



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Lime Down Solar Project
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) - Part 1
Date:	16 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)

00:00:25:16 - 00:01:21:08

So I'd like to welcome you all morning this to Issue Specific Hearing six in relation to Limesdown Solar Project. My name is Janine Laver and I'm an examining inspector and have been appointed, as you all know, by the Secretary of State to be the lead member panel to examine the application and she'll be taking us through the hearing today. My colleagues Mr Ben Northover to my left and David Love to my right are also examining inspectors to the panel. We constitute the examining authority or the XA for this application, there are other colleagues in the room today Mr Ramiel Burnie our case manager at the back of the room and his colleague Liberty is and we've got back in Bristol the live stream so case team you should contact today if there are any terms or any queries that you have about the running of hearing today.

00:01:22:19 - 00:01:54:19

In terms of housekeeping you'll be aware of the procedure now we run through some housekeeping then we go through introductions and then we get into the substantive part of the hearing. So on to housekeeping there are no planned fire drills today so as with previous instructions yesterday, there are fire doors immediately to the left of us and to the right of us as soon as we exit the doors. They must have pointed to the EV charging points in the car park. So if we hear the fire alarm, we should all exit. Not aware of any media representatives today.

00:01:55:25 - 00:02:04:26

Please do raise their hands if they're from media. No. Okay. Everyone please set all devices and

00:02:07:02 - 00:02:07:18

to

00:02:13:02 - 00:02:14:17

not sure sure you

00:02:16:06 - 00:02:53:07

Measures or arrangements to enable the participation can. in the meeting but please do speak to case team if that's not the case. If at any point during the hearing you have something you wish to raise with us please do raise your hands in the room virtually on Teams. But just note there might be a delay before come to you about that. And also, I'm quite blind of the room where my glasses are on, so I apologize that I keep looking over my glasses like a school teacher at you or they'll be flung on and off through the day. Recording of the hearing will be made available on the National Infrastructure Project website as soon as practicable after this hearing is finished.

00:02:53:09 - 00:03:23:25

With this in mind, please do introduce yourself each time you speak just for the purpose of the recording. For in person participants, if you're not at a table with microphone, one will be brought to you if you wish to speak. As with other events, this is recorded and it will be published on the PINS

website. So please don't say anything on public record that you don't wish the world to be able to listen back to or see you saying as they will be there for people to see for up to five years.

00:03:24:24 - 00:03:56:28

We will have short comfort breaks this morning and, of course, a lunch break. So the agenda we published on the eighth of September is an examination library reference EV12-one. It'd be helpful if you had a copy of that in front of you. I intend to follow that agenda in its order today. So coming on to introductions, I'll come to the applicant first. I believe miss Broderick, it's yourself, mister Threlford, mister Darryl, but please do introduce your colleagues. Good morning.

00:03:57:00 - 00:04:13:05

My name Claire Podrick, I'm a partner at Pinceton Masons LLP, solicitors for the applicant Lymedown Solar Park Limited. I have a number of members of the applicant's team who I envisage might be speaking to today's agenda items with me in the room, so I would just let them introduce themselves.

00:04:15:27 - 00:04:25:02

Morning, everyone. Will Threlfall on behalf of the applicant. I'm a senior project development manager at Island Green Power. I'm project lead for Linedown Solar Park. Mister Thrill Falls Fine.

00:04:27:26 - 00:04:35:11

Good morning, everyone. My name is James Darrow. I'm a director at Transport Planning Associates, and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. Thank you.

00:04:36:15 - 00:04:55:00

Claire Bodrick the Those are people we envisage predominantly talking to today's agenda items. Should there be a need for further environmental input then we may have somebody who might need to come forward but they'll introduce themselves then. Great, thank you. So I'll come down to Wiltshire Council and Miss Shalloughby please. Odette Shalabee, barrister instructed on behalf

00:04:55:02 - 00:05:08:20

of Wiltshire Council. There are a number of people here and online who I'm just going to introduce. I'm going to start with the two people next to me. Do you want to introduce yourselves as these will be the people doing most of the talking today?

00:05:10:03 - 00:05:13:21

David Lehr, Wiltshire Council Highway Development Control team.

00:05:15:21 - 00:05:19:17

Good morning. Kim Corr, Wiltshire Council. Sorry. I didn't

00:05:19:23 - 00:05:20:17

your surname.

00:05:20:19 - 00:05:24:12

surname. Corr, c o r p s. Thank you. Thank you.

00:05:24:20 - 00:05:33:09

Odette Shallerby, Wiltshire Council. And then I think we have online, mister Cheleda. If you could turn your camera on and just make sure that's working and introduce yourself.

00:05:34:10 - 00:05:39:26

Hello. Kevin Shalida, Wiltshire Council. Yes. Thank you. Thank you.

00:05:40:25 - 00:05:59:06

I'm Shallowby, Wiltshire Council. And we also have, for later on in the session, with me in the room behind me, Kate Tate, who's an arboricultural officer, dealing with the impacts on on the woodland, and also online, I think, Lisa Price, who's also an arboricultural officer at the council, but that will be only towards the end of the Okay. The agenda.

00:05:59:08 - 00:06:03:08

Thank you. Okay. Come on now to stop lying down, mister Gazelka, please.

00:06:04:12 - 00:06:19:11

Thank you, madam. Danny Gazelka, barrister instructed by stop lying down. I'm joined by, Cecilia Reynolds, who I'll be doing the, speaking from the side. And then I'm joined by mister Bruce Bamba.

00:06:22:00 - 00:06:29:29

Bruce Bamba of Relton TPC Limited working on behalf of Stop Line Down. Mister Bamba is fine.

00:06:30:01 - 00:07:00:14

Thank you. Thank you. Okay, great. So the only other IP I had registered to speak on this agenda was mister Seymour Williams. He wants to talk about traffic management on Pig Lane. Do we know if mister Williams is tending? No. He's he's hasn't shown yet. Okay. Well, if he does arrive or turn up online, we bring him at in that point. Are there any other IPs who registered to speak that I didn't have on my list from case team?

00:07:02:02 - 00:07:07:27

K. I'm not seeing anybody. Now is there anybody who hasn't registered participate who would like to participate?

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

And, again, I'm not seeing anybody. Okay.

00:07:16:26 - 00:07:54:17

So that concludes the introductions. So we can now move on to item two, which is the substantive part of the hearing. Now, I feel this may be a long hearing today, and I apologize in advance for the amount of time that I be will speaking. There is a lot to cover, and there's no opportunity to defer these matters to a subsequent hearing. So I would really be looking to get through the whole agenda. Now I really would not want to go beyond five pm as you did yesterday just for the well-being of all parties, but I think it's in everyone's interest that we really try and wrap this up as best we can today.

00:07:54:19 - 00:08:08:25

Now, I'm certainly not anticipating or expecting agreement to be reached on the issues, but rather that the agenda items are fully aired. So without further ado, let's get on to construction HGV numbers.

00:08:10:20 - 00:08:32:00

So it would be helpful, I think, if we could start with the applicant just putting on our screen the original transport assessment, ES appendix thirteen-one, which is APP-two thirty three, particularly interested in page nine zero five of nine fifty four of that PDF.

00:08:35:25 - 00:09:11:17

Whilst we're waiting for that to arrive, I'll carry on. So Table thirteen-twelve and Annex E of the original transport assessment, APP two thirty three, identified that the number of solar modules to be delivered to the solar sites would be five hundred and eighty eight thousand nine hundred and eighty eight. And that number informed transport assessment from the outset. So we're waiting for that to be displayed, page nine zero five. It's the PDF nine zero five. And that should be for the modules and delivery cables table of the transport assessment.

00:09:13:00 - 00:09:15:03

Look over the top of my glasses.

00:09:21:24 - 00:09:44:25

Yeah. Thank you. Now, as we can see, this table states that if the modules are delivered in regular forty foot containers, each container would deliver five hundred modules, which would equate to a total of eleven seventy eight HGV deliveries or twelve hundred rounded up. Now that figure remains unchanged in the latest transport assessment REP six-fifteen.

00:09:45:21 - 00:09:46:12

However, as we

00:09:46:14 - 00:09:59:13

can see from that table that's on the screen in APP two thirty three, the applicant originally reported if high that cube containers were used to deliver the modules, the total number of HGV deliveries would reduce to nine ninety four.

00:10:00:29 - 00:10:38:17

Now Annex E, which is what this is, was updated at deadline one, and that is REP1-sixty, and that's the tracked version. I note that the reference to high cube containers and nine ninety four deliveries vanished without explanation. Since then, the applicant has maintained that if high cube containers are used, the of number panels delivered would increase, but the number of deliveries would be no greater than twelve hundred. So I guess the point I'm making is I'm perplexed by this, because if the original transport assessment said, which informed the EIA, by the way, if that the number of panels required

00:10:40:17 - 00:11:11:29

were five hundred and eighty eight thousand nine hundred and eighty eight, it was either eleven seventy eight deliveries in standard containers or nine ninety four in high cube containers. Now when I asked at Ish three for clarity on how the construction traffic forecasts were developed, the applicant

clarified that the estimates and breakdowns of construction activities were provided by a contractor, so based on professional ment and derived from experience with developments of similar nature, size and scale. Hope you're all still with me. I realise I'm talking a lot.

00:11:12:25 - 00:11:56:11

Now the XA, based upon what the applicant told us, we should therefore have some confidence that when five hundred and eighty eight thousand nine hundred and eighty eight modules were suggested by the contractor as the likely requirement for the development, such that it informed the transport assessment and the EIA that it was based upon experience. So I therefore scratch my head as to why eight hundred and forty two thousand five hundred modules came into the examination orbit. And the only rational explanation I can come up with, and applicant the will have an opportunity to correct me, the only rational explanation to come up with is that the applicant underestimated the number of panels required and thus underestimated the number of HGV deliveries from the outset.

00:11:57:22 - 00:12:14:06

Now, since Stop Limedown and the council raised concerns about underestimated HGB numbers, the applicant has pushed the narrative that the number of modules in the transport assessment isn't an issue because if high cube containers are used, you need never go above twelve hundred HGV deliveries.

00:12:15:27 - 00:12:50:00

And you say you'll commit to this in the outline construction traffic management plan. But I must come back to this original Annex E in the transport assessment, which showed high cube containers were used, the number of deliveries would actually be reduced. So by adopting a higher number of modules now, nearly two hundred and fifty thousand modules more, the number of mountain structures increases, the figure for waste increases, which means the overall number HDVs of increases. The module number increase also potentially increases the number of construction workers required, and we'll come on to construction workers later.

00:12:52:00 - 00:13:16:23

So, and I nearly to the get point of handing to the applicant to explain, it seems to me that the worst case was not assessed in the ES chapter thirteen or the transport assessment. So I'm going to come to the applicant and ask it to explain how it went from five hundred and eighty eight thousand modules in nine hundred and ninety four high cube containers to now eight hundred and forty two thousand five hundred modules in twelve hundred high cube deliveries.

00:14:57:14 - 00:14:59:24

Applicant, thank you for bearing with me there.

00:15:01:14 - 00:15:34:09

So obviously, as was stated before, the information that was used in the original transport assessment that was submitted applicant by as part of the DCO application was based on information provided by contractors and that was typical of the figures being used on other schemes of this nature. Obviously, the position has been evolving as more and more of these schemes are going forward through to, actual construction, now.

00:15:34:19 - 00:15:35:08

The,

00:15:36:26 - 00:16:07:29

comments that were made by Wiltshire Council and Stop Lime Down were taken into consideration. As part of the exercise to ensure that we weren't underestimating the potential movements for the scheme, the applicant undertook an exercise to review all of the figures and to try and determine what would be the maximum number of components that could be accommodated within the site.

00:16:08:15 - 00:17:01:15

Since the DCO application was submitted, new forms of panel array layouts have come onto the market, so you can have a two panel system and a three panel system. And so when the applicant was trying to put together what it considered to be the maximum amount of components, it went with the biggest biggest number it could conceive for any of the given elements. And so when reviewing these figures, that is what it utilised in terms of taking the footprint of the development, how many panels could potentially be located within that footprint, trying to get to the the the maximum that we could in order to address some of the concerns that had been raised about underestimating the components.

00:17:01:17 - 00:17:34:14

However, as we've said, haven't we done a detailed design. It's indicative. It's based on indicative information, but we were trying to make sure we had fully captured the absolute maximum feasible parameters within the revised assessment. So that is the explanation for the increase in components. It was part of the exercise that was done to take on board the concerns that were being raised and making sure that we had fully assessed the absolute maximum we felt could be

00:17:36:02 - 00:18:06:04

feasibly fitted within the footprint of the scheme as opposed to what an indicative design had shown, which was the original estimate. So we were trying to maximize maximize the parameters to give comfort to council and the objective groups that we had fully assessed the maximum worst case. You can see, however, just based upon that table, which then vanished, it hasn't brought any comfort at all.

00:18:06:07 - 00:18:37:07

It's just cast out on whether that original assessment was adequate. There's two hundred and fifty thousand panels more. We've gone from a lower number of HiQ deliveries to a higher number of HiQ deliveries, even though the overall number of deliveries hasn't changed. It almost feels like we're trying to fit pieces into an existing puzzle, but the pieces are not the right size. So we've stuck with twelve hundred. We're gonna keep sticking with that twelve hundred deliveries, and it doesn't matter what else we tinker with as long as we just hold that number.

00:18:37:21 - 00:18:38:06

So

00:18:41:19 - 00:18:43:12

yeah. I'll stop there.

00:18:48:16 - 00:19:05:27

I'll come back to you shortly, Ms. Broderick, to possibly expand a little bit more on the exercise that you've undertaken with increasing the number of modules, to take me through that process. But before we get there, can I just want you to,

00:19:07:20 - 00:19:38:16

I just want to touch upon section two of your rep five one zero seven, which is your response to table two of stop line downs appendix d of its written representation, which was rep one one seven two? So the that's context for rep five one zero seven. Now it would be helpful to me if we could show page two of that document on the screen. So this document can come down, and we can display page two of Rep five one zero seven.

00:19:49:03 - 00:20:22:12

Yeah. So I'm looking specifically at the table two, and in essence, that is table two of Stop Lyme Down's REP1 submission just reproduced in your document. Now, we can see from that Mr Bamba compared the number of HGV deliveries made per hectare of the works number one area identified for Lyme dam in relation to a number of other consented solar sites, notably West Burton, Cottam and Greenhill, which were all IGP schemes, and Botley West and Heckington, FEN.

00:20:23:15 - 00:20:57:04

Mr Bamba identified the number of deliveries and the ratio of deliveries per hectare of solar site for lying down is less than half the average for the other sites. Now, the purpose behind this table, and do correct me if I'm wrong, Mr Bamba, but was to demonstrate the applicant has under assessed the number of panels required and the subsequent HGV numbers for the project. Yeah, we're not disputing that. But the applicant has disputed the numbers in this table and provides its position in table two dash one, which is on the next page. So if we could move to the next table in this document on the screen, please.

00:21:01:28 - 00:21:32:10

Great. Now, in the first instance, I would note that mister Bamba's original calculations, which was on the previous table, had a works area figure of seven hundred and forty eight hectares, which was the site area from the design principles and parameters document. And in three rep dash one three three, which was the applicant's initial rebuttal to stop lying down, the applicant stated defenced area containing solar panels is actually four hundred and sixty nine hectares, not seven hundred and forty eight, which is fair enough.

00:21:32:26 - 00:22:16:27

But we're now told that the area containing panels, and it's here on this table in front of us, would be three hundred and eighty five point three hectares. Now presumably, it's not feasible to plant the entire fenced area with panels. So that's the reason for that site area coming down. Mr And Threlfall is nodding. So great. So three hundred and eighty five point three hectares is the figure that the applicant has arrived at for maximum panel planting. Can I suggest that this is including it in the design principles and parameters plan? Clare Brodick the applicant, this is the area the area shown coloured blue for that work number on the works plan, so it is already secured because we can only locate panels within the areas.

00:22:16:29 - 00:22:41:14

Yeah, appreciate that, but could it not be also indicated, the hectare in the design principles and parameters plan for the avoidance of doubt? Because if that is the figure we're working to, it would be quite clear on the face of it then that we're not trying to measure off a plan, we are working to a hectare figure. I'll plant that for the moment because I would also then suggest the figures included in the outline construction environmental management plan for the avoidance of doubt.

00:22:43:26 - 00:23:17:13

Can I project for the applicant? We can take the point where, I mean, obviously, don't consider it's necessary because it's quite clear that the work can only be carried out within that area on the works plan. But if it would assist to give as to what that figure is, then I'm sure we can add that in. Yeah. And so I will issue an action for that to be followed up, please. Okay, so just returning then to section two and table two-one of Rep five-one hundred seven, I want to call into question some of the information which the applicants relied upon in producing this rebuttal.

00:23:18:07 - 00:23:54:17

Now, the applicant states when providing a comparison with other schemes, it's important that variables being compared are consistent, and that seems perfectly reasonable to me. But it goes on to say that the trip calculations on other IGP schemes were not broken down into detail, but the trip numbers of solar panels and mountain structures would have included trips associated with waste packaging, etcetera. And it's for that reason the applicant says that the HGV movements related to waste packaging for linedown have now been added to the modular mountain structures numbers to demonstrate comparison with IGP's other schemes.

00:23:58:10 - 00:24:11:29

Mr. Bamba notes in his deadline six submission, which is AS028, that the Greenhill trip generation was based on that presented for COTTOM, and COTTOM assumed that waste was accounted for in the other category.

00:24:13:19 - 00:24:26:01

Now, we've only got the applicant's word that the trip figures in IGP's other schemes would have included more than just modules and mounting structures because you do state in your submission Rep five point one zero seven that they were not broken down into detail.

00:24:27:19 - 00:25:24:05

I guess I call into doubt the reliability of the HGV numbers in the other IGP schemes being put forward in this table. Now, not here to examine those other schemes. I'm not here to examine the other inspectors who examined those schemes. They just may not have gone into the detail of the numbers, but they're important here because we're being told that these are like for like comparisons, and I'm not certain that they are. Also, the reason I'm cast out on some of this is because the HGV trip oversights that we have already identified in Lime Down so far, and I'm specifically back going to ISH three, where we discussed missing numbers for spoil removal, delivery of movement of construction machinery, increase in the number of conversion units and so on, and the applicant statement that any errors would be accounted for in the application of a fifty percent up left, it's feasible that the HGV movements identified for those other IGP schemes were not accurate either.

00:25:25:11 - 00:25:46:08

So I just would express some caution to the applicant about making assumptions on what was included in other those IGP trip figures when we don't have any clarity on those. We have a statement from Mr. Bamba already looking, having looked at Greenhill, which refers to cotton, which refers to other category for waste. So

00:25:49:11 - 00:26:02:15

I personally would prefer for this table to be rerun with the waste figures taken out of the line down figures because I'm not confident that they were included in other the IGP trip calculations.

00:26:04:05 - 00:26:24:20

Now, before I come to the applicant's comment, there's only other one other matter I wanted to raise, and I guess it's a bit of clarity. And it's whether the site area shown here in this table for the three other IGP schemes are the solar PV planting areas only. I'd like some clarity on that. Or if they were the entire works area one.

00:26:26:11 - 00:27:07:02

I'll come to you now. Claire project for the applicant. So those are the in the same way that I described the areas on the- MS: The fenced areas. MS: The colour for that particular work number, they're the sort of solid blue coloured on the works plans. The works plans for those other projects had were similar, it's those elements of work number one, which is the solar panels themselves and the converter units. What it excludes specifically is the inter array cabling because work number one as a whole covers a very large area for all those projects because it includes inter array cabling.

00:27:07:04 - 00:27:39:09

What we've sought to do in terms of clarifying the works area to is remove those inter array cabling areas, and they vary quite considerably between the schemes depending on where the parcels of of panels so are located. So to ensure that it's a fair comparison between the schemes, we've just utilised work numbers at one a to c, which is the equivalent Okay. In those projects. So it is fair comparison in terms of the the work numbers that have been used

00:27:40:25 - 00:28:12:09

there. In terms of the confidence in the HGVs, obviously, they've in respect of some of them, Mr Darrell can speak to them because obviously, he was involved in the transport assessment and his company were involved in the transport assessment for those projects. I would say that you can have reliance on the it's not just been somebody observing what was in the public domain, it was actually involved in the production of the transport assessments. But Mr Dowell can speak to that if that's helpful.

00:28:12:17 - 00:28:13:02

Thanks.

00:28:15:15 - 00:28:17:01

Mr Dowell for the applicant.

00:28:19:01 - 00:28:28:06

Yes, other those figures do include waste, which is what we said in the text. That was in the calculations for Cottam and Westburton especially.

00:28:28:08 - 00:28:39:16

So how do you account for the statement in Greenhill which states it relies upon Cottam, which cotton says waste was included in other and not actually included with mountain structures and solar panels.

00:28:39:18 - 00:28:47:28

Yeah, so it might say that, but in the actual calculation in the spreadsheets waste is included. That's all I can say really.

00:28:48:00 - 00:28:56:24

So if I were to look at the spreadsheets for those other three, it would say solar panels, mounting structures and waste in one row.

00:28:56:26 - 00:28:57:11

Would have that in

00:28:57:13 - 00:29:03:27

there, yes. It wouldn't say, oh, this includes it, it's but in the spreadsheet, in the total number, so we know that that's in there.

00:29:03:29 - 00:29:08:29

Well, would be in the spreadsheet because hopefully you will have accounted for waste, but I'm asking would it have been under the same row?

00:29:09:01 - 00:29:10:00

Yes, it would, yes.

00:29:10:02 - 00:29:20:08

Thank you. Okay, that's helpful. Okay, I'll come to mister Bamba to see if he wanted to to comment on anything in that table.

00:29:24:17 - 00:29:28:26

Bruce Bamba on behalf of Stop Lime Down. Yes.

00:29:33:20 - 00:30:07:03

Am also slightly bewildered. I'm not sure what that three eighty five hectares refers to because we've this had progressive slimming down of the areas that are actually allocated for panels. I was under the impression that those the blue areas shaded on the plans referred to the four sixty nine hectares and then the three eighty five was excluding those empty areas, if you like, within those blue areas.

00:30:07:08 - 00:30:14:19

So it's not clear to me. Haven't measured the areas myself I haven't seen any measurements of those areas.

00:30:17:09 - 00:30:29:05

But I well, you know what my views are in terms of the compatibility of how these different schemes have been compared.

00:30:30:28 - 00:30:40:20

Again, we can only rely on statements from the applicant on how things like waste been have dealt with.

00:30:43:26 - 00:31:10:14

Because of this uncertainty, what I have done in my recalculated assessment is take that three eighty five hectares and applied assume that that is covered with panels because that is the area covered by panels and essentially taken the assuming a four point five meter panel area and a two point five meter gap between the panels, which is

00:31:12:21 - 00:31:43:04

those are dimensions that the applicant has provided already and worked out based on a panel area, a single panel area of two point seven meters squared, the number of panels that you could fit in that area, which seems to me to be a sensible way to come up with a figure of a worst possible case, assuming that that is three eighty five and assuming that four point five meters and two point five meters is the worst case.

00:31:43:16 - 00:31:51:16

And that gives a figure of nine hundred and seventeen thousand three hundred and eighty one panels. And because

00:31:53:26 - 00:32:15:22

I had the meeting with the applicant, and there were exchange of notes after that and notes of the meeting, which didn't clarify exactly how this was calculated. Therefore, I've adopted that as a, if you like, sensible first principles approach to coming with a up figure of number of panels.

00:32:19:05 - 00:32:24:23

Thank you. Does Wilshire Cancer want to comment just on this table?

00:32:28:06 - 00:32:47:17

I think from our point of view we've obviously accepted the number of pounds sorry David Liverwiche Council. We've accepted the applicants obviously from a lorry loading perspective we're interested in the number of panels then and obviously the applicants considerably raise those now to nearly

00:32:51:02 - 00:32:52:08

eight hundred thousand.

00:32:54:01 - 00:33:11:17

So I am bemused to how the area's kind of cracked down because obviously in terms of this table if you reduce the area of panel coverage you are obviously going to make the ratio look better. So originally I think at ish three we were talking one hundred and sixty nine, now it's obviously down.

00:33:13:26 - 00:33:51:07

I haven't looked into the area and how it's composition the same way as Mr Bamba has but at the end of the day we are interested in you know the number of panels the applicant has already your point that it's gone up from five hundred to eight hundred in the blink of an eye which does and when I looked at your comments about why has that happened I think when the numbers changed, I think the applicants said they had to achieve a panel density of a certain number per acre to achieve a generating capacity of one megawatt.

00:33:51:11 - 00:33:56:18

And when I looked those numbers back, I think the original numbers would have been well under that. So

00:33:59:02 - 00:34:10:29

I was a bit surprised recently when I said, okay, so were the original numbers actually correct? And that's the point that was raised. But at the end of the day, if it is now what it is eight hundred thousand, eight hundred and fifty thousand panels,

00:34:13:11 - 00:34:24:26

we're interested in the number of lorries that equates to and say I haven't looked the precise, know, how that distributes over an area where that area is correct.

00:34:24:28 - 00:35:00:06

Yeah. Which is the point I was trying to ask the applicant to put in the design principles and parameters in the outline environmental management plan so that it absolutely was clear because we've been on shift in sands throughout. And what I don't want is to get into the construction stage if this development consent order is granted, and we're on more shift in sands because we've got no clarity around the planting area. Miss Broderick, you want to come in? Claire Broderick, the applicant. Obviously, just in terms of just to be clear, the areas for work, this particular the panel areas have only changed where we've removed panels during the course of the examination.

00:35:00:08 - 00:35:33:27

So there has been some adjustment to the to the figures where we have taken out some panel. Are you suggesting you've dropped from four hundred and sixty nine hectares to three ninety No. That's how much has been reduced. No. No. No. What I'm saying is there has been a reduction since the DCO application was submitted because we've removed panels from field a one, for example, in response to other comments. So there there has been a change to the Can I ask how many hectares that would equate to? If we're raising it, let's let's let's wanted to in case there was we weren't saying I couldn't say it was exactly the same from the beginning because we have taken out Yeah.

00:35:33:29 - 00:36:12:00

I agree. I wonder if it might be helpful if we could just share the works plan on the screen just so that we can provide an just so it's absolutely clear what we're talking about. And if I'm sure we can provide

so in order to calculate that area, the the person who prepared the the works plans calculated that figure because they can calculate that that particular shading area on the plan. Yeah. So that's how it was calculated, and I'm sure we can arrange for mister Bamba to have access or see the GIS that sits behind that PDF so he can understand how figure that has been has been calculated.

00:36:12:02 - 00:36:42:05

But I think when you're working out the number of panels that can be fixed and apologies, don't think Charlotte had that ready. But when it comes up on the screen, you'll be able to just see that the the areas are not neat rectangles or squares. A lot of the areas for this blue work numbers are irregular shapes. So you've got, yeah, some that are more uniform shapes, some that sort are of long and narrow. And then if you

00:36:44:00 - 00:37:04:04

So can I just ask down? So we're we're looking it's not we I guess our position is that you you're not just taking the total area and then dividing it by a number to get the number of panels. We have looked at how many panels we think you could possibly fit within these areas, but that doesn't account for

00:37:05:25 - 00:37:52:09

we haven't done the detailed design. So there are lots of other factors that could be taken account into in terms of the the final number of panels that could result in in fewer panels. But we were trying as part of this exercise to think about how many panels could you realistically if you were disregarding lots of other factors that you might put in place for the detailed design, how could you many could you fit in any of those given shapes? And that's where we came up with the the number that we had. But can I just go back a stage as to why exercise that was undertaken during examination and why that exercise was not done to that degree before you submitted your transport assessment? Because some of this discussion throughout this examination may not have been necessary.

00:37:53:20 - 00:38:08:03

As I said, we feel like we've been on shift in sands. We're two hundred and fifty thousand panels more, but surely that exercise was done. And the technology can't have changed that much in six all months of a sudden, you know, panels are very different from where you started this process.

00:38:10:28 - 00:38:42:12

Cleveridge Viatkin, the three panel design wasn't available in the market when this transport assessment was being done. So it is a a fact that technology has moved on and what is being considered now as being suitable design measures weren't envisaged at the point that the transport assessment was carried out. The transport assessment was carried out based on an indicative design, based on information provided by contractors that had been used, but further work is continuing to take place.

00:38:43:03 - 00:39:21:08

Island Green Power as an organisation are looking to in the process building of out West Burton, and they're getting, you know, a lot more information as a result of having contractors appointed on that scheme and providing more detailed information that was that that was not available at the point that Cotton and Weiss Burton were going through the DCA process and when Lime Down transport assessment was was being undertaken. Mister Darrell obviously provo undertook the transport

assessment based on the information that he was provided with that was considered to be indicative and suitable at the time.

00:39:21:10 - 00:40:00:24

But as a result of this exercise, we have interrogated that information more thoroughly. We've utilised the more detailed information that's coming out of contractor information being provided on other schemes in it, we're trying to be transparent here and saying, well, yes, actually, there could be greater level of components that you could feasibly fix within there. We will rerun the numbers using that updated information. We're not trying to hold fast to the original figures. We've accepted some of the concerns and queries that have been raised and have taken it away to look at in more detail and try to update the information.

00:40:00:26 - 00:40:28:21

But you are holding fast on the twelve hundred delivery. So that is the one thing you are holding fast on. I was actually going to ask about 3P panels because when I was going through the other application material, I couldn't find any reference anywhere to 3P panels in the documents that were in the exam. In REP five thousand and sixty five, which is the illustrative drawings for components of the project. Only one or two panel configurations are shown.

00:40:30:19 - 00:41:17:16

In APP fifty five, which describes the main components of the scheme, three panel configurations are not discussed or illustrated in any of the plates at all. So from what you're saying, this has all happened in the last six months since this examination has pretty much been running. Three panels come on to the market, and that is the change in your panel numbers. Cleveridge, the applicant. I'll let mister Threlfield provide a bit more information, but I think as part of the exercise, we were trying to look at what was possibly maximum number of panels that could be accommodated within the area, and the view was taken, well, if if if the project were to happen to use this solution, then that could be that would increase the number of panels.

00:41:17:18 - 00:41:55:10

So we were trying to look at what would be the maximum, but Mr. Calfield can provide some more information about the actual whether it is where it has got to on the market. But we're not saying it would be used for this scheme necessarily. We're just saying it is we were trying to work out how how we could get maximum the feasible number for the purposes of this exercise. I would like to hear from mister Thravell. But mister Thravell, as when you're when you come in, can I just add a question? And that is whether using a three panel arrangement changes the height of any of these arrays?

00:41:56:13 - 00:42:08:16

Thank you. Will Throwfall for the applicant. Yeah, was going to clarify that. So the difference between 2P and 3P fixed panels is to do with how many you lay in portrait on one row.

00:42:08:18 - 00:42:09:03

So

00:42:09:29 - 00:42:13:29

you're not increasing the work area or the solar PV areas,

00:42:15:25 - 00:42:49:03

nor do you need to change the parameters. What we would look to do if you just take one area and you want to look for the most efficient design between 2P and 3P, 2P allows you to put two panels on top of each other, but you might be able to gain an extra tilt in a row. And you would feasibly be able to fit more rows in because they're shorter in length from the bottom to the top, if that makes sense. So you can get more rows. I think the rule is generally for every sort of ninth row, let me word this right, for every eight rows of 3P, you gain a ninth row in 2P.

00:42:49:05 - 00:43:26:27

The 3P obviously makes the physical length of the or not the height that sense but what's the right word for the measurement? The depth of each one. So you could do that But what you're looking for is what's more efficient. Is it two panels with a slightly higher tilt? If you look at the topography it might be that you can gain extra PV irradiance from doing it that way in the row. Or is it that you actually drop your tilt which theoretically drops your irradiance level ever so slightly but if you place a third panel in there in that row that then potentially gives you more generation in there.

00:43:26:29 - 00:44:03:02

So the heights and the flexible parameters, it's the tilt that adjusts in regards to parameters, which is how we can fix it in there. Now the 3P mounting structures and the design and the various electrical stringing and things like that that goes into the background of that, that's what's come forward most recently. And as Ms. Broderick says as part of this exercise, what we've done is we've done a 3P design across the entire site. That doesn't factor in the fact that, A, we've lost some fields, but also the fact that we've committed to using tracker panels in certain areas for Glint and Glare, for example, or various design implications.

00:44:03:11 - 00:44:35:26

So this is an indicative design. Electrically, it doesn't really work. It's not been designed in that manner. We've used a design tool to do this. This is the detailed design tool that we use. appreciate I there's mathematical calculations that have been used on areas and those numbers I don't dispute them, but they've not been done using a design tool which factors in all various factors, hence why we've got this difference between forty two eight or the nine hundred and something there because the mathematical calculation would give you more. But the difference between the design isn't alter anything.

00:44:35:28 - 00:45:05:28

It's just actually can you place less rows but more panels on each row you do two panels and have, as I say, one or two more rows? It doesn't change any of the design parameters, but it's come forwards and we felt that the way to gain the absolute maximum amount of panels we could possibly use was to do this design and that could help inform things. That maximum design fits within the parameters of what we've done with the transport numbers because of the buffers we'd applied. That's kind of my position listening to everything that's been said.

00:45:06:29 - 00:45:24:18

But presumably these are fixed arrays because obviously we were working your transport assessment was based upon a fixed array, which was not probably not your intention across the whole site because tracker panels have been in play the entire time. If you end up planting more tracker panels, numbers of panels come down.

00:45:24:20 - 00:45:59:11

Exactly. The idea, the 3P design is the way to achieve the highest amount of infrastructure that you would need, and that would include cabling and all sorts of things. So that's what we've tried to do. That design gives you your worst case scenario to help inform all of this. Just on the point of clarity in terms of the field removals, the numbers I have in front of me are the field sizes, the hectares. So it's twenty hectares of field that's dropped, but obviously the work numbers will be slightly smaller than that. So I would have to just come back to you check what they are, what we've lost in terms of hectare change based on table two point one.

00:45:59:21 - 00:46:20:00

But even if you assume twenty hectares of field, that is the only actual change from the beginning to where we are now in terms of the hectares. It's just we've tried to provide clarity on where we physically can place the panels. And I believe Mr Bambeau understood that work area and that's what his mathematical calculation of panel numbers is based on.

00:46:20:12 - 00:46:24:04

So going back that works to plan which was on the screen,

00:46:25:24 - 00:46:28:23

if we could bring that back up that would be helpful.

00:46:30:25 - 00:46:33:02

Just want to be absolutely certain.

00:46:34:25 - 00:46:43:27

So the seven forty nine is everything that would be in the red line. Is that correct?

00:46:45:22 - 00:47:01:26

I'm trying to work out the four sixty nine, the seven seven hundred forty eight, and the three hundred and eighty five. The three hundred and eighty five you're telling me is the blue oblongs? Yes. That's correct. The four hundred sixty nine is it would include all of the sort of grid

00:47:04:27 - 00:47:37:16

Fair Project, up to the fence line for those panels, but disregarded the trying to find an example. There are some areas where the fields are linked together and you have lot bits of cabling, between them. So it sort of include the four hundred and sixty nine included kind of on on the on the plan you're looking at now, it would have gone up to the, to the most adjacent red line, so that sort of hatched, blue area. But there are some areas, within work number one, which are just underground cabling.

00:47:37:18 - 00:47:46:17

I'm just trying to find a good example, which is why you just look at work number one, it's in entirety. You end up with a much bigger number.

00:47:47:13 - 00:47:49:13

Seven forty nine includes the habitat areas

00:47:49:15 - 00:48:09:29

as Thank you. That's helpful. So I think our view in terms of if you're doing a comparison between the number of HTV movements linked to the number of solar panels, then the area that you should be utilising for the comparison is is just the areas that you can put the solar panels on.

00:48:11:17 - 00:48:33:09

And that's what we've tried to do in table, and obviously we've the same exercise was done in terms of the areas for Greenhill, Cottam and West Burton, and they do include more areas, larger areas for for this particular work number of risk. I think my colleague, mister Northover, has a point he wants to

00:48:34:01 - 00:48:47:03

Yeah. I just wanted to I just wanted to I think you may have answered it already. But in terms of taking into account the irregular shapes, the site specific considerations,

00:48:48:18 - 00:49:00:00

how have you taken that into account? Have you done an initial design layout of the panels or rather than a percentage reduction calculation of the area? That correct?

00:49:04:02 - 00:49:38:01

Will Throwffle for the applicant. I can answer the first point. I'll just query the So second yes, we've done a design. So it is a realistic design. Mean, if you take what's on screen here, panels, if we're talking about the fixed panels, they would be in facing south rows. They would be on an east west access. Obviously you can see these fields all kind of do a kind of northwest to southeast divide. That obviously takes away certain areas in locations and the rows are divided in there. So that's probably the contributing biggest factor to how we've got slightly different numbers there.

00:49:38:03 - 00:49:46:25

If you were to turn those into exact squares, you would obviously be able to probably get a few more panels in. So we've done that design. And then, sorry, the second part of the question,

00:49:46:27 - 00:49:47:12

I think,

00:49:49:10 - 00:50:04:11

alternatively would be to measure the entire area as a regular rectangular shape and then apply a percentage reduction. But that's not what you've done. You've done a layout and counted the number of panels.

00:50:04:13 - 00:50:16:19

No. My understanding is that is what Mr. Bamba has done. We have done it on a design using the tool that we use to physically design these schemes and would use to design a scheme in future. Okay, thank you.

00:50:19:18 - 00:50:23:03

Mr Bamba, would you want to come in at that point?

00:50:23:05 - 00:50:33:01

Thank you, Rob. Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. A couple of points. Could we go to back the the table just briefly? The two stroke one table.

00:50:33:03 - 00:50:34:26

That's rep five one zero seven. Yeah.

00:50:34:28 - 00:50:35:15

So yeah.

00:50:49:16 - 00:51:32:01

Yeah, I mean, is a point that I've brought out. These comparisons, we have the work number one areas. If you look at the ES for each of those schemes, they look the works plans look very similar to the one we've just seen with the blue hatched area and the solid blue area there. For Lime Down, we have reduction from the seven forty eight, four sixty nine to three eighty five. I noticed that for Cotton, the Works number one area that's given as the headline headline figure comparable with the seven forty eight is eight ninety seven.

00:51:32:03 - 00:51:40:28

So that hasn't been adjusted at all. That's been left the same. And the same thing applies to West Burton. The works number one area hasn't been adjusted. So

00:51:42:14 - 00:51:57:07

the point I raised, these are not on a like for like basis. If they were, those two would need to be adjusted in a similar way to what's been done for Lime Down. That's all I wanted to say about that.

00:51:57:19 - 00:52:27:29

Uh-huh. And think on that point, one of the questions I asked the applicant's team when I started off on this table was whether those areas shown there were the works number for one those other projects or if they were reduced areas based upon the panel planting areas. And Ms Broderick, you told me they had been reduced, but I'm hearing very different from Mr Bamber. My understanding that they those is are the figures for the equivalent work numbers, but we will double check that point.

00:52:28:01 - 00:52:56:22

That was my understanding as the exercise that had been undertaken. Okay. Well, I think what I'll do Let me double check over that is if by all means, double check and you can come back us to on it. But if we don't have clarity by the end of the day, then I will issue an action for this table to be rerun with the actual reduced areas for those other schemes so that we are, as you in this document, comparing apples with apples. Mister Darryl?

00:52:57:09 - 00:53:06:12

James Darryl, for the applicant, I'm confident that they are the works one area, the blue areas. They are comparable. It's the learning, and those PSEs are different, that's why. It's just the wording.

00:53:06:14 - 00:53:18:19

I think those figures may have been given in those projects, which is why it was why why mister Bamba had been able to use the correct figure from the outset, if that makes sense. And we think those figures were listed in those

00:53:20:07 - 00:53:54:03

in those documents. So where mister Bamba had taken it out of those documents, he'd got the correct figure. Was for Greenhill and Lime Down, where it'd been phrased slightly differently. The there was the distinction. But for the avoidance of any doubt, we will get that double checked and confirm the position exactly. Well, think I what would be better is rather than just keep going over the point today and coming back after a break and telling me a little bit more information is that you submit another document or as part of your oral submissions, we receive more information on these numbers.

00:53:55:04 - 00:54:28:09

Because if I were to open up West Burton now on my screen from the NCIP examination library and bring up what it says in design principles and parameters, would tell it me works number one was three hundred seven hundred and thirty four? How would I know that's a reduced area in the way that you're suggesting? Because your design principles and parameters tells me it's seven hundred and forty eight hectares for works number one, but we're sitting in the room and saying the planting areas is three eighty five. So how do I know West Burton's planting area is seven thirty four or if it's the whole works area?

00:54:28:12 - 00:54:32:24

Yeah, James Bell, for the applicant, it to is do with the wording in each of these documents.

00:54:32:26 - 00:54:47:19

And that's what I'm looking for clarity on, and it's probably better that comes in a written form because we can just keep going round the semantics of what's in a document, of which none are of able to see here today. Mr Bamba, I'll come back to you, please.

00:54:48:25 - 00:55:26:27

Thank you. Bruce Bamba, first top line down. The point on the 3P layout, which is something that we haven't seen any indicative kind of drawings or illustrations of. Mr. Paul mentioned that you gain an extra row if you're using a 2P compared to a 3P because you're putting three panels together and then reducing the tilt and then presumably the gaps between them would be similar or maybe slightly reduced because they're not shading each other because they're not on such a tilt.

00:55:27:04 - 00:56:00:23

It seems to me that if a calculation was undertaken using a 3P layout, then you'd have a greater density of panels within a given area compared to a 2P if actually you're putting more together and reducing the tilt? Does that help sort of point I mean, this is not something I've looked at because I haven't seen

the illustrations, but it seems to me that what's being said would imply higher a number of panels or a higher density of panels or coverage compared to a two P layout.

00:56:00:25 - 00:56:04:20

Well, I think mister Trample was saying that which is why the number of panels has increased.

00:56:05:24 - 00:56:08:28

I see. I'd explain the points.

00:56:09:00 - 00:56:13:29

Is that correct, Mr. Thraful? Might as well just back and forth on this to get this right.

00:56:14:02 - 00:56:39:13

Yes, that's correct. And I think also spacing and shading also can be affected by topography. So there isn't a kind of blanket rule. What I will say is the design we've run has factored that in. So we have then reached this maximum case design. And saying we've tried to build the most dense layout we can in order to provide the most infrastructure, the most amount of panels to be able to inform the situation.

00:56:40:02 - 00:57:13:15

I think to be clear, to come to the applicant's aid a little bit here, I don't think the applicant is suggesting they are planting eight hundred and forty two thousand five hundred panels. The purpose behind this exercise is for the transport assessment. There will obviously be implications for a climate assessment, and I'm not going into the climate assessment, but I think you've rerun some of those numbers on a higher number of panels. So I don't want to get in necessarily to the detail of how many panels. The reason I started off with the number was because we have changed significantly.

00:57:13:18 - 00:57:52:21

The panels have gone up. The deliveries haven't gone up, that's the reason for the discussion. But I think to come to your aid, this is the case the worst case scenario if you planted a fixed panel layout. Now a worst case scenario would be three P, not one or 2p, on this site area. Is that correct? The Yes, that's correct. And we've done that exercise for the purpose of getting the maximum parameters transport assessment. And as you identified, in order to be consistent across the suite of documents, we then reran the climate change, numbers using the same figure to make sure that the assessment information was consistent Yeah.

00:57:52:24 - 00:57:58:15

Before the examining authority. Mister Bamba, did you want anything else to add before I come? Ms. Shalibi, I appreciate it. I can see you. Mr.

00:57:58:17 - 00:58:37:16

Just to clarify, Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. On that basis, my calculation that I put into the spreadsheet, which is based on that four point five meters and two point five meters, that is on based the old layout. So my estimation, if it is the total area, then that is underestimating the number that would be generated by a 3P arrangement. But obviously, you need to consider if there are areas within

those solid blue areas that are not covered in panels, and whether that would account for the difference in the estimates that are being put forward.

00:58:38:10 - 00:58:51:21

So you're slightly on the back foot here, because obviously we've received a document from you, a deadline six, AS028, which has rerun your numbers, which has reduced from your previous representation. But obviously, you're presented with a different scenario. So

00:58:54:00 - 00:59:02:26

we will obviously go over your figures very shortly, but the scenario might change at your next submission based upon new information today.

00:59:07:27 - 00:59:42:25

Adet Shalaby, Wilshire Council. Just two quick points. Obviously, as the examining authority has made clear, it is important that the worst case figure is established because that is the basis for the environmental assessment and the Rochdale envelope and the whole approach the appellant has adopted. And I think it's just still not entirely clear the council to whether this entire reduction, increase, sorry, from five hundred thousand to eight hundred thousand is purely because of this three p issue. Because the point mister Lear made earlier was that he was told by the applicant that they had to achieve a certain density, a certain number of panels per hectare.

00:59:43:02 - 01:00:00:04

And he's looked at the original proposal and that didn't achieve that density to get the megawatt output that the applicant suggested, which suggests there was some incorrect approach originally rather than just a change in the technology. And I just want to reinforce that point that he made before.

01:00:00:06 - 01:00:07:22

Yeah. Thank you. I understand that. I think my colleague, Mr. Love, may want to raise a point.

01:00:08:19 - 01:00:44:09

It's more of a point to note than anything else because it has been discussed by my colleague, missus Labour. When when I when I do go into the West Burton solar project and SIP documentation library and I have a look at the concept design parameters and principles document revision d, and this is just a a quick check. I mean, I I come up on with a figure on works numbers number one of five hundred and seven point four four.

01:00:46:23 - 01:00:52:11

I think some clarity around the figures in table two point one does need to be checked.

01:00:53:24 - 01:00:55:19

Thank you, Ms. Love.

01:00:58:21 - 01:00:59:10

Okay.

01:01:01:08 - 01:01:13:17

It'd be good now to come into the applicant's uplift in HTV numbers. Obviously, we've talked around it. We've talked around panels. But the headline

01:01:15:05 - 01:01:38:16

from Rep five thousand one hundred seven was a total HGB trip generation that's thirty four percent higher than the originally estimated and documented in the transport assessment. Now, it'd be helpful if we could display a really helpful table, which was in Mr Bamba's deadline six submission, is zero AS twenty eight, and it was table one of that.

01:01:40:02 - 01:01:53:01

It's on page seventeen of AS zero twenty eight. Now that, when it shows, will the applicant's be revised HGV numbers broken down into component parts, and I think Lister Bamba's used

01:01:55:20 - 01:01:59:20

REP five-one hundred seven to populate that table.

01:02:46:15 - 01:02:50:00

Okay. Yeah. Perfect.

01:02:54:24 - 01:03:13:21

Now I don't know if applicant the or mister Daryl wants to run through any of the figures in that table. I don't intend necessarily to go line by line to ask how you've arrived at each of those but maybe if the applicant could just summarise

01:03:17:14 - 01:03:20:03

some of the headlines from this table, please.

01:03:22:03 - 01:03:24:29

James Dour of the applicant, when you say headlines, what do think?

01:03:25:01 - 01:03:36:16

Well, the things have that really changed. So we've gone from, if I look at waste two thirty to five twenty nine HGVs in your assessment, obviously we've talked about panel numbers. If

01:03:38:06 - 01:03:52:27

we go down to one hundred and thirty two kilovolt substations, we've gone from four ninety six to ten twenty two HGBs, with the four hundred kilobytes substations similarly. So I guess I'm trying to understand why these numbers weren't accounted for before.

01:03:55:00 - 01:04:08:06

Okay, yeah. So on the first one along there, we've discussed owner panels, briefly discussed panels per HGB. We haven't mentioned mounting structures.

01:04:11:02 - 01:04:47:27

Difference here is previously we were getting information directly from the contractor, including estimations. For the mounting instructions we've gone directly to a supplier, which is something you'd

probably normally do at the detailed design stage, which the applicant has an NDA with, and they provided us with the amount of mounting structures that are delivered within each lorry load. So that's what we've adopted. That. Now we have supplied information to Wiltshire because we're under a PPA with them, we can share NDA information, but obviously we can't supply it to stop lying down at the moment.

01:04:52:09 - 01:04:53:03

Not a reason.

01:04:53:05 - 01:04:57:09

ask Mr Darrell why there is an NDA on those numbers?

01:04:59:01 - 01:05:38:13

Will be thrilling for the applicant. Between us, our design team and IGP and manufacturing suppliers, they would they provide us with new information on new products and things like that, and often where you've got major contracts potentially on the line with these things. We have NDAs in place, which mean we are unable to share information. Now what we've done in this situation, we appreciate that Mr Bambas wanted to see evidence. We appreciate that Wilkes Council wanted to see evidence, of certain things. In this situation, we reached out to a supplier, or two suppliers in regards to panels, in regards to, I think Michelle is probably about to ask this question, about how many panels can

01:05:39:29 - 01:06:12:09

fit in a Hi Cube container. And both of these manufacturers advertise the fact that you can fit seven twenty panels per container. We got permission only yesterday to share that specific information about panels per high cube container, provided we have a confidentiality clause with another party. We explained to them, obviously, as part of this examination. I will talk Topline Down about how we can do that to show you these things. These numbers are coming direct from manufacturers, so they're backed up from that. I appreciate the easiest thing to do would just be for evidence to be provided.

01:06:12:18 - 01:06:32:21

There's legal things around that, but as I say, provided to us council because we're able to do so. If they could at least verify the HGB numbers sorry, the high cube container numbers. Other information we're gonna try and get. But as I say, the mounting structure that we were just talking about, we don't have permission to at the moment share that information outside of it. We're trying.

01:06:32:24 - 01:07:19:11

I think where it's obviously, it's not something which you can necessarily do anything about, Ms. Shelby. I will come to you. But what often we hear through NCIP examinations is everything must be evident. So we've got your evidence into the examination and often third parties, interested parties are on the back foot because they're having to gather their evidence. But if everything is wrapped up with a non disclosure agreement, then how can those other parties gather their own evidence to submit to us to challenge your evidence? And it's obviously not something that I'm saying that you're deliberately, you know, withholding, but you see difficulty the here for examinations where one party has all of the IP, the intellectual property, and other parties are scrambling to dig around for evidence to challenge.

01:07:19:23 - 01:07:23:18

Anyway, that's just something I wanted to raise generally, but Ms.

01:07:23:20 - 01:07:52:11

Shalaby, thanks. Shalaby, Wilshire Council. So just to be clear, because I think mister Darrell said that the mounting structure information had been shared with Wilshire Council, and mister Threlford confirmed it it hasn't, as far as I'm aware, as far as mister Lear is aware. Some information was received yesterday about containers rather than mounting structures, but that was just yesterday. And I don't think mister Lear has had a had a chance to review that or critique that in any detail, but I just don't want things to be said if it's shared with Wiltshire that that haven't been. Okay.

01:07:53:27 - 01:08:05:12

We'll throw for the applicant. Sorry, the information about the numbers has been shared with Wiltshire. The specific evidence and manufacture about mountain structures hasn't been shared because of the NDA issue. I do take your point around the restriction.

01:08:05:14 - 01:08:13:02

Sorry, Mr. Darrell, apologise for cutting you off mid flow but felt it was important to press that point, but I'm going to come back to you now.

01:08:13:28 - 01:08:19:19

Okay, thank you James Darrell for the applicant. So yeah, we have provided that information to Wiltshire but not stop line down.

01:08:22:28 - 01:08:42:16

Concrete footings, again this is information that we got from the manufacturer and we've supplied that, so we've explained the weightings of the front and rear footings for the mounting structures and now that's included in our analysis. Our previous run looked at

01:08:44:04 - 01:08:57:20

a smaller footing but the manufacturer has stated that it's a heavier and a bigger footing made of concrete so we've included that in our calculations which is fair to do. Waste packaging has gone up because there's more panels.

01:09:01:03 - 01:09:28:23

General access tracks and BESS and one hundred thirty two substation, the numbers are pretty similar to what we had before but obviously they've changed in terms of the amount of detail we're providing for each of these things. For example the one hundred thirty two kV access tracks, we're using the UKPN guidance for access track depth and width and things like that in construction.

01:09:31:05 - 01:10:02:04

Compound surfacing and compound other trips. So compound surfacing we've essentially increased the size of our compound to match stop line downscout. What I was trying to do was get to an agreement for everybody here so we can sort of move on and to get the other important issues. So

where I can, I've adopted assumptions that Stop Line Down have adopted. So that's the reason for some of these changes.

01:10:02:06 - 01:10:25:10

Spoil, we assumed ten percent previously. Slot went down and assumed five percent and now they're assuming twenty five percent. So obviously there's moving targets on both sides, I agree with that. But we're sticking with ten percent because the plan is to keep the spoil on-site next to so the spoil from access tracks would be spread across to the side of access tracks, for example.

01:10:25:12 - 01:10:32:16

Can we stick on spoil a second though? The original assessment was two thousand one hundred and ninety six, now seven hundred it's and twenty one.

01:10:36:09 - 01:10:39:29

Yeah. I I don't recognize that. Hold on.

01:10:44:21 - 01:10:51:10

I mean, that may be an error in this table because I just want to clarify. Mister Bamba, maybe can help.

01:10:51:12 - 01:11:08:26

Quick Bamba's top line down. The two thousand one hundred and ninety six because it's a combination the spoil removal and general were lumped together previously, so that seven twenty one is not directly comparable. That's just part of that element.

01:11:08:28 - 01:11:11:25

Okay, thank you. Apologies, Mr Dow.

01:11:13:08 - 01:11:54:22

Yes, so the plan is to and this is the plan on other sites as well that are actually being built out now to keep the spoil on-site but we've allowed ten percent taken off-site just in case that some of that material needs to be taken off-site and as I said before you up dig the access tracks, put the soil next to the access tracks, spread it out for the Bess and the other sort of compound areas. So you've got obviously a bund which some of the soil will be stored in and then there'll obviously be stockpiles of soil which is set out in the soil management plan that's submitted with the documents and so that explains what happens with the spoil there.

01:11:56:10 - 01:12:34:23

And then for the thirty three kv units we underestimated the number of trips there, so what we had previously was we took our plan which had areas showing where the units would be. In the text it said there would be up to two in each area, but in our an error that I made I assumed one per area. But obviously the text says it's up to two so we've changed that, it's up to two and we've included those trips. Then I watch says naught for that. And then conversion units and foundations we've added further detail to provide trips to deliver foundations for those areas.

01:12:37:08 - 01:12:39:15

One hundred thirty two substations

01:12:41:29 - 01:12:43:20

I'll just go to my spreadsheet.

01:12:49:13 - 01:13:09:07

The one hundred thirty two substations we've added, so previously we did have some information in there for just aggregate but now we've added in concrete as well. So we've got aggregate at depth of zero point three and concrete at a depth of zero point five. And then we've also got other trips associated with the substation as well.

01:13:09:22 - 01:13:14:23

But why is that figure so vastly different from what was originally assumed?

01:13:14:28 - 01:13:20:26

Because it didn't have the concrete. Concrete is obviously heavy and generates more trips.

01:13:20:28 - 01:13:23:27

Yeah, but why had nobody assumed concrete?

01:13:25:01 - 01:13:28:19

Because we didn't have any detailed design.

01:13:29:03 - 01:14:00:08

No, I appreciate that. The point I want to come back to is that is the table we've been looking at about comparing your other schemes, IGPs, schemes, and we're told those figures in those other schemes are reliable because they included waste, etcetera, and all sorts of other things. But those schemes similarly wouldn't have had detailed designs. So we're being asked to rely on those figures to give the sense a sense check on these figures, but these figures are completely different from where you started, which had no detailed design.

01:14:00:10 - 01:14:04:18

So I I just can't see that I'm ever comparing apples with apples here.

01:14:18:09 - 01:14:51:02

Yeah so with all the other schemes and when we started working on this one, included lots of buffers to account the fact that we weren't at the detailed design stage. That includes the fifty percent but also the AADT assumption which is the construction trips have happened every single day for the construction period. As we've gone through this exercise and I do actually thank Slotline Down and Wiltshire for getting more detail into this because I think it's been very helpful and very useful. What we've done is we've gone in more detail.

01:14:51:04 - 01:15:03:16

We've got much more information from suppliers, sources to speak to suppliers and manufacturers, so therefore the buffers that we included previously are not as relevant now because we've got much more detailed information.

01:15:03:19 - 01:15:05:04

Okay, all right.

01:15:13:17 - 01:15:24:09

So can I now we've got these revised numbers, which are I will come over to you stop lying down? Quite different from where we started. I

01:15:26:13 - 01:15:55:29

just am still a little confused why the relevant tables in the transport assessment, the ES chapter and the construction traffic management plan have not been updated. They still contain the original of numbers panels, the original numbers of deliveries, a fifty percent buffer. None of that has changed since REP five thousand one hundred seven has landed on our desks, and I would like to understand why that has not been revisited.

01:15:56:08 - 01:16:29:05

Yeah, so James Darrell for the applicant. So we received the late submission document last week, didn't we, which has got the comments. So we had a meeting beginning of August about our revised trip generation with Stopline down. And then we got a response sort of beginning of September, so notes from that. We also had a meeting with David Lear at Wiltshire Council about the trip generation assumptions midway through August. Then we got his notes as well, sort of I think it was the ninth of September.

01:16:30:04 - 01:17:02:15

And then we got the late submission as well. I was hoping to do before this hearing was to agree the numbers update and all the reports because I don't think well I wouldn't think it was helpful to put in numbers that then still weren't agreed and I thought we were just we were getting there because actually if look you at the list we're pretty much agreed on most things and Wiltshire agree on more things than Stop Line Down did. So I was hoping we could get those numbers agreed and then I was going to update the reports and I can do that for deadline seven.

01:17:02:17 - 01:17:03:02

All right.

01:17:03:14 - 01:17:06:03

Thank you. Lying down, please.

01:17:07:25 - 01:17:38:03

Thank you, madam Danica. Stop lying down. I don't know if mister Bammer wants to come in on anything, so I'll I'll let him come after. I just wanted to get just because this table is up, just so I understand, because I may have been slow at understanding this point. Just on the solar panels, the two figures that are there, is the applicant's position that the reason for that change is solely this point about the three p, or is it because the design under all this has changed to a different design as well?

01:17:41:17 - 01:18:12:23

Claire Bolshak, the applicant. No. So the the original number was based on an an indicative design, and then for purposes the of this exercise, we've tried we've rerun the design to see what is the absolute maximum number of panels you could fit in if you used the three p design and squished as much in for lack of a more technical term. We're trying to think what was the maximum number of panels you can you could possibly get in in that site. So that was the exercise that was done using the design tool.

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

So that that was it was a a the three p solution contributes quite a contribution to that, but also we were trying it was just how many can you possibly fit in. I want to come back on that, mister Kazako. It's my understanding. So the indicative design was never run then on a worst case? It was an Taking account taking account the three p, which you said is new technology, so, obviously, obviously, that will have some uplift in in the numbers, or I don't know what the percentage would be.

01:18:45:07 - 01:18:48:03

But in essence,

01:18:51:02 - 01:18:56:21

we were always going underestimating numbers on indicative design. Is the message I'm getting?

01:19:10:12 - 01:19:47:05

Claire Bojek We for the applicant. So my understanding is that original figure was based on an indicative design. However, over based on an assumed what we assumed the taking into account panel technology changes would be the the wattage that might be available when the scheme was constructed. And then we've rerun the exercise looking at what's currently available on the market, which is three p design, slightly larger panels, but also within the parameters that have been assessed in terms of what's the maximum out there at the moment, whereas of the original assessment was was an indicative design at at that point in time.

01:19:47:10 - 01:19:50:02

Alright. Miss mister Kozalko.

01:19:50:17 - 01:20:02:03

Thank you, madam. Danny Kozalko, stop line down. You asked the question I was going to ask, which was, I mean, my understanding of the normal approach to Rochdale envelope is that you assess the the maximum reasonable maximum,

01:20:03:20 - 01:20:10:02

which I think is part of the reason that mister Bamba spent so long on some of these points. But, anyway, do you have any

01:20:14:23 - 01:20:44:29

Bruce Bamba. Stop line down. Just couple of points on this table. Just returning well, general point. I think listening to the applicant, the position is that they are happy to share with us the information in terms of numbers that suppliers have provided to them, but they're not in a position to provide the specification that has been, for example, used to arrive at those numbers. Is that correct?

01:20:48:05 - 01:20:49:25

I would like you to answer

01:20:49:27 - 01:20:50:12

that. Mr

01:20:50:17 - 01:21:22:00

Threlfall, for the applicant. The information that, as I understand it, I've been working on basis, what evidence can we provide you? We're saying to you that a supplier has given us this information. I'd like to be able to show you that information has come from a supplier. That's the hard and fast way to give you what's available. For example, the HiQube container information, it includes the data sheet of a panel that may not be the panel that we use, but it's the one that's available now that's informed this design.

01:21:22:29 - 01:21:36:11

But it also contains the specifications about how it can be delivered and things like that. So there's quite a lot that's in there. I would like a mechanism to share that with you so that you can say, I've seen it and I'm happy with it. That information is what's sitting there.

01:21:36:13 - 01:21:45:04

Could that information be submitted to the examination as a confidential document in the same way we have badger surveys come in for XA the to be able to see that.

01:21:47:23 - 01:22:15:01

Claire, project Obviously, we would have to be cautious how we would report on that. Appreciate. Yes. I mean, it's something that, obviously, if if you were content to for it to not be published, if we provide it, then we'll If you've got an NDA, then I would obviously, the PINs would the planning inspector would have to abide by by that. But I think it would be helpful to us into the examination. But whatever you could do to get that two stop line down may be helpful. Miss Kozako, you're you seem to be shaking your head.

01:22:15:03 - 01:22:50:00

Thank you for thumbtack, Kozako, stop lying down. No. I'm actually just being a bit confused. My I I it may be that miss Broderick knows the the underlying DCO examinations better than me, which is not intended as a loaded comment, genuinely just meant it as she might know them better than me. My understanding was there's a provision in the regs that is really, really firmly against the examining authority being able to consider confidential information except in very limited circumstances, one of which is where it's protected by the act that protects badgers as an example.

01:22:50:03 - 01:23:05:21

The reason I flag is that because if this is this is an option, we've raised other issues where we have been repeatedly saying we would like this information to be put into the examination, and the applicant has said we can't. We've got agreements with landowners. If we go can down this route, which I'm very happy to explore.

01:23:05:23 - 01:23:46:03

I don't know if we can. I will be exploring it with legal in the background as well. Great. But I was mooting it because if it was something the applicant was prepared to do and our own legal advisers could advise us that it was acceptable to for receive it, then we would receive it. If our own legal advisers tell us that we can't receive it, then, obviously, we will be Yeah. Clever to get it. It's missing that suggestion. Yeah. No. It's my understanding that the circumstance is very limited, and I've only known it been used, as you say, badges or where there's a defense issue or something along those lines. I mean, the other option that we're happy to explore outside of the of the hearing is whether mister Bamba in his professional capacity would be able to commit to confidentiality and and and see it.

01:23:46:05 - 01:23:55:21

He is able to see it, but obviously, doesn't doesn't share it widely with might be preferable. So that that's a potential option as well if mister Bamba would be willing Willing to to to do do so. so.

01:23:58:12 - 01:24:05:14

Mr Bruce Bamba, stop line down. Yes, that would be fine. I'd be very happy to do that if that can be achieved.

01:24:05:26 - 01:24:11:29

Obviously, you'll professionally be bound by not then using that information in other examinations if you were called as a witness Of in course. other

01:24:12:06 - 01:24:28:05

Yes. No, understand that. I mean, the reason I need to see this is if I just, again, use first principles approach and think of a two point seven meter squared panel and apply a typical

01:24:29:21 - 01:25:00:14

weight per meter squared, then multiply that up by seven twenty. I arrive at about thirty tons just for panels. That's excluding any packaging, which you can't put into a container. Otherwise, you're looking at abnormal load. So it seems to me that without this kind of clarification, first principles suggest that you can't get this many panels of this type in a HTV container.

01:25:00:29 - 01:25:24:19

And similarly, Mr. Lear has raised concerns about getting fourteen hundred mounting structures into us onto a single flatbed, I think, or it might be a container. Again, there's this question and there are questions around this and if we can arrive at something where I can see that yes, this can be achieved, then I think that that's very helpful.

01:25:24:21 - 01:25:58:28

Obviously, we're just running on such tight time now with deadline seven being on the second of October that there really is time no to waste in getting this information shared so that we could get to the end of this examination. And even if the numbers are not fully agreed and the impacts are not accepted as being acceptable, at least we have will a final position to be to to go to reporting. So whatever you can do, please, applicant. Care, Roger. Care. But, yes, we're we're working away in the background here to see whether we can share with that mister Bamford.

01:25:59:05 - 01:26:00:23

Yeah. Miss Shalaby, please.

01:26:00:25 - 01:26:32:17

Just very briefly, two two final points on this. So what I I really didn't understand, the applicant's answer to mister Kozelko's question, which echoed the one I made earlier where mister Lear thought there had been changes in the assumptions rather than just change in the technology. The applicant started the whole session by saying the new numbers for the panels were really about getting a reasonable worst case. But as mister Kozelko pointed out, that should have been done in the first place, and it's still not clear whether the sole reason for the change was the introduction of the potential for three p. And we really haven't understood the answer to that.

01:26:32:24 - 01:26:38:19

I just also wonder whether mister Lear wants to add anything about that point about the mounting structures or anything from what you've heard.

01:26:41:01 - 01:27:13:23

Yes. In terms of the, sorry, David Lee, which is council. In terms of the, items on the table, as Mr Darrell said, we we've we've a had meeting about ship generation. I've also spoken to Mr Bamba with the applicant and so effectively in so first thing I would say is that we're pleased that the numbers are now at least in the same ballpark rather than twenty six thousand on one hand and sixty five thousand on the other. We are last figures I saw about eight thousand apart.

01:27:15:01 - 01:27:31:05

In terms of the three key items I just wanted to raise in terms of our concerns going on secondly I did receive information from Mr Threlfall last night but I didn't obviously I've only seen him this morning and came through at Ace Klock about the seven fifty

01:27:33:10 - 01:28:08:15

getting seven twenty panel effectively we've always had the same concern that twelve percent increase in volume of a high cube container suddenly achieves a forty four percent increase in panel capacity so obviously I'll have a look at that and I mean it looks fine. The one thing I did make in my last comments is because what seems to happen is the applicant has now said actually we need another two hundred and fifty thousand pounds another two hundred to three hundred thousand pounds panels over and above their original estimate but the number of lorries stays the same and because we'll use high q containers.

01:28:08:17 - 01:28:41:21

I think the point I made is well in the origin if we were looking at worst case assumptions in the original applicant's TA, they said, actually, we're going to assume standard containers at five hundred. But now and and I said, So when and although high cube containers were high cube containers were mentioned, they weren't assumed because otherwise, why wouldn't have I assumed that in the first place? So if I assumed a worst case, but now they've got the higher number of panels, it seems it's that expedient or basically convenient.

01:28:41:23 - 01:28:49:24

So actually, we'll be using IQ and the number doesn't change. So I think I said, well, I'm not suggesting that the applicant assumes to go back to the original assumption

01:28:53:03 - 01:29:18:07

everything's a standard container, but the reality of two years deliveries, will you always get high few containers? Maybe you should go for an assumption of a mix of containers. So, you know, fifty percent of the loads will be made by Hi Cube and fifty percent will it may not change numbers substantially, but it will at least there'll be an element of risk that's removed. In terms of mounting structures, we didn't really get on to that, but

01:29:20:02 - 01:29:48:29

the applicant's latest figures say that they can achieve I think it was something on using four six forty watt panels they can effectively get zero point nine to one point one megawatts of supply effectively generating capacity on one flatbed Arctic. So if you work those numbers, so one of comments I had originally as well, you've now got this massive increase in panels, but your lorries have only your mounting structural lorries have only gone up by, it's not very much, forty five.

01:29:51:09 - 01:29:51:28

And

01:29:54:05 - 01:30:16:11

so I said, why hasn't it gone up more? The ratio that Mr Bamb has always discussed that typically it's been the ratio of sort of the number of HGV deliveries for mounting structures compared to panels is typically zero point seven three. I think the original applicant's number was zero point four five, so that was challenged. It's gone up to

01:30:17:29 - 01:30:50:23

fifty one now, zero point five one, so it's crept up as you would expect because you've got so many more, but it's still some way lower. But when I worked the numbers back into terms of what that meant in terms of a load to Lori, so whether you look at the generating capacity, you say, well, this is the maximum. I think it's nine hundred thousand or zero point nine megawatts is nine hundred thousand watts. If you divide it by the panel size, you get fourteen hundred mounting structures on a single lorry. And if you work that into then, if you then divide that number into the number of panels, you get the five ninety nine lorries.

01:30:51:00 - 01:30:59:10

So the underlying assumption there is that one flatbed articulated lorry can carry fourteen hundred mounting structures

01:31:01:01 - 01:31:38:29

packaging. I don't know if that includes the pile structure that goes with it because, obviously, I don't know how they're about three meters high. You've got presumably, they're driven piles, so there's another additional length, and then there's probably a pile cap with that as well. So and and even if that was possible, what is the total weight of that? Which, obviously, you know, you can't exceed the

laden weight of an HGV. So that's a question. So which, if it's too many, will push it further up to possibly up to where the zero point seven three or something higher.

01:31:39:16 - 01:31:59:25

And the only other main point have we on those numbers there, and it's come up again, so we so the spoil number, spoil volume now has been agreed by between mister Daryl and mister Bambra, we've obviously shared that conversation. It's about ninety four thousand cubic meters of excavated waste.

01:32:01:20 - 01:32:34:07

Now the applicant maintains that none of that's going to leave site. And now the assumption is actually we'll put ten percent in as a worst case, but ten percent is generating seven hundred HCV movements. So I suppose our concern was, well, if that was twenty percent, thirty percent, and I know mister Bamba's used twenty five percent, it, you know, it's gonna it will result in should they not be able to utilize all that waste on-site or or store it in any way.

01:32:34:21 - 01:33:14:01

And that also includes the compounds as well. So the compound material when they're disused, one of the differences in the numbers I know one of the difference between the two parties is that when the compounds are effectively demobilized, all that aggregate material is basically not just taken off-site. It's just stored and reused. So it seems that there's this sort of general assumption that all the excavated waste, all the stuff they don't need anymore never leaves site, it all stays within the stays within the boundaries. And I suppose the council's concern is, well, if that if the you know, say to the excavated swarm was fifty percent, that's another three thousand HGVs, which we don't know about.

01:33:14:03 - 01:33:47:03

So is ten percent is ten percent a reasonable worst case? And I know that's the difference between the two figures as we see. But as I said, the figures at the moment much are closer than they ever were because we're looking at a a if we look at it as a range, the applicant's adjusting thirty six thousand, stop line down is adjusting forty four thousand. If I was to be devil's advocate, I might suggest, well, probably in the reality, it's gonna be somewhere in the middle. But but at least we're not talking about a range which was originally twenty six thousand v sixty five thousand.

01:33:47:05 - 01:33:48:23

So that's very welcome.

01:33:50:06 - 01:34:00:07

Thank you, mister Lear. I don't know if the applicant wants to comment on any of that. It's not expecting you to comment, but their point's well made.

01:34:06:02 - 01:34:07:10

The difference

01:34:09:27 - 01:34:46:17

in terms of the panels, the five hundred and the eight forty two, it's because one's two panel, one's a three panel, the mounting structure itself doesn't actually increase the three panel. The mounting structures, information that we've got directly from the manufacturer tells them how they pack the

mounting structures and so that's what we've used. I don't think there's much variation in that. Use of high cube containers for panels, that's what's being used on other sites as well and it looks like that is what is used for the for solar panel deliveries to these large sites.

01:34:46:29 - 01:35:25:02

So I think with the information that we're going to provide you from the NDA information, and hopefully we can get some in group with Bruce, then that will sort out the mounting structure issue and the panel structure issue that I think is not agreed at the moment. In terms of spoil, we're assuming ten percent is going off-site, we are assuming some of it goes off-site. And as I say, our plan is to keep the spoil on-site as much as possible, that's why we've assumed the ten percent. There's lots of what if scenarios if one hundred percent goes off, but the plan is to keep it all on-site and we've allowed for ten percent of that spoil having to be taken off-site if it's required.

01:35:26:01 - 01:36:00:29

And Clare Produce for the applicant, just to, I guess, make the point in terms of the what ifs. Obviously these are the parameters that we are utilising for the purposes of assessment for this process. The final construction traffic management plan will need to set out the actual numbers as they are known once the detailed design has been fixed and the suppliers have been selected and the contractors have been selected. The figures that the council will receive for approval in that final plan will be based on the actual scheme that's going to be built out.

01:36:01:01 - 01:36:20:21

As I've said before, when applicant submits that plan for approval, it will need to confirm whether that whether there are any material differences from the environment what was assessed in the environmental statement. So if, for example, it transpires that there is, the percentage of, spoil removal was,

01:36:22:19 - 01:37:02:28

happened to be greater than the applicant would need to explain that at the point of, discharge and explain how it's going to achieve it so that there's no materially new or different effect. So I think that this isn't the numbers will be revisited at the detailed design stage and the council will need to sign off those on final numbers, and we will need to demonstrate that it all fits within the parameters that were originally assessed. What Mr Dowell has been trying to do is achieve a level of compromise to try and get an agreed to rerun to rerun the assessment for the purposes of the DCO application, but the council will have final sign off on the on the final numbers.

01:37:03:00 - 01:37:34:08

So in the event that they are greater or less for whatever reason, then that that would be with at dealt the discharge. I think the council's concern, and I'm speaking for them, is probably they don't want the can kicked down the road, got a consent order granted based upon certain environmental parameters, and then they're having to contend a discharge of a requirement stage in having another battle. Obviously, they would like to be assured and comforted by the numbers that are here are not going to substantially increase at detailed design stage.

01:37:34:10 - 01:38:04:18

There is no way of knowing that. That's why you have a Rochdale envelope, of course. But as much comfort as they can gain from the assumptions made around mountain structures and spoil removal, as much as that we can wrap up, that gives will give the council more confidence then at a subsequent discharge requirement stage. But before I move off, I want to just come on to the construction traffic management plan, and we've got a whole segment on it later, but there's an important point here about, particularly around the module numbers.

01:38:06:11 - 01:38:40:26

Just going to get it up on my screen. So construction traffic management plan, I think that my I'm looking at the tract, it's rep six zero four two, and it's section six point one seven. It states should the number of modules in the final scheme layout exceed six hundred thousand modules. Hi Cube containers with a capacity of at least seven twenty modules per HGV should be used where required and to allow the number of solar deliveries not to exceed twelve hundred HGVs.

01:38:41:15 - 01:39:14:10

Now, I'm somewhat uncomfortable with the words should be and where required in that statement in section six point one seven, because should be to me isn't a commitment. If it's a commitment, should be must be, because otherwise it's just a recommendation, and where required, similarly suggest optionality. So if we were working on a worst case assumption, it would be eight hundred and forty forty two thousand five hundred modules in regular containers. And I think that was the point mister Leo was was trying to make moments ago.

01:39:14:12 - 01:39:27:24

So I think there's going to be some more explicit control required in that section of the construction traffic management plan so that we've not got this optionality or this suggestion.

01:39:30:15 - 01:39:34:17

So I'm going to issue an action for to be that revisited.

01:39:44:01 - 01:40:09:21

Miss Project, if you don't have anything to come back to me on about that, I just want to come to Mr. Bamba to ask whether he wanted to run through anything in his HGV numbers from his AS028 or whether we've you've covered what you wanted to talk about your position on your numbers when we talked about the applicant's position.

01:40:10:25 - 01:40:41:20

Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. Thank you, ma'am. Yes, a couple of points. Just before I bring up one or two of the points relevant to my calculations, I just want to point out that the applicant's calculations, as far as I can see, have excluded the HEVs associated with the BEST units and the BEST power conversion units, which is together three fifteen HEVs.

01:40:42:00 - 01:40:59:14

They are in the spreadsheet as it's set out, but they haven't been included in the total. So my belief is that the total increase compared to the original is not thirty four percent but thirty seven percent but I'll leave that for mister Daryl to just check.

01:41:02:15 - 01:41:07:29

Would it be helpful miss if we had your numbers on the screen?

01:41:11:00 - 01:41:19:12

Is there anything? I mean, I I suppose that's specifically for for for your HGB numbers, your deadline for. You

01:41:21:27 - 01:41:45:24

there's a reduction notable in the number of movements for the four hundred kilovolt substation and the best in your numbers. Would it be helpful if we Yes. Okay, so if we could go to AS028, that one you just had on the screen, and it will be table three of that, which would be page twenty nine, if the applicant's team could share that.

01:42:07:06 - 01:42:11:23

Right. Yes. Is that a helpful table, mister Bamblar?

01:42:11:25 - 01:42:17:23

Yes. That is helpful. Let me just position myself so I can see that clearly. So

01:42:19:27 - 01:42:43:05

the the key differences, they relate to the spoil, which we've talked about. The total number of HGVs is highly sensitive to the amount of spoil. So I don't believe applicant has adopted a reasonable worst case. So what I have done is assume twenty five percent,

01:42:45:22 - 01:43:17:13

which seems like, whether that is you can judge for yourself, whether that is a worst case or just a reasonable case. But whether whatever position you adopt, I think the fact of the matter is that this is a key element in the HGV trip generation and needs to be thought about carefully. There is also the matter of the compounds and their removal.

01:43:17:21 - 01:43:46:07

Again, the applicant has assumed that all the material used to surface the ten compounds remained on-site. Again, I believe that is a best case. And some of that material is likely to be removed because it will not be suitable for reuse elsewhere or there may not be anywhere where could be it reused.

01:43:48:07 - 01:43:49:25

You mentioned the

01:43:55:04 - 01:43:57:25

did you mention the substation Yeah. The change?

01:43:58:28 - 01:44:05:10

In terms of the BES units, I think from your original numbers, they changed.

01:44:07:24 - 01:44:09:29

Shame I haven't got it in front of me.

01:44:11:17 - 01:44:14:20

But the four hundred kilowatt substation as well.

01:44:16:13 - 01:44:17:02

Yes, the

01:44:19:04 - 01:44:42:10

during the discussions and our meeting, the applicant provided additional information about the expectation as to the surfacing of the substation. And I considered that reasonable. So we have agreed on that in terms of the depth of construction and the amount of aggregate and concrete to be used.

01:44:42:20 - 01:44:43:16

Okay. Thank you.

01:44:43:18 - 01:44:48:22

So that that is agreed now. There's a change in the best units.

01:44:51:11 - 01:45:01:25

It's a change from best units. I think well, the change there is that they are going to be abnormal loads now rather than standard conventional loads.

01:45:10:09 - 01:45:28:03

There is disagreement on the concrete footings. I believe what the applicant has assumed is based on an assumption about, concrete blocks weighting down the front and back supports for each of the

01:45:29:28 - 01:45:57:29

panel arrays. they What are now assuming are concrete blocks, concrete beams really, that straddle the kind of width of the row. And if you take the dimensions of those and apply it to the areas that we're looking at, we end up with, a much higher number of HGVs. So I calculated

01:46:00:04 - 01:46:14:12

two seventy five HGVs rather than the one hundred and four HGVs that the applicant has suggested. I've also put in an allowance in general for

01:46:16:08 - 01:46:46:27

the the import and export of equipment, cranes, machinery, excavators. This is something that in other schemes has been assumed to generate quite high numbers. I'm conscious that the applicant has made allowance in some of the elements of the scheme for which they hadn't previously. Additional allowance for the equipment and structure and components of the substations, for example.

01:46:48:08 - 01:47:19:19

But that is quite a modest allowance. And I think the element of that that would cover the general requirement for machinery and machinery is very low. So I think it is reasonable to put in an additional allowance bearing in mind the size of this scheme and the length of the duration of the

works to put something in that has not been allowed for thus far. I've adopted eight hundred HGVs. That is half of what was adopted for a similar size scheme.

01:47:21:09 - 01:47:35:05

On the basis that there is some allowance in the other elements, I didn't feel it was as to correct put the straight number in. I think that covers the key differences between us.

01:47:38:04 - 01:48:18:01

I am I am slightly concerned with the applicant's approach to this HCV trip generation, which is that well, if it turns out to be higher, then we can deal with that down the line because we know and we'll talk about it later today how sensitive the network is. So there is a genuine risk that we find a situation where the level of HGV generation is significantly higher and the knock on effects in terms of the impacts in terms of highway safety and environmental impacts is not something that can be properly mitigated.

01:48:18:03 - 01:48:26:08

Yeah. Thank you, mister Bamba. Thank you. We don't have any questions on that. Does the applicant have any comments to make?

01:48:27:18 - 01:48:36:29

James Darrow from the applicant. Yes, the BES and PCS units is in the spreadsheet but it's not in the total so I need to add that in, so that's correct.

01:48:40:01 - 01:48:51:12

The spoil as I said, stock went down first, stated the spoil element as five percent and now it's twenty five percent. We've said ten percent and that's just our proposal.

01:48:54:05 - 01:49:09:08

The compounds, reusing the aggregate in the compound obviously that is a common thing on a construction site and aggregate is sieved with buckets on diggers and things like that so it could be reused.

01:49:10:17 - 01:49:14:21

When you say it could be reused what could it be reused in?

01:49:15:01 - 01:49:17:15

The aggregate. Access tracks.

01:49:17:17 - 01:49:18:19

Just the access tracks.

01:49:18:21 - 01:49:23:04

Access tracks, nothing else that requires aggregate but mainly the access tracks in this case, yeah.

01:49:26:03 - 01:49:29:21

Otherwise you're paying for aggregate when you don't need to.

01:49:29:23 - 01:49:30:08

In

01:49:32:20 - 01:49:36:23

terms of concrete footings, again that just directly came from

01:49:38:25 - 01:49:59:25

the manufacturer but I think what's happened is the area that we've said that requires archaeological protection, some of that area, quite a bit of that area, doesn't have panels in it so obviously there's no concrete footings required for areas where there's no panels so that's why there's a difference between what Bruce is saying and what we're saying. In terms of equipment deliveries etc,

01:50:03:20 - 01:50:11:23

We've always had a little allowance in for equipment and machinery and that has increased over time but we think that our allowance is suitable.

01:50:13:08 - 01:50:47:04

Stockline Downs allowance in terms of the other trips and equipment trips was twelve twenty seven at deadline one and then seventeen fifty at deadline two and now it's two thousand eight hundred and two. We're assuming seventeen oh two which includes all the equipment and delivery. So we're not intending to increase that number we think that that number is reasonable. Mean for the compounds for example we've assumed two HGVs a week and that's for every compound whereas obviously we know that servicing of compounds, HGVs, will be moving properly from one compound to the other.

01:50:48:24 - 01:51:02:21

Over a two year construction period that's quite a lot of HGVs, two a week, so we think that that accounts for some of those trips for manufacturing sorry for equipment machinery. We've also assumed that for the

01:51:04:18 - 01:51:40:23

concrete areas for the one hundred thirty two substations we've assumed, which we've adopted Bruce's assumption, that fifty percent of the area is concrete. But the plans, so if you look at Rep five thousand sixty five appendix thirty three second condition one-one, the plans actually show about seven point two percent. As I said previously concrete deliveries generate a lot of HGV trips, so quite that's a big overestimation. Also for the four hundred kV substation we've similarly overestimated it at forty nine percent but it's more like five percent if you see APP083 figure thirty three which shows that.

01:51:41:00 - 01:51:45:02

Okay. Just want to come back briefly just on access tracks.

01:51:46:20 - 01:51:55:26

You're absolutely right. Why would you want to import more aggregate than you needed for the access tracks? But are the access tracks not needed during construction?

01:51:56:17 - 01:52:19:13

Yeah, but because of the phasing, obviously some are needed earlier than others. So if you can reuse the aggregate, then you do. And also you can top up the access tracks as well with the existing area. The point is that isn't going to be moved off-site in case you need it, and it's probably going to be used for the access tracks. That's certainly what's being carried out, what's going to be done on Westburn, for example.

01:52:20:05 - 01:52:31:15

Okay, I won't press the point. Does anybody have any more comments to make before we close item out two on HGV movement numbers, mister Bamba?

01:52:32:16 - 01:53:11:17

Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. Just on that point, and you probably understand this point. If if we look at, say, Area C, for example, and the compound within Area C, that compound is going to be put in at the beginning of Area C, and then the access tracks will need to be put in as well, and the compound will have to be open while those access tracks are being used. So if that aggregate is going to be used somewhere else, for example, in one of the parts that's going to be brought forward later, then it would have to be transported from area c into the other area.

01:53:11:19 - 01:53:22:08

I think in practical terms, I'm not I'm not sure it works into this this idea that, well, is going to be an opportunity to use all that aggregate on-site.

01:53:22:10 - 01:53:40:18

Mister Bamba, that point is not lost on me, but I didn't want to raise a point on that any further. But thank you. Much appreciated. I'm going to call an end to that item, now. We'll come back onto item three after we've had a comfort break. Could we please come back at eleven forty?