean at this time at an outline application level we would have liked the applicant to introduce to the LLFA that

01:29:38:02 - 01:30:07:11

they will apply the principle of such in the paneled areas because just having the grass SWAT may not provide sufficient flood management because of the inherent risk of failure of vegetation, of compaction and of stripping the land, which can be happening simultaneously within different parts of the site. So I think

01:30:09:11 - 01:30:40:27

from the LLFA point of view, we would like to have at this stage, least the principle of a SUDS based approach in not only Limedown DNA, but the applicant should be open to application of SUDS within limedown ABC and C as well through the framework of multifunctional approach. Okay, thank you. I'll come to stop limedown and

01:30:40:29 - 01:30:43:14

then we'll come on to the betterment rates. Think that just keeps the

01:30:43:16 - 01:31:00:24

discussion a bit clearer. Come to Stop Limedown please. Stop Limedown doesn't have anything further to add except just to add its agreement to what Wiltshire Council have just outlined. The principle of SUDs should be taken into account in terms of managing flood risk within the panelled areas. That's all.

01:31:00:26 - 01:31:05:18

Okay, no thank you very much. I'll come to the applicant to respond on that point please.

01:31:08:15 - 01:31:45:02

Josh, would we on behalf of the applicant? I think we've discussed this particular point quite. I think we've well established our position on it, which is that given the research that we've put out in various rebuttal documents and things like that to deal with the Fay and to stop Lyme down, our position is that that grass ward and the management plans and the decompaction of the soils, all of those things will ensure that the surface water flood risk or the surface water generation from the development will not be exacerbated.

01:31:46:05 - 01:31:54:28

The addition of built suds and hard interventions throughout the panelled areas would have significant impacts on

01:31:56:23 - 01:32:02:18

the proposed development and it returning to its arable use post operation.

01:32:05:15 - 01:32:06:06

Okay, thank you.

01:32:09:00 - 01:32:16:28

In terms of SUDs, detailed design stage, am I right in saying that actually the Council will have an opportunity to review

01:32:19:08 - 01:32:20:28

the subs proposals at that time?

01:32:21:27 - 01:32:27:22

Clairvoy of the applicant. The requirement eleven in terms of the detailed drainage strategy has to

01:32:27:24 - 01:32:28:09

be

01:32:28:11 - 01:32:32:02

approved by the local planning authority. Similarly,

01:32:33:24 - 01:32:36:01

to the extent that there are integrated

01:32:37:29 - 01:33:27:06

drainage systems with other green infrastructure then again that's part of the Olemp. Again another document that is approved by the relevant planning authority. So I think see we've said it a number of times there is a limit to the information that is available at this point in process and we've done our assessment based on a of set defined parameters. Some of the information that's being requested just isn't available at this point in the process and we don't consider it as necessary for the examining authority or the Secretary of State to have that level of detail because the commitments being made will ensure the outcomes are consistent with the environmental impact assessment and it is for the applicant to make sure it designs its scheme to achieve those outcomes.

01:33:28:14 - 01:33:46:04

I don't think we can say much more in terms of the particular point. We said we take away the concerns raised about how we monitor and ensure effectiveness of the swell and that's an action that we've got with us and we'll provide some more detail on on that but

01:33:48:09 - 01:33:50:13

we do seem to be sort of moving away from the issue

01:33:50:15 - 01:33:51:00

and then going

01:33:51:02 - 01:33:53:29

back back to it again. Yeah we've set out

01:33:54:01 - 01:33:56:00

our position. Thank I'm

01:33:56:02 - 01:34:10:26

happy to move on actually on that point. I'd like the LLFA to comment with respect to the how the applicant set out their approach to betterment rates when calculating the volume of attenuation. Can I ask the applicant to respond to those comments please?

01:34:12:21 - 01:34:14:19

Applicant or LLFA?

01:34:14:21 - 01:34:17:20

Sorry, I meant the LLFA. It's been a long day.

01:34:18:12 - 01:34:19:20

It's alright. Yes,

01:34:21:10 - 01:34:32:16

I mean we have standard a position of, we expect thirty percent betterment from developers of sites.

01:34:34:02 - 01:34:34:21

So

01:34:36:16 - 01:35:04:20

this is normally for conventional development, but this is a solar park where there is a section of paneled areas and then there's a section of infrastructure areas. So we understand that we would definitely need seventy percent sorry, thirty percent betterment in the ClimbDown D and E. But in ClimbDown A, B and C,

01:35:06:11 - 01:35:15:17

although we would encourage them to provide betterment, but it's not like, I mean, that is not part of our policy.

01:35:17:10 - 01:35:23:12

But if they could provide anything improvement we would always welcome that.

01:35:23:27 - 01:35:29:15

Okay, thank you. I'll come to stop lying down on the point of betterment if you have any comments to make Ms Reynolds.

01:35:32:27 - 01:35:42:11

Okay thank you. I'll ask the applicant to comment but actually I do wonder if this point would be added to the statement of common ground and fleshed out from there.

01:35:43:29 - 01:35:53:01

Josh Rippey on behalf of the applicant. We've stated the Wiltshire's policy verbatim within all of the drainage strategy examples.

01:35:54:19 - 01:36:07:02

We've committed to the thirty percent betterment over the greenfield runoff rates. The strategy there is to set the principles and those principles have been defined by Wiltshire's policies and by national policies.

01:36:09:21 - 01:36:17:16

Our understanding was that that is already agreed. I don't know how we can further agree something we're if agreeing to their existing policies.

01:36:18:08 - 01:36:19:11

Okay, thank you.

01:36:22:01 - 01:36:42:01

Think adding that to the statement of common ground to clear that out, and then as you say we can address any matters that are outstanding because you've heard from the applicant minister saying they feel that they've complied, they're there with it. You feel that perhaps there might be some further work to do with some further points of clarification. Let's add that to the statement of common ground to resolve that issue.

01:36:43:20 - 01:36:48:02

I see Ms Houghton has a hand up online. Can I bring you in please?

01:36:50:14 - 01:36:59:27

Yeah thank you. Sorry I was bit late raising my hand earlier. Was just if you wanted some very brief comments from the Environment Agency on SUDs if you're happy for that.

01:37:00:00 - 01:37:01:22

Oh please, absolutely.

01:37:01:24 - 01:37:28:21

Perfect, fine, thank you. So yeah, I'm Lucy Houghton for the Water Quality Specialist for the Environment Agency. It was just to basically summarise that we were aligned with what the applicant was saying before about the subs position in terms of where we were at. We reached agreement with that a number of deadlines ago. Our position was written in rep three one four six where the applicant was able to make amendments to improve

01:37:30:06 - 01:37:58:12

sediment controls and certain aspects to do with wheel washing concrete. We were satisfied with that approach and we also note that we also now named in the relevant requirements. So again that detailed design will be consulted on that. So we're satisfied from both the water quality perspective and just to say so my colleague Phil doesn't have to come back on camera just from a flood risk perspective regards to with the SIDs we defer to the LFA for that but from water quality we're happy with where we're at.

01:37:58:29 - 01:38:03:08

That's really helpful, thank you very much. I do appreciate you coming in.

01:38:05:08 - 01:38:20:05

Does anyone have anything else they to want comment on that before we move on, which I think will be item five? So I'll come round. The Youth Council, do you have anything further you want to add before we move on to any other matters?

01:38:21:09 - 01:38:42:22

I would just like to have a bit more clarity on when on Thursday we will have this agenda. Sorry, can you speak up a bit? Didn't. Sorry, yeah. I was just trying to confirm what will be the timing of discussion on Thursday about this LLFA issues.

01:38:47:09 - 01:38:48:08

Well,

01:38:49:23 - 01:38:56:29

I'm sorry to say it in terms of time, could be how long is a piece of string. That's the only thing I'm sorry to say.

01:39:04:01 - 01:39:10:25

I'll confer with my colleague just to see if I can give you something a bit indicative, morning, afternoon, that sort of thing, just bear with me.

01:39:52:29 - 01:40:17:21

Sorry I just need to confer with my colleague and also my legs were stiffening up. So we do have some matters that will be of interest that we will need your view on in the morning session. There are things like discussion around ordinary water courses and that sort of matters. Then the substantive matter with the verification framework would be discussed later in the afternoon. So ideally I would like you here all day.

01:40:17:28 - 01:40:18:15

That's fine.

01:40:20:10 - 01:40:25:21

A stop line now, Ms. Reynolds, do you have anything you would like to comment on before we move things on?

01:40:25:23 - 01:40:26:25

Nothing further, thank you.

01:40:28:16 - 01:40:39:10

Just noting I don't think we've dealt with Agenda item four point seven which was relating to HDD before we moved on to item five I think you'd said, which was other matters.

01:40:39:12 - 01:40:41:20

That's a good catch. Thank you very much.

01:40:44:00 - 01:40:49:11

So item four point seven, I don't think should take long, famous last words.

01:40:51:06 - 01:40:57:16

Yes, horizontal directional drilling, I'm looking for an update on the position between Wiltshire Council and the applicant on this one. Now,

01:41:00:00 - 01:41:23:22

thinking this could end up just being an action point to take away but if I come to the council first, because the references to HDD in the latest statement of common ground submitted deadline six seem to suggest that there are no outstanding issues, but in responses to execute two's Rep five thousand one hundred fifteen, the council explained two outstanding issues. I'm actually just looking for a quick confirmation of where we are, please.

01:41:27:13 - 01:42:12:27

Wellshire Council broadly supports the use of HDD at environmentally sensitive crossings where it can reduce impact on water coils, groundwater, flood risk and ecological receptors compared to open cut methods. The council notes that the applicant has identified SGD crossings and has committed to groundwater investigation, hydrological risk assessment, drilling fluid management, pollution prevention measures, and contingency planning and monitoring. The council's primary interest is ensuring that cross specific risks are appropriately assessed and suitable mitigation monitoring and emergency response measures are secured through the detailed CMP water management and associated approval processes.

01:42:12:29 - 01:42:37:13

And the council does not object to the in principle to the HDD, but any remaining matters, you know, relate to detailed implementation, approval of crossing methodologies rather than the principle itself. And I would also like to add that, you know, this matter also concerns ecological issues as well. So I think they should also be involved in this discussion.

01:42:39:03 - 01:42:41:13

Yeah. Okay. I mean, I think what we'll do.

01:42:43:01 - 01:42:46:10

I'll come to the applicant first, and then I'll see what I think.

01:42:48:00 - 01:43:19:22

William Barrett for the applicant. Yes, we thank Wiltshire Council for their comments on HDD. In the SO c g, we refer to item three point seven point nine, which is a summary of what Mr Singh has given us this afternoon. On the point of monitoring and controls. Yes, we are also in agreement with Mr Singh and Wiltshire Council. This is a very important element of any HDD crossing.

01:43:20:14 - 01:43:56:11

So we would refer to the monitoring commitments that are set out in the outline camp rep six thousand and twenty nine and just a couple of other references relevant to HDD to help the question. The preliminary geotechnical risk register takes a closer look at HDD in regards to ground conditions and groundwater, and that's Rep one one hundred twenty nine. And then also, as we were talking earlier this afternoon, it's the hydrogeological risk assessment that has been under discussion with the Environment Agency, and that's another important element.

01:43:56:18 - 01:43:57:07

Thank you.

01:43:58:13 - 01:44:05:07

Thank you very much. I actually have horizontal directional drilling to discuss on Thursday.

01:44:06:23 - 01:44:08:18

Mr Singh will be here on Thursday,

01:44:11:10 - 01:44:36:27

the applicant, your team will be here as well. And also we'll have, I assume the ecology, your ecology colleagues as well. So we may, I think we'll just park that for further detailed discussion on Thursday and then we can bring, I think that's probably the most appropriate place for it because we'll have ecology colleagues here as well, we can start fleshing that out in its entirety given it does relate to the wording of the Kemp.

01:44:39:09 - 01:44:44:08

Stop lying down, do you have any comments you want to make on this bearing in mind I am going to discuss it on Thursday?

01:44:44:10 - 01:44:45:11

No comments.

01:44:45:18 - 01:44:46:24

Thank you very much.

01:44:48:12 - 01:44:52:00

As you're on the phone, the Environment Agency, do you have any comments to make on this matter?

01:44:57:11 - 01:44:59:04

Lucy Harrison for the Environment Agency.

01:45:00:25 - 01:45:11:28

Ultimately our position is that our concerns to do with mitigation around HCD have all been resolved. However if you wish to ask further questions we can also be available on Thursday.

01:45:12:15 - 01:45:16:23

If you could be in attendance on Thursday that'd be ideal, thank you very much.

01:45:18:20 - 01:45:39:05

Okay, that then, move on to item five? Okay, thank you very much. Right, you'd be pleased to know we're on the home straight. There are relatively minor matters. There's an issue of consistency across documents

01:45:41:10 - 01:45:56:03

that I'd like to bring to the applicant's attention but what I propose is there's sort of seven or eight of them but what we'll do we'll include them in an action point rather than go through them now and then furiously scribbling etc. We'll just put them in the action points.

01:45:58:06 - 01:46:23:20

It is just a matter of making sure documents are dotted and crossed, etcetera. At the start of the hearing today, Ms Catherine de Greene, if she is still with us, mentioned she may want to come in at some point. And I would like to invite Mr Greene if there's anything she wanted to say on the agenda items she's heard because I don't think we've heard from Mr Greene today. So if I invite you to speak please.

01:46:38:13 - 01:47:06:26

Representing my brother and my sister-in-law, her father was one of the founding members of the Nature Conservancy and he and a team worked on the effects of pesticides and the human's impact on the environment. He started his work in nineteen fifty two.

01:47:08:24 - 01:47:27:19

I just feel very, very strongly that this project should not go ahead. It's far too large, the consequences of which will be felt for the next generations. And as my father was a very

01:47:29:05 - 01:47:33:08

good sportsman and he used to hunt

01:47:34:28 - 01:47:51:11

with the Beaufort and he worked for the MOD and he fought very hard in the Second World War that we are betraying our ancestors and our descendants. Thank you very much.

01:47:53:01 - 01:48:17:06

Thank you Mr Grant. I would also like to thank you for your patience today. I do appreciate you staying the course and providing your comment at the end there. If I could ask you to provide your comments in writing as opposed to hearing submission, please, you can discuss that with the case team, Mr Bernie and colleague. That would be very helpful. Thank you.

01:48:21:06 - 01:48:25:02

Now with respect to the matter of Farley's farm, Mr Seymour Williams,

01:48:26:27 - 01:48:48:23

having conflabbed with my colleagues, can I ask that Mr Seymour Williams provides his response as soon as possible following this hearing? However, it may be useful he if watches the recording back. Now, I can't promise, but I think the recording should be published Friday afternoon,

01:48:50:11 - 01:48:59:17

possibly into Monday. as But soon as he's seen this, if we can get in, because I'd like a comment from the applicant on deadline seven on his points.

01:49:01:25 - 01:49:25:17

Claire Bojack the applicant. If it's possible when he's submitting to it pins that a copy could also be provided directly to the applicant team. I know the stop line down are able to send documents directly to us. That would just mean that we don't have any delay between it being uploaded onto the pins website and web there it's more achievable for us to respond to it by deadline seven.

01:49:26:01 - 01:49:30:28

That's a good point, Ms Project. Reynolds, can we can I ask Stop Blame Down to do that, please?

01:49:31:12 - 01:49:39:18

Yes, just to be clear, obviously Seymour Mr Williams is providing his comment in his own capacity, but we do have his contact details so we can ask for him to do that. Yes,

01:49:41:21 - 01:50:03:14

it's important that he does because any delay, we are getting towards the end of the examination now and we want to resolve this issue. We want to get to a position and so it's in his interests to make that submission and pass that on to the applicant as soon as he can. Thank you.

01:50:05:11 - 01:50:08:15

So that would be an action for Mr Seymour Williams.

01:50:10:12 - 01:50:43:09

Okay, so I'm going to move on to item six, review of the issues and actions arising. as Now we turn to item six in the agenda, there are quite a number of action points resulting from today's event from this morning and this afternoon. So what I propose to do, as intimated earlier, is to release these as soon as practicable after this hearing. I think parties have a good idea of what is expected. With the exception of Mr Seymour Williams, the deadline for these submissions is deadline seven Friday second of October.

01:50:43:19 - 01:50:44:27

Does anyone have any questions?

01:50:48:24 - 01:51:22:00

I'm not seeing anyone in the room. I'm not seeing any hands up either virtually or in the room either. Okay. So I will now to move item seven. So as I said, post hearing notes, documents, etcetera are required for deadline seven, Friday second of October. And I do want to sincerely thank everyone for their participation today. It has been a long day. Thank you very much for everyone's contributions to the proceedings. I will now proceed to close Issuer Pacific hearing five.

01:51:22:02 - 01:51:28:25

Thank you for your participation. The time is now six minutes past six pm. I close this hearing. Thank you.