



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Light Valley Solar
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 4
Date:	30 July 2026

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

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

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

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:28 - 00:00:16:28

Okay. Thank you everybody. Time is now 1525. And I'd like to welcome you back to this issue specific hearing for the Light Valley Solar project.

00:00:18:23 - 00:00:25:03

We'd like to take a seat now, please just confirm that everyone in the room and online can hear me. Okay.

00:00:26:22 - 00:00:31:18

And the live recording and streaming is has commenced. Thank you.

00:00:33:17 - 00:00:49:21

So now move on to item 4.6, which is the water environment. And just again, I just wanted to check briefly with the applicant that your representatives are at the table. And I will also be coming to the local authority and the Environment Agency for some questions as well on this item.

00:00:56:17 - 00:01:13:08

But first let's look at the flood risk mapping and data. So could the Environment Agency and North Yorkshire Council confirm the applicant's assertion? At the present day and future, flood zone three mapping or data is unavailable for the study area. If I could just go to the Environment Agency first, please.

00:01:17:02 - 00:01:25:21

Jane Field, Environment Agency, I will pass you over to my colleague Sean Holland and Phil Sayle, who are our flood risk and modelling specialists.

00:01:27:12 - 00:01:36:09

Um good afternoon. Sean Holland, photo specialist at Environment Agency. Um, can I just clarify, is that are you talking about flood zone three or flood zone three B specifically?

00:01:37:06 - 00:01:46:27

I'm off to understand whether the present day and future flood zone three B mapping and data is available or not.

00:01:47:09 - 00:02:26:07

So when we look at three B this is designated by the local authority. So this will take into consideration um local models. Commonly this uses the 1 in 30 outline with current policy guidelines. However, depending on when the um Sfera. So the strategic flood risk assessment was written. This can also use the 1 in 20 outline for modeling. And this also takes into consideration flood alleviation schemes that protect areas up into the 1 in 1000 event. However, this is designated by the local authority. Um, and if that modeling is not appropriate, then they will use our flood zones as, um, proxy, um, proxies for these situations.

00:02:26:12 - 00:02:45:19

Um, currently, the applicant has undertaken their own site specific modelling, which has then undertaken a scenario of the 1 in 30 extent to understand what present and future um, 33 B may look like. Um, however, we would defer to the LFA to provide the specific outlines for the flood zone. Three B.

00:02:47:03 - 00:02:57:01

Thank you. So just to clarify, the Environment Agency doesn't hold in its modelling the flood zone three B so the 1 in 30 year for this particular catchment.

00:02:57:08 - 00:03:17:12

So we would not hold the flood zone three B as that is an outline determined by the LRF. However they may use our modelling. I'm just going to pass over to my colleague Philip Sale to clarify which outputs were used in the current Environment Agency models for both the river air and the river views.

00:03:20:22 - 00:03:51:26

Good afternoon sir. Philip Sale for the Environment Agency. Um, so yeah, chance is correct in that we don't differentiate between flood zone three A and flood zone three B, and that's for the local planning authority to decide. But in modeling terms actually as fashion mentions, the 1 in 30 year modelled extent is usually used to define the function of the plain extent or flood storage areas. Um, so, as Sian describes the applicants undertaking their own detailed hydraulic modelling for the river.

00:03:52:19 - 00:04:26:06

The river relatives and also some of the ordinary watercourses, in particular cross site one and site to um, and none of the built. Development from that modelling falls within the 130 year extent. The only aspect of the development which falls within, uh, the one in 30th floodplain is the cable crossing associated with the river uz. Um, in terms of future flood risk. So the applicant has applied climate change to their modelled outputs in terms of this.

00:04:26:08 - 00:04:53:02

So they've applied the higher central and upper climate change allowances to assess future for the risk. But yeah, we don't have a product which can be downloaded which shows the extent function of the plan, because that's for the local planning authority to define in that strategic flood risk assessment for some areas that's available and defined, but for this area that isn't readily available. But as I say, the applicant has undertaken their own site specific modelling to quantify the risk to the development.

00:04:55:08 - 00:05:03:08

Thank you. And if North Yorkshire Council, are they able to comment on this? I'm not quite sure who's still attending the hearing.

00:05:09:18 - 00:05:40:15

No. Okay. I shall turn to the applicant then on this point. So obviously we the examining authority has asked for representation of the zone three B um, in relation to the proposed development and hasn't been furnished with that being depicted. But yet the Environment Agency are suggesting that you

have produced a model which identifies the 1 in 30 year. Is it just a case that you simply need to provide us with some plans that show this?

00:05:47:01 - 00:05:50:06

You'll just need to turn your microphone on. Thank you. Thank you. Will MacBain.

00:05:50:08 - 00:06:25:12

From. On behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. So, um, as part of the. Application process, um, Artium has modeled the 1 in 30 year floodplain. But as Phil and Sian was pointing out, um, that can be that is a sort of probabilistic definition of that floodplain, but the local authority has to decide whether to just use that probabilistic extent to the floodplain or designate in other ways, because it may be that there are other areas that are important for flood risk management, where water has to flow or be timed to be stored in time of flood.

00:06:25:14 - 00:06:59:16

But they might want to designate. But generally local authorities are using that 1 in 30 year outline, which we have provided as part of the application. Um, North Yorkshire's strategic flood risk assessment is shortly to be updated. I think it was last done before the new definition of functional floodplain was furnished a couple of years ago, I think. So, yes, we can provide the information, but it is the North Yorkshire County Council's role as leader local authority to say that if they choose to use that to designate the floodplain, and that may well be done when they do the SRA shortly.

00:07:00:28 - 00:07:08:22

So at the current time, um, have you provided any plans that identify with zone three? B?

00:07:09:10 - 00:07:26:17

I believe I believe we have. Well, I can check actually verify, but as far as I'm aware we certainly modeled it. And we've we have 1 in 30 flood out loans for these areas both now and at the end of the application with the application of the relevant uplifts for climate change.

00:07:27:03 - 00:07:30:22

Okay. I don't believe that has been cited, but.

00:07:30:24 - 00:07:33:01

That's that's very easily provided.

00:07:33:03 - 00:07:34:10

Okay. So.

00:07:36:11 - 00:07:38:15

How would you quite like to have that. Yeah.

00:07:39:24 - 00:08:00:14

So can I just double check. And I profess to be no expert on this. Um, so. absolute deadline a we submitted, um, a revised figure 15.10 um, which, um, update 011 and that shows flood zone risk zone three on it.

00:08:01:11 - 00:08:03:08

Yes, that's for doom three. But what.

00:08:03:22 - 00:08:04:07

It's.

00:08:04:09 - 00:08:10:04

Three a you'll need to use the microphone. You'll need to use the microphone and introduce yourself every time you speak please.

00:08:10:06 - 00:08:27:22

Flood sorry. Flood zone three incorporates three A and three B which is the functional floodplain. These plans do not differentiate between the two because we're so far away from three B, and we're not impinging on those areas. It wasn't seen as a priority, but it is relatively straightforward for us to provide that information.

00:08:28:17 - 00:08:35:29

Okay, that we'll have the answer for you to provide it. It has been asked for already and we would. Your response was it wasn't available.

00:08:36:01 - 00:08:38:05

Hence the functions.

00:08:38:07 - 00:08:40:16

B, c every time you speak, you'll need to introduce yourself.

00:08:40:18 - 00:08:51:15

Sorry on behalf of the applicant. The functional floodplain map is not available, which is slightly different from the 1 in 30 year outline.

00:08:52:28 - 00:08:53:20

Yeah, it's.

00:08:53:22 - 00:08:56:16

A technical point, but as I explained, there is a difference.

00:08:56:18 - 00:09:27:29

It would be helpful for the applicant to identify the proposed development in relation to flood zone three, be how you want to do that internally and how you want to define that, and what conversations you need to have with the local authority. I will leave that for you to decide, but you need to represent to us proposed developments in relation to Flood Zone CVB and we have asked for this. Hence we do as well that that is an action and we shall carry on. I will just turn to the Environment Agency who's got their hand up and patiently waited.

00:09:29:06 - 00:10:07:05

Um, John Holland, on behalf of the Environment Agency, um, this is also a matter that we, um, mentioned in our relevant representation. Um, currently we have received, um, updated documents that I don't think have been submitted into examination currently for review so we can give. Comment on them. At this point in time, the outline for the one and 30 year extent, which, um, we would recommend without stepping on the toes of the local authority because it is obviously their determination for the threads we would recommend to be used as the outline of three B is within the appendix of the model, um report, which then is appendix on to the Fra.

00:10:07:11 - 00:10:22:20

Um, it was obviously a conversation to be had between the applicant and the local, uh, LFA to decide if this is the appropriate extent to use. However, we recommend that a figure of that then be included in the main text of the Fra for that clarity on where that extends it.

00:10:25:04 - 00:10:29:29

Yeah. That's helpful. The applicant like to respond at all on that point from the Environment Agency.

00:10:31:29 - 00:10:58:25

Uh, Will MacBain, on behalf of the, um, applicant? Uh, yes, that that is fine. So I think, uh, Sean's right. So we have provided the modelling information. That's just clarifying with North Yorkshire whether we've whether they feel it's appropriate to use that as the definition of the functional floodplain, which is in their gift to do. Should they choose to do so. But they won't produce that functional floodplain definition until they update the SFR, which I think is going to happen in the foreseeable future fairly soon.

00:11:03:01 - 00:11:31:12

So currently, in the absence of flood zone 3D mapping and evidence that's been submitted in your statement at procedural deadline, a in the letter, which is PDA 001, you state that there are no areas of flood zone VB within the shell, the development sites of the proposed development, and that the sequential test has been applied during the site selection process. What evidence are you relying upon in the absence of identifying flood zone?

00:11:31:14 - 00:12:06:03

VB will MacBain on behalf of the applicant. I'll have to check the maps, but I would assume that what we're saying is that the 1 in 30 year, not none of the development, is within the 1 in 30 year floodplain. So unless North Yorkshire Council chose to define the functional floodplain in a different way which which they could do then, then that statement is correct. But we probably we can now verify that with North Yorkshire, if we feel that that's if the if you believe that's an important thing for us to do.

00:12:06:13 - 00:12:06:28

Yeah.

00:12:07:04 - 00:12:19:14

Okay. So are we that into the action point around providing for zone three being the justification and demonstration of the sequential test inappropriately applied during the site selection process.

00:12:22:03 - 00:12:45:29

And the applicant. Again I just ask you another question. You just you did refer to environmental statement figure 1510 being updated at deadline A to include the identification of climate change flood zones. This is in exam library reference PDA 011. By adding this data retrospectively. How does this demonstrate that the site selection process considered the future risk of flooding?

00:12:48:25 - 00:13:32:03

Will MacBain on behalf of the applicant? So, as the Environment Agency have pointed out, the applicant has done site specific detailed modeling of all of these sites. Um, and that included, um, uh, modeling with all the relevant climate change uplifts applied. So the, the, um, the work has been done, the Natura two mapping that was provided quite late in the day, then that came out of the national data set does include climate change, but that is a national data set which is much coarser and less detailed than the maps that have been produced in collaboration with the Environment Agency using site specific models.

00:13:32:06 - 00:14:07:20

The models we've used include the lower ooze, the lower air, and the wharf hydraulic model. So they've all been used to produce that modeling. And the agreement was made in the environment. What assumptions we should make, and therefore the fact that a new data set has come out partway through the application, which shows slightly different data, is because that is a national data set. And if you look at the boundaries, you will notice they're quite straight edged, um, which implies that they're, you know, it's a proxy for when a time where they have local models they can use to make those better in that location.

00:14:07:22 - 00:14:15:13

And that's how NAFTA two works. It pulls in local models to improve the quality of the data, um, on a continuous basis.

00:14:15:26 - 00:15:00:21

And just add to that, said Mr. Foxman, the applicant, which is your question about how that applies. How that relates to the site selection process and the site selection process obviously is done on a moment in time and then progresses. Um, and so the, the, um, consideration of floods. Flood zones in that first selection process was done in the context of the um, modelling available at the time. Um, what we can do is take away a note, take away an action, to do a note, to suggest if any of the conclusions we say in the site selection report about flood risk would change as a result of that modelling? Um, but it's in the context of that would be retrospective looking at that now.

00:15:01:03 - 00:15:15:04

Um, I would hope I don't. Well, I'm not even going to try to say what the conclusions of that would be. Um, but obviously we can take an action to do that. But noting, um, that it's a site selection is taken at a point in time.

00:15:16:10 - 00:15:48:09

At the time the site selection process was undertaken. Could you just explain what climate change, flood zone mapping was used to inform that site selection, because the application has submitted

didn't include mapping to show the climate change flood zones, which subsequently asked for it. And the explanation I've just received suggests that this is new data that's become available. So what I'm asking is what data was there for use in terms of climate change flood zones to inform the site selection?

00:15:54:28 - 00:16:09:21

If the applicant personally could answer that question is not here. So we will take that action away to answer that, because that's that's our planner expert who took in all the influences from all the expert, from all the technical experts as part of that process. But.

00:16:12:03 - 00:16:41:04

Will MacBain, on behalf of the applicant, what is typically done in such circumstances is used the 1 in 1000 year floodplain as the proxy for the one in a 100 year flood plain. So it's quite common to do site selection exercises using the existing flood map for planning and the strategic flood risk assessment if it's available, and other information that's, um, around. Um, so there are ways you can do it without having to produce that mapping.

00:16:45:18 - 00:16:52:14

Okay. So we'll have a note upon how that process has been followed. Is that correct? Mr. Fox that's. Yeah.

00:17:00:24 - 00:17:16:22

Briefly touched on this. So, um, the environmental agency updated its flood risk mapping in May 2026. Um, and I'm just wondering whether the Environment Agency had had an opportunity to review the proposed development and application in light of these updates, and had any comments to make.

00:17:19:11 - 00:17:53:21

Hi. Um, Sean Holland, on behalf of the Environment Agency. Um, so we have looked at the two outputs and we have understood how this is implemented on the flood zones. However, when it comes to looking at the approach the applicant has taken on site, we would refer to their site specific modelling because we feel that would be a more accurate and detailed understanding of the current and proposed future flood risk to the site when it comes to design and mitigation and taking a sequential approach to that design. Also, we would defer to the site specific modelling because it has an extra layer of accuracy and, um, on site reality.

00:17:55:11 - 00:18:03:02

Um, so we do not feel that the NAF or two updates should have changed how the mitigation and the design was done.

00:18:12:16 - 00:18:39:29

If there was a representative from the North Yorkshire Council, the local authority, I would have asked them a similar question because the mapping, um, released in May 2026 from the Environment Agency included updates to the surface water risk. So I will now just ask the applicant to explain whether they've had an opportunity to review the release of the new mapping available, and how that interacts with the proposed development.

00:18:42:17 - 00:19:20:12

Will MacBain, on behalf of the applicant? Um, as far as um, I'm aware, and I will check this and verify it afterwards. But we've looked at the surface water flood mapping from naphtha to generally the surface water mapping is localized surface water running off from the fields without there being any major. What you're concerned about is if there's a major surface water flow route through the site that the development might disrupt, but generally it's runoff sitting at the surface within the site and then running off into the fields, um, along the, uh, in line with the contours, which is very easy to manage, um, as part of a site drainage strategy.

00:19:20:14 - 00:19:28:24

So, yes, as far as I'm aware, we have looked at the NAFTA two surface water maps and they don't present any concerns to us.

00:19:36:16 - 00:19:45:28

And if they were available, they wouldn't have changed any site selection. They wouldn't have changed the sequential. No. Or it wouldn't change the sequential approach to the no no.

00:19:47:07 - 00:19:50:27

Because the water generally follows the contours and the depressions.

00:19:52:28 - 00:20:03:19

And that happened to note that the PPG is clear that, um, as long as you can show that you've managed your surface water risk, you don't have to comply with the sequential test of surface water.

00:20:14:04 - 00:20:23:08

For completeness, then, would it be useful to have the footage assessment updated to reflect the latest information given that is now available.

00:20:27:13 - 00:20:34:07

Will MacBain on behalf of the applicant? I think it will need some very minor tweaks, but I don't think that would be a problem.

00:20:35:21 - 00:20:48:07

Okay, we shall have an update. Um, sorry. We'll have an action for an update. Sorry for the flood risk assessment and associated environmental statement figures. Thank you. And would that be appropriate for deadline two? Is that achievable?

00:20:57:20 - 00:21:13:24

I'll move on to some further questioning. The examining authorities found some of the environmental statement. Chapter 15 figures are slightly difficult to observe. If the applicant could just put on a screen. Figure 15.9 of the environmental statement. That is AP 123.

00:21:15:21 - 00:21:21:15

And if we look at sheets one initially because it just gives an example of this. You

00:21:23:03 - 00:21:29:00

may need to zoom in slightly for the given the scale of the mapping I think.

00:21:33:19 - 00:21:40:21

And some more. So we can really focus on the development side one and have that for the majority of the screen, please.

00:21:48:29 - 00:22:12:24

I think you can if you start to sort of just view this mapping very briefly, just to as an example of the issue that we have is that those blocks which have been overlaid on the mapping obscure the surface water risk from us being able to understand what that is for those particular points. And again, if we just go to sheet six, we'll see a probably another example of this as well.

00:22:20:17 - 00:22:24:11

And then if we just zoom in onto solar development side two.

00:22:31:08 - 00:23:01:12

So as we can see there, we've got these grey shapes that are overlaying. Basically don't allow us to see the surface water risk for those particular elements of the proposed development. What will be useful is to have these figures provided so that we can see the risk that's underneath. It's currently slightly hidden really, so we can see the risk that's posed to these proposed development. And so they would be in action to update those figures. It's my list that I have.

00:23:01:14 - 00:23:19:21

This this sort of difficulty of observing the mapping applies to figures 15, 16, 15, 17, 1518, 1520, and 1522 to 1526. It's the it's the way that you've drawn. I think the layers.

00:23:22:00 - 00:23:42:28

Would also be used to useful to identify the proposed conversion units on all of these figures, which is similar to what the approach that was taken on figure 1515, which is app 129. That way we'll examine the three to be able to understand the risk that's posed, how that relates to the flood risk assessment.

00:23:48:22 - 00:24:11:18

Absolutely. We will do that. So just just to check just trying to think through how we would practically do it. Um, we would the the blobs on screen, the blobs that are there to be able to see the surface wanderer underneath. We could take out the, the block color that we would still need the lines, because that's the delineating where the infrastructure is. So there would still be a small amount of overlap for that. But we can.

00:24:11:20 - 00:24:32:07

Yeah, that that may be one option or it's just a case of reordering them, perhaps so that the blue on screen is actually the highest part. And so therefore we can see it because there's probably a concern, as you can see, for the gray one that's on the screen now that looks to be surrounded by blue. So it's probably all blue. And we'd just like to understand that risk. But we've got the action but I.

00:24:34:15 - 00:24:38:21

Don't think there'll be any comments but I will just offer that to the environment. And so any other.

00:24:41:23 - 00:25:01:19

No. Okay. We'll turn to the next item which is the flood risk assessment. If we could keep, uh, environmental assessment figure 1519 on screen again is app one, two, three, which we've just mentioned there. And this is probably an example. There are areas identified at high risk of surface water flooding within the order limits.

00:25:03:22 - 00:25:26:23

Of development proposed in these locations. This is still the development sites one two, four and number seven. We've been observing some of those blue blobs, if you like, on there. My understanding is that you've undertaken rainfall modeling for the solar development cycles one and two only, and submitted mapping that provides depths for surface water flooding anticipated at these sites.

00:25:28:09 - 00:25:39:23

This is shown in figures 1523 to 1526. And it'll be useful to have a figure 1523 on screen. So that is app 137.

00:25:43:24 - 00:25:45:06

If we zoom in

00:25:46:22 - 00:25:59:16

just a little to make it easier for people to view, we can see there are large areas of surface water risk identified from your modelling that you've undertaken where there is proposed development in those areas.

00:26:01:15 - 00:26:15:28

So to demonstrate paragraph five, eight, 15 of MPs and one, could the applicant to explain what mitigation is proposed to ensure that the proposed development in these specific areas would remain safe and operational for its lifetime during times of surface water flooding. Please.

00:26:19:08 - 00:26:57:29

Will MacBain, on behalf of the applicant. So so what we're looking at here are maps of its direct rainfall. So it's a technique where you imply the rainfall over the site and it predicts where it will run off to based on sort of gravity. It doesn't take account of below ground systems. And sometimes it's not giving detail on on necessarily the role of all ditches and watercourses. So you might see areas where it's ponding, where it's not necessarily modeling it perfectly, but what you're looking for is, as I said before, whether there are significant surface water flow paths traveling through the site, which we might disrupt.

00:26:58:11 - 00:27:34:09

Um, in terms of mitigation, this is very straightforward to mitigate, because if you imagine once you if you develop something in those areas. Clearly you can. You can raise it slightly, but the rain falling on those sides will be intercepted by the drainage system, and that will be designed to convey the water safely away at a rate that won't increase flood risk for others. So. So we feel that the risks

associated with surface water on these sites is far less important and severe than the the fluvial flooding risks, which have been carefully mitigated as well.

00:27:34:14 - 00:27:41:12

Okay. Thank you. My understanding is for the solar development sites, there is no drainage that's been proposed as part of the development.

00:27:42:01 - 00:28:14:27

The will MacBain on behalf of the applicant. There is absolutely a drainage strategy for the site. Um, but the the there is a hierarchy for drainage. And at the top of that hierarchy is to, to let the water seep away in situ to the ground. So for certainly for the parts where we're not worried about Um, contamination risk. The water will be encouraged to, um, uh, run off into the ground, but there will be surface water pathways, swales provided.

00:28:14:29 - 00:28:51:13

So any access finds its way out of the site without causing any problems. But that is, that is in line with best practice in terms of sustainable drainage. Um, we will have to do infiltration testing. Um, and we will have to verify the capacity of the soils to take access surface water and design the system so that if the water doesn't soak away, it has a safe route to the watercourse. But we won't be looking to put that into pipes if we can avoid it. We'll be looking looking to use features at the surface swales, vegetated swales, which improves water quality, um, and is less of an ongoing liability.

00:28:51:15 - 00:29:27:01

Okay. Thank you. So we take the example of soil development site one, which is on a screen. We've got some blue areas which are identified there to be at high risk of surface water flooding by the modelling which you've undertaken in those areas. It is proposed on the layouts that have been provided for selection of solar panels in these areas, and the drainage strategy explains that there isn't supposed to be any drainage within the solar within where the solar panels are. So based on your explanation there, we can assume that that blue is likely to be like what it is.

00:29:27:03 - 00:29:46:04

So on that basis, what I'm what I'm asking is going back to my original question is what mitigation is proposed to ensure that the proposed development in these specific areas will ensure that the development remains safe and operational for its time of development. So I'm looking for what is the mitigation and where is that stated?

00:29:46:18 - 00:29:49:04

Right within within the drainage strategy.

00:29:50:01 - 00:29:50:16

In the.

00:29:50:18 - 00:30:30:08

Wilmot Vein on behalf of the applicant. So the drainage strategy does set out the principles and the approach to drainage. As I said, it doesn't give that in full detail because we need to do some ground investigation, some infiltration testing. Um, but, uh, generally we'll be looking to use the contours to,

um, shed the water safely away without doing, um, you know, major infrastructure, drainage, uh, pipe work and so forth. So there will be there will be, um, uh, measures taken to ensure that those surface water pathways are perhaps formalized to take the water safely through without causing problems.

00:30:30:10 - 00:30:33:06

But we are talking about very shallow depth of flooding here.

00:30:34:05 - 00:30:40:20

Well, looking at this planet shows to be above one meter in some locations, so that's not particularly shallow.

00:30:42:13 - 00:31:21:18

Thank you. We'll start to turn your microphone off. Sorry. I think it seems to me that there's within the flood risk assessment. It isn't looking it hasn't identified mitigation in response to the risk from surface water. The flood risk assessment is proposed. mitigation in response to the fluvial risk. Based upon the mapping here, what I'm asking for is should the flood risk assessment not be looking to provide mitigation to demonstrate how it would be safe and remain operational from surface water flooding? If the NPS and the NPF is quite clear that it's from all sources of flooding, that proposed development needs to be made safe.

00:31:22:17 - 00:31:30:26

The answers I've had so far would keep referring back to the drainage strategy. I don't think that's quite what I'm looking for. It's from the flood risk assessment point of view.

00:31:32:18 - 00:31:42:08

If you. Is there anything more you want to add that you think can relay my concern around the assessment of mitigation from surface water flooding, or is it something that needs to take away?

00:31:43:24 - 00:32:14:29

Will MacBain, on behalf of the applicant? I think when it comes to the, um, the flood sensitive parts of the development, the battery storage and the the converters, these are sensitive to flooding, and they have been designed to be set well above the fluvial flooding, which automatically means they will be a long way above the surface water flooding. So where things wear apparatus is flood sensitive, we have no concerns about the risk to the to those elements.

00:32:15:01 - 00:32:50:06

The solar panels are mounted on um, on um steel um approach that takes them some well above the level of, um, any surface water flooding that's noted across these sites and the locations where those solar panels are going. So whilst, yes, the drainage strategy is not complete and we haven't provided a full drainage, um, design because there is work to be done in terms of understanding the topography and the ground investigation. Further detail from a flood risk assessment point of view, we do not consider that.

00:32:50:08 - 00:33:02:15

We think that the impacts are the effects are negligible because we've got, um. Uh, um, the receptors that are potentially affected are of low vulnerability.

00:33:02:17 - 00:33:04:16

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wasserman.

00:33:04:18 - 00:33:35:27

The applicant. Just just to clarify, because I'm conscious your question there was, where do I find that in the flood risk assessment? I imagine you're looking at paragraphs in particular seven for 20 onwards, uh, flood risk assessment. And I think given that we've already committed to updating flood risk assessment for other reasons, what we would do is look at that section to see if we can reflect what Mr. McBain has just said there, so that you're clear that, um, I can see that the language in this section could be read as, um, being only relevant to fluvial.

00:33:36:01 - 00:33:44:21

Um, and then you're wanting to be sure that the surface water risks are managed today. I'll be hoping that Mr. McBain has provided that reassurance verbally, but we will reflect that in the update at the Fra.

00:33:44:28 - 00:34:17:23

Yeah, that'd be useful. Thank you, Mr. Fox. Need to, uh, probably keep some responses as brief and concise as we can on some of these. We can continue to work through all of our questions for this afternoon as well. So I appreciate your help with that regard. You mentioned that, um, solar panels will be raised well above these levels. That's what I think. That's what you were saying. So just to confirm on that, uh, the flood risk assessment refers to mitigation being finished. Floor level set at the design flood plus 300 mil freeboard or or the maximum credible scenario.

00:34:18:15 - 00:34:28:05

Just for clarity, and this may be a yes or no answer. Does that include the proposed solar panels or is it the flood Sensitive equipment.

00:34:29:23 - 00:34:52:29

Bill MacBain, on behalf of the applicant, that the particular mitigation you're referring to there applies to the flood sensitive apparatus, but it is intended now to to put the solar panels themselves above the, um, I believe it's 100 year flood level. Um, Megan can probably confirm that online, but, uh, we can certainly come back and verify that.

00:34:54:25 - 00:34:56:22

Okay. We'll build on that.

00:34:59:25 - 00:35:32:27

At the moment, it would seem to be described in the flood risk assessment that the solar panels will be allowed to flood. So what you've just described to me there is a little different to what's so what's just been said. I think what would be useful in order for us to be very clear about the risk that's being proposed, is to understand the standard of protection that the proposed solar panels would have. And of course, this is going to change across the site, dependent upon and across each site as well, and to understand what standard protection they would have.

00:35:33:25 - 00:35:52:27

And as part of that, it would be useful to what would to understand what the minimum height of the proposed solar panels would be. Of course, we have a maximum. Would it be useful to have a minimum height? And whether that would be agreed on an individual or on a block by block basis of the solar panels. I can imagine how that might be something that's useful.

00:35:55:02 - 00:35:56:00

And that seems sensible.

00:35:56:02 - 00:36:08:28

But the thoughts about that we can we can take that away. I mean, I would I would note the points in the fray about partly going to depend on the type of panel as well, and the fact that some of them could fold up, for example, in response to an event. But we can we can touch on that.

00:36:14:03 - 00:36:17:07

Notice the involvement got their hand up. Thank you for waiting.

00:36:20:03 - 00:36:59:27

Good afternoon. This is Sean Holland on behalf of the Environment Agency. Um, just to hopefully give a bit of clarity to the situation. Um, this is a point we have also raised in our relevant representation. We had concerns that these panels would be inundated in a flood, um, scenario. So we're looking at the 1 in 100 plus climate change scenario here. Um, additionally, we then thought this may have knock on effects for flood flow routes and it may cause off offsite increases in risk. Um, we have had meetings with the applicants since we made those relevant representations in our most recent meeting, and they clarified to us that they would be looking to raise those panels to be above that flood level by the minimum freeboard.

00:37:00:07 - 00:37:15:22

Um, however, this has not been translated into the SRA yet. We are hoping to see these in upcoming documents, but we still haven't seen those changes yet. However, the conversation of changing those levels so those panels are not inundated and can be operational during a flood event have been had.

00:37:17:18 - 00:37:23:20

That's really useful for that update. Thank you. I don't suppose you need to respond, but you you can't, you.

00:37:24:01 - 00:37:46:12

Know, just to clarify, just because I'm wondering where your mind might go on that, which is just I think it would help when we do that, just to confirm that if we were going to be putting minimum heights in how that cross refers to the commitments that we've made on height more generally, because I can imagine you're thinking of what does that mean for landscaping, visual, etc., etc.. So we will cover off that point in making those submissions.

00:37:46:28 - 00:38:16:19

I think it might be useful if there is a need to be a plan. That kind of gives us some of these minimum heights, that we understand what that may look like on a block by block basis. Understand that there's

flexibility that's needed on the final design height, and that you've got an envelope which is being proposed. But of course someone would need to implement this and enforce what's necessary. And given the wide sort of scale of each of the development sites and the number of sites, that could be quite difficult without such a plan.

00:38:21:19 - 00:38:30:16

For the applicant. We'll take that away, because I'm not I'm not sure when the answer to that is in terms of now versus as part of discharging a discharge requirement, for example.

00:38:37:12 - 00:38:52:21

Okay. Moving on to the conversion units. Can the applicant confirm that the conversion units are identified as fluid sensitive equipment, and that all units would be raised above the desired foot level plus 300 mil freeboard. Or will it be the maximum possible scenario for the level?

00:38:55:19 - 00:38:59:06

Well, being on behalf of the applicant, it will be whichever is the

00:39:00:24 - 00:39:01:19

highest.

00:39:02:26 - 00:39:12:15

Okay. And then and so whichever is the highest. So what would the maximum finished floor level be for these fluid sensitive conversion units.

00:39:13:23 - 00:39:19:24

Well it would be the 1100 year 100 year flood level

00:39:21:12 - 00:39:39:14

will obtain on behalf of the applicant. It would be the 100 year plus climate change flood level, plus a 300mm of freeboard or the maximum credible flood, whichever is the worst, on some on others at 600. So it depends whether it has voided foundations or not.

00:39:39:16 - 00:40:12:18

I think it's going to be similar to the points around the solar panels, which is what is the minimum. Um, so in sorry, what is the maximum finished floor level going to be for the conversion units in various areas of the site that are at higher risk? That's clearly going to change depending upon the level of risk and the source and which solar development site. So I'm not looking for a design criteria. I'm looking for a meters above ground level, I suppose. Which is which is exactly what we're heading for with the minimum height for the solar panels.

00:40:13:06 - 00:40:14:08

Does that make sense?

00:40:19:25 - 00:40:45:06

Well, on behalf of the applicant. That does make sense. Um, it requires on site one. Um, the most challenging requires finished low levels about a meter above existing levels. Well, sites three and four

require increases of approximately 300 and 660mm, respectively. So that's what the requirement is from a flood risk mitigation point of view. But there may be other factors that determine what height they're actually installed in practice.

00:40:45:18 - 00:41:09:01

Yeah, I think it would be useful to have this on a site by site basis as to what exactly those, um, finished floor levels would be for the conversion units. Um, not just because at the moment the language in the flood risk assessment is approximately a meter. As you're we need some a bit more certainty around that to understand how that works with the rest of the design parameters. Thank you.

00:41:18:03 - 00:41:22:21

I would just like to offer the Environment Agency the opportunity to comment on the conversion units of the flood,

00:41:24:09 - 00:41:26:15

more sensitive elements.

00:41:27:04 - 00:42:04:01

Um, good afternoon, John Holland, on behalf of the Environment Agency. Um, we also are happy for the commitment to be made of, um, 300m or 600, depending on the mitigation used underneath the converter stations to raise them, um, millimeters above that design event, um, or the critical maximum. We feel that that would make the converter stations resilient and safe for the lifetime of development for, um in times of flood. However, we have concerned that we need to see commitments for if they are not looking to use silted, voided structures if they're looking to do land raising.

00:42:04:11 - 00:42:41:16

Um, what this may look like for the loss of capacity and how that may impact flood flows and flood flow routes. At the moment there is a discussion being had between us and the applicant about how they make this commitment. So this could either be looking at an a commitment to providing flooding compensation if they look to do land raising at that detailed design stage, um, and that commitment either to be in the commitment register or looking to see if there needs to be a requirement placed on the DCO. That basically means when they come in to do these detailed designs, we have an assessment undertaken for the impacts that those signs may have on flood risk and the appropriate mitigation that needs to be implemented, that we need to be consulted on as the Environment Agency.

00:42:41:18 - 00:43:31:22

And then it is for our approval before they can then start those works. Um, this is an ongoing conversation we're having with the applicant, and I think this is something we're looking to resolve over the next few weeks, over the next couple of deadlines, to understand that kind of dialogue, of the best mechanism to ensure that the loss of floodplain is not happening. Additionally, we are looking to kind of talk to the applicant about if they are looking to use wider structures underneath these, um, converter stations to allow the free flow of water through. Um, they that comes with additional risk, um, of debris buildup, which may cause kind of, um, additional risk of water raising and, um, free flow not being allowed, which is also why we're looking for them to put an additional 300 mils, um,

of freeboard into the design of the structure so that if that there is that debris, you still have a little bit of space to have additional water.

00:43:31:28 - 00:44:02:12

Um, that would also look at having a maintenance scheme put in place for the whole scheme. So they should look at clearing out any debris checks during, um, regular kind of intervals. But also having checks directly after a flood event has occurred because that's when the most debris will build up. Um, so at the moment we still got a few things that we're kind of ironing out about the specific design criteria of those converter stations, and how we ensure that we do not have any loss of capacity whilst they are also safe for their lifetime. I hope that made sense.

00:44:02:17 - 00:44:11:00

Yeah. Thank you. Just to confirm, your interest is largely on the fluvial risk. Um, and you're not having the same conversations around the surface water risk?

00:44:11:05 - 00:44:44:04

No. So we are within the environment agencies remit. We look at the fluvial flood risk to and from the development. Um, the only interaction we necessarily have when it comes to surface water on is if there is kind of an assessment done of the compound risk, where there are areas where both are occurring and they may interact with each other, or if there is a system, a drainage system that is looking to run off or discharge into one of our watercourses that may, um, make a flood situation worse. Um, and understanding kind of what that discharge may mean for downstream flood risk and things like that.

00:44:47:07 - 00:44:48:16

That's useful. Thank you.

00:44:49:20 - 00:45:24:25

For that. Um, just um, to two quick points. So firstly in relation to those queries about um management and everything else, um, to the extent that that requires updates to the Outline Operational Environmental Management plan, I think it would be we will seek to reach agreement with the Environment Agency on that as soon as possible. Um, and we had um, I think there are some amendments already, um, in there in the kind of working draft. Um, and then the point about the um, compensation, just to re-emphasize, obviously, that sounds like a kind of like a scary word.

00:45:24:27 - 00:45:44:28

Um, that is, um, specifically in relation to, Um, it's like one of websites, right? Development site one. Um, and to the extent that it is required, it would be within the bird mitigation area. So this is not any kind of, uh, land that's not otherwise already in our order limits. Just to reassure you on that.

00:45:47:16 - 00:45:52:02

Okay. Is this a new hand or is it the, uh. It's a new.

00:45:52:04 - 00:46:27:04

Hand. Yeah, this is a new hand. Just to comment on a couple of the comments that have just been made and also a couple other bits to do that. Um, so this is John Holland on behalf of the Environment

Agency. Um, so this compensation that we are discussing is actually separate from the compensation that has been spoken about being placed within the bird mitigation. Um, that compensation has been used in discussion, in direct conversations about the impacts that the solar panels themselves may have on floodplain capacity. The capacity that may need to be provided for these conversations has not been, um, quantified and has not been discussed about where that may be.

00:46:27:08 - 00:47:00:25

Now, we do not have concerns that it will not be able to be provided across the site because there are many places across the site which are connected hydraulically and hydraulically to the current flood extent, but do not flood themselves. So they are capable of holding that water and being provided for a level and level volume for volume capacity, and which is why we are happy to look to make this a requirement for the detailed design stage, or a commitment for the detailed design stage, as we do not have concerns that this will not be able to be provided. However, it is separate from the mitigation that is being provided in the bird mitigation.

00:47:02:09 - 00:47:10:26

The discussions we've had around the bird mitigation, that has been all to do with the mitigation about the actual solar panels themselves. And so I hope that kind of clarifies that a little bit.

00:47:13:04 - 00:47:36:02

That's great. Thank you. Um, at the moment. Speaker. What I would, would, um, reassure you, though, is to the extent that, um, comes agreement as about how that would be deployed, we would. I don't think that needs a separate two year requirement. We would seek to impute it within, um, relevant management plans. And once we worked out what that is, we will then update you and explain how it's secured.

00:47:36:20 - 00:47:54:02

And I'm assuming some of this is going to be there for updated in a, in the flood risk assessment going to be set up there. So it's clear as to how this has been assessed and mitigated. And we can be we can have some certainty over what will form part of that final um, governmental management plan.

00:47:54:24 - 00:48:17:07

Absolutely. So yeah, absolutely. That's the key point of how it's secured. And I know that you sometimes get CEOs that say build it in accordance with the flood risk assessment, but I think that's actually almost too simple for this because of how risk assessment covers so many different things. Um, so and different phases. Um, so, um, yeah, it would all be done together, but I just wanted to assure you, we know we need it and we will work out how to do something.

00:48:21:09 - 00:48:39:07

Okay. Finishes my questioning on the flood risk assessment. I think we've covered quite a bit, and we'll detail the actions that are going to be required, as agreed for the update, and around the risk from surface water as well as fluvial. The mitigation measures in the plans to help give some certainty over what's been proposed.

00:48:45:21 - 00:48:49:27

I shall move on to water supply.

00:48:52:09 - 00:49:30:03

A question to the applicant and your response to the relevant representation, which is reference 819 and that's contained within as 036. You explained that the process for identifying the groundwater abstractions. However, there is a lack of certainty as to whether all obstructions have been identified. For example, a borehole at Milford Lodge mentioned in relevant rep 1051 would the applicant commit to reviewing the list of obstructions to ensure completeness, especially where representations are flagged, those which are potentially missing?

00:49:33:06 - 00:49:33:24

Thank you.

00:49:33:26 - 00:50:09:22

Jason Fairburn on behalf of the applicant. So the process for the identification of all the water abstractions, we go through the process of data collection. So we've got a five kilometre radius search around the water limits. We request that data from the Environment Agency to identify licensed abstractions for groundwater surface water. We've contacted and collected data from the councils for the private water supply data. And then we also compiled additional, um, desk based information from BGS geological borehole records, including for the the lodge that is mentioned in the relevant rep.

00:50:10:04 - 00:50:46:03

Um, we also collate that with the position of the locations to clarify whether there's surface water, groundwater abstractions. And then there was a period In January 2025, May 2025 and August 2025, when we were able to go out and validate, visit the study area and um, following that, the receptor um, importance was identified, um, based on the visits where those were possible, where the visits were not possible, the receptor was precautionary assessed into the categories set out in the um app.

00:50:46:05 - 00:50:55:07

5053 the table um which one table set evaluation.

00:50:57:17 - 00:51:26:15

Table at 519 and the receptor evaluations. So they'd be precautionary assessed. And so depending on the nature of the obstruction they would either be very high high medium or low receptor importance. And then we'd use a uh source pathway receptor for each one. Looking at the nature of the activities in the in the, in the, in the scheme. We'd be looking in terms of abstractions, the potential effects on quantity and quality of productions. Yeah.

00:51:26:17 - 00:51:39:21

Just want to interject slightly. Um, not really. After the the process that you've gone through, I think what I'm asking for is whether you would commit to reviewing the list of abstractions that you've already got to ensure completeness because of the relevant representation.

00:51:39:23 - 00:52:10:09

Yeah. So that's that's a very good question. So I think we did respond to that relevant representation. Um, the represent let me just remind myself on the reference for that one. So that was the yeah. For the Milford Lodge. It was the what 19 RR 1051 and that was PDB 005. And that, as you said, set out

concerns about identification, characterization and understanding. And in our representation to that particular point, we did clarify that. Yes, it's obviously useful and understanding to know where that is.

00:52:10:11 - 00:52:20:22

That record actually is within the BGS Geological Survey. So there is borehole records and we do include. The abstraction license is shown on the figure. Let me get the figure reference.

00:52:25:09 - 00:52:42:09

So the yeah the the all of the abstractions identified are in figure 15.8. AP p 122. And those that are visited or the status of visit were identified in figure 15.13 AP 127.

00:52:47:09 - 00:53:11:00

But as I said, sorry. Jason Furber number of the application applicant in terms of that relevant representation, we did include. Um, and that there is note in the relevant that that abstraction point is covered. It includes a 50 meter stand off for protecting against the potential impacts on quantity. And then the effects on quality are secured in various documents, including the outline Kemp for pollution, runoff and construction water management.

00:53:11:02 - 00:53:11:17

Okay.

00:53:11:19 - 00:53:12:09

Thank you, thank you.

00:53:14:14 - 00:53:55:22

Question to the Environment Agency, please. In response to your concern that the potential severity of impacts of the proposed development on licence and unlicensed obstructions is currently unacknowledged. In the environmental statement, the applicant explained that a procedural deadline SAS 036, that licensed groundwater abstractions for public water supply are covered in the surface water section of table 59 of Environmental Statement, chapter 15. Aside from the slightly confusing inclusion of groundwater abstraction under surface water, just wanted to clarify if this response deals with your concerns, and I note that response only refers to the licence.

00:53:55:24 - 00:53:57:28

Abstractions are not unlicensed.

00:54:09:19 - 00:54:14:14

Um, I will pull in my colleague Mark Currin here. Please.

00:54:22:04 - 00:55:00:26

Good afternoon. Mark Corcoran, Environment agency. Um, I think, um, what the applicant has explained there in terms of the process and the data sets that have been used or sound like what we would expect, and it does, I think, answer that. I think we we can take that away though. I think one thing to mention in terms of, um, in terms of those receptors and their sensitivity and any potential missing from the data sets, is that any, any permit applications, whether it's a dewatering

programming or whether it's, um, the water supply and abstractions that the applicant will be responsible for will consider derogation, risk, um, particularly in terms of quantity.

00:55:00:28 - 00:55:16:03

So it's very much in the applicant's risk to have a complete data set. Otherwise those permit applications might, um, might be problematic. So, um, there is an extra sort of element of reassurance there in terms of protections to, to abstractions. But, um, I think that's what I've got to add to that for now.

00:55:26:22 - 00:55:28:12

Any further comment at all?

00:55:29:24 - 00:55:52:22

Chase Irving, on behalf of the applicant. So yeah, acknowledging the Environment Agency comment there about subsequent downstream consents and permits, they would be secured at the time ahead of those. Um, obviously, well, water abstraction discharges can be transient. They can change over time. So we've got what we've got at the point of collection that those would be checked ahead of that application and the application tailored appropriately. Thank you.

00:55:52:24 - 00:56:45:25

Okay. Thank you. Okay. Moving on to water demand during the operational phase, as I, um, so as identified in the past, how can we clarify this point? Water demand during the operational phase is identified as 2.7 and 34m³ per day for average and peak uses, respectively. In table 38 of the Water Resource Assessment, which is AP 204. The assessment explains that these figures do not include the proposed replacement activities, as this demand would be negligible given the scale of the replacement activities which we've discussed today, which is the best replacement for five times up to five times during the proposed development lifetime substation replacement conversion units and the solar panel replacements.

00:56:46:15 - 00:56:50:01

I'm uncertain whether this demand would be negligible.

00:56:51:25 - 00:57:10:25

Table 37 of the Water Resource Assessment provides water demand figures for the construction phase. So if one were to ignore water demand for directional drilling and the dust suppression for the applicant, explain whether the remaining activities would provide a conservative estimation of water demand during replacement activities.

00:57:13:03 - 00:57:47:21

Thank you for your question, Jason Fairburn, on behalf of the applicant. So the water resource assessment was put together in response to the P.E.I. consultation response from the Environment Agency identifying water scarcity issues, water supply. So that sets out, as you say, the water demand for construction operation. Those have all been discussed and developed based on established references. Previous precautionary. They've been precautionary estimated based on the scheme understanding at the moment, um, the supply options, we can come on to those separately.

00:57:47:23 - 00:58:12:17

But in terms of the, um, I think it was in the operation phase that you were talking about the possible, um, replacement of asset infrastructure during the pace. So the obviously the potential demand. So that could potentially be as much as during construction aspects of that. So, um, I think what we can probably do is take that one away to see whether there's estimates of that in, in that water resource assessment.

00:58:15:29 - 00:58:23:10

Yes, I think that would be useful to update that, because at the moment there isn't replacement activity. So include an action for that.

00:58:23:12 - 00:58:49:03

So just one more point if that's possible please. Jason Bateman on the application. So in the water resource assessment we a discount for the decommissioning at the moment. And that's obviously the comments in there relate to the kind of far far term uh and what the, the technology and the sort of guiding approaches for that decommissioning and the water requirements would be. But they would be less than the other demands set out.

00:58:50:01 - 00:58:50:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:59:00:23 - 00:59:38:10

You mentioned briefly then about the water supply options. So I'll just briefly touch on that then. So the water resource assessment identifies several project level water supply options. However, I'm wondering if the applicant could provide some more clarity on the strategy for supplying water to the various elements of the proposed development throughout its lifetime. For example, the most likely sources for each solar development sites and cable construction compounds notwithstanding the need for some flexibility where sources are outside of the order limits, and ask the applicant to also confirm if any works would be necessary to facilitate such a supply.

00:59:38:12 - 00:59:45:04

For example, the Yorkshire Water connection. Again, is that something which you would be willing to do?

00:59:46:06 - 01:00:19:27

Jason Fairbairn on behalf of the applicant. So yeah, with respect to the water supply, within the water resource assessment, we've set out what we anticipate, the demands. We identify a range of potential sources that could be required. Some potable water from Yorkshire Water through abstraction, potentially from groundwater or surface water, from licensed trading, from capture of rainfall, but also potentially tinkering, which is routinely used in construction projects at certain points of the year. So the water assessment demonstrates that there is a feasible option.

01:00:19:29 - 01:00:30:23

It's likely potential that there would be a mix of options. So in terms of a hierarchy of water use for construction phase, there's mitigation in reducing the demand. And that's secured in certain documents.

01:00:30:28 - 01:01:07:12

I'm sorry to interrupt, but I have we have read the the application process and what is there. My ask was for you to go away to look at providing us more detail on a element by element basis rather than project level, so that we can understand this water supply sources for each of those elements. So for the solar development sites and for the construction compounds, and also to confirm where there's a reliance upon potentially a Yorkshire Water connection that would and whether that would need works outside of the order limits, because of course we would need to understand how that would be facilitated.

01:01:07:26 - 01:01:12:26

I guess I'm really looking for it. Yes. You're happy to go away and look at this and provide us with the information.

01:01:13:27 - 01:01:33:00

About the applicant. Just I just want to be clear on the ask. So are you when you say the breakdown, are you saying that for each core element, you wanted to know what is the more like more likely supply option and where is it located? Or are you wanting to know the numbers of the amount? Sorry, the proportion of water that would be needed for each activity?

01:01:33:06 - 01:02:05:21

Yeah, I think I'm looking for one for each of the solar development sites and for the construction compounds. What are the most likely sources of water supply would be on that basis? Because at the moment it's clear that for some of the obstructions, they can only be sort of detailed there. They've got a limit of how much they could provide. There would potentially be a need for, um, connections from Yorkshire Water. But again, that would be from outside of the order limit because we don't know where those locations are. So I think it's just that a bit more certainty around an element by element level of that.

01:02:05:26 - 01:02:52:18

And unless someone shoots me, I'm, I'm not sure we can do that now. So that's kind of the point. What we've identified to the water resource assessment. Assessment is the amount of water that is going to be needed. But the scheme as a whole and the fact that we will, that we will be able to find options to do that, to try and suggest right now that, for example, certain events like one would come from X Yorkshire Water mains connection or Y abstraction points. It's just that for that to be a basis of any kind of decision making, I don't think would be correct, because it's not we're not committing to that being the option that would be used, because we need the flexibility to understand at the point in time that construction happens, which of those is the most suitable and available option to use, and it's likely to be a combination.

01:02:52:20 - 01:02:58:22

It won't it won't be one of those things say I do understand the answer, but it's just not possible at this point.

01:02:58:27 - 01:03:28:19

Where there's a reliance upon a Yorkshire Water connection, which I understand that that's one of the more likely ones, based on some comments during this week. We don't know where those. It explains in the application documents that points of connection have been discussed with Yorkshire Water, but with that information hasn't been submitted into the examination. It would be useful to understand where those were and if they are outside of the order limits, how would there be any works needed to facilitate a connection?

01:03:29:00 - 01:03:41:24

We can definitely do that, sir. I think that that's a clear ask. It was more to break it down on a side by side basis and say where the water is definitely going to come from. I just don't think we can do that at this stage. Okay.

01:03:43:13 - 01:03:44:15

I'm sorry. I'm just bringing Mr..

01:03:45:00 - 01:04:16:01

Sorry Jason Fairbairn on the applicant. So yeah, there have been early discussions with Yorkshire Water about the total quantities as it says in there. They've confirmed they don't see a problem with that overall quantity. The detail, as you said, is the connections. They've indicated sites where they they've got it closer connections. But we'll take away that action to kind of complete that. But as I said in the water resource assessment, we do have the tank ring option as the backup because the quantities involved on, on, um, on a lot, they're actually in reasonably sort of small quantities during construction on a daily basis.

01:04:16:03 - 01:04:22:21

And the tank ring has, in terms of the tanker numbers, are incorporated into the tank, into the travel um, transport assessment. Thank you.

01:04:22:23 - 01:04:23:09

Yeah.

01:04:23:13 - 01:04:32:29

I think if there's any need to revisit some of that on the basis of now incorporating the replacement activity, water demand as well. Obviously that will just need to be reflected. Thank you.

01:04:34:26 - 01:04:42:15

Okay. I've got, uh, Mark, I can't quite see the surname. Sorry, but you've got your hand up on line. Corcoran.

01:04:43:19 - 01:05:17:18

Yeah, yeah, it's Mark Corcoran. Uh, Environment agency. Um, just in response to, um, I think the point you made around hierarchy. I think that's a really important aspect of the water resources assessment. Um, the water resources assessment that's been undertaken by the applicant, it's actually very good. Um, it does options appraise a lot of alternative sources of supply to Yorkshire Water. Um, despite the fact that Yorkshire Water have agreed to be able to supply the, you know, the quantity

required. So the certainty I'm looking for at this stage really is confidence that there is a source of supply available that is practical and sustainable.

01:05:17:20 - 01:05:49:18

So, um, the applicant has identified that. I think the preference, though, really is to steer away from not from potable sources of water for non-potable uses during construction. So it's a preference to look at a non-potable sources for just depression and wheel washing. And some of the, you know, some of the other activities that don't require it. So I think, um, looking at what's possible and what that hierarchy would look like and doing it in order to sort of start off the reactive engagement with potential permit applications to look at what's possible. Um, I think that was the next steps of the water resources assessment.

01:05:49:20 - 01:06:21:08

It was to look at logistics and cost implications. Um, as the applicant said, um, it's likely to be a mixture of those options. So, um, I have some sympathy for the lack of detail at this stage. I think a lot of this will come out in detail design and with contractors and pre commencement. But um, I think generally I'm pretty happy with what's been evaluated to date. And I've got confidence that there is a source of supply. It's just about how how water efficient it can be. Um, and how much we can avoid pressure on the water company through, um, through iterative design ultimately.

01:06:21:10 - 01:06:22:27

So yeah, just to say that.

01:06:23:26 - 01:06:30:00

It's really useful to hear your position, the Danish position on this. Thank you. Any remarks?

01:06:30:02 - 01:06:57:25

Yeah. Jason Fairbairn on the applicant. So as we said earlier on that hierarchy, ideally you wouldn't use clean potable water for those construction phase purposes. That's why that mix of potential options. But it's exploring those at the right point in the process. Obviously, some of the existing abstraction licences within the footprint of the project. And that's the opportunity potentially to license, trade and use some of those abstraction quantities. But obviously that's further down the process. And that would be using non-potable water for non-potable purposes to offset that potable demand.

01:06:57:27 - 01:06:58:16

Thank you.

01:06:58:18 - 01:07:04:24

Thank you. Any further comments on this before we move on to item D?

01:07:06:29 - 01:07:23:23

No. Okay. I shall the 17th 30 will explore the proposed approach to firefighting, containment and disposal of water at the proposed battery energy storage system. And I'll hand over to Mr. Willis for some initial questions on this matter.

01:07:24:22 - 01:07:55:04

Thank you, Mr. Tandy. Yeah. As I say, there's a there's a couple of questions I'd just like to start off with. This relates specifically to the fire modeling assessment that's been contained within appendix 16.5, which is app 187. So for the purpose of the assessment, five worst case scenario, fire locations have been identified and the modelling assumes an incident will occur at these locations at the same time. I also note that the battery storage units that have been used in the model in are smaller than those of the parameters that have been used for the purposes of the assessment elsewhere.

01:07:55:15 - 01:08:19:11

So really, my question to the applicant is given that there could be up to 540 battery energy storage units installed, and that the final units themselves may be larger and therefore contain more battery cells than those that have been used in the modelling. How can we be confident that the worst case scenario. Sorry, the modelling reflects the worst case scenario, particularly in relation to smoke and pollutant emissions.

01:08:28:00 - 01:08:32:25

I'm going to bring in Paul Gregory, who's the applicant, battery safety and testing consultant.

01:08:40:17 - 01:09:11:10

Paul Gregory for the applicant. Um, so the best fire emissions, uh, modeling, uh, study, uh. Environmental statement, volume three, appendix 16.5, um, uses an illustrative design. Uh, five megawatt hour current, uh, best enclosure design. Um, it models the toxic gases emissions.

01:09:11:19 - 01:09:44:06

Uh, as per the environment. Sorry. The UK Health and Security Agency um, modeling requirements. Um, and the results of the worst case fire scenario is based around the fact that the illustrative design, uh, underwent large scale fire testing, which is mandated now by NFPA 855 2026, recommended by National Fire Chiefs Council to demonstrate that the fire does not propagate from one best to another.

01:09:44:17 - 01:10:00:05

The best model that was used, um, underwent large scale fire testing, so there was no propagation, i.e. that worst case scenario was a loss of one Bess enclosure. Um.

01:10:03:10 - 01:10:07:08

Sorry. I'll just go down to the requisite.

01:10:09:11 - 01:10:10:28

Section one notes here.

01:10:24:19 - 01:10:25:19

So the

01:10:27:08 - 01:10:35:27

just to go to the report and the modeling inputs that were used, um, the consequence modeling. So.

01:10:38:00 - 01:11:16:16

Concentrations of carbon monoxide. Formaldehyde. Hydrogen chloride. Hydrogen cyanide, hydrogen fluoride, ammonia, nitrogen dioxide, and particulates from a potential fire were modeled using the air quality dispersion model to determine the likely effects on human health. In addition, a high level visibility assessment has been undertaken using the model particulate results to determine the effect of best fire emissions on visibility to the local road network. The modelling uses conservative assumptions, including the five worst case locations, so that's positioned at the boundary of the best, where best enclosures wouldn't be situated.

01:11:16:18 - 01:11:34:09

Um, uh, there was a worst case release height, uh, temperature and plume parameters, and the commission rates were assumed to persist for extended durations up to eight hours. Uh, there was the use of five years of hourly meteorological data with maximum.

01:11:34:22 - 01:11:51:26

I mean, sorry to stop you, I understand that. I think my point is within the assessment, I understand that correctly. Those pollutant concentrations. Therefore assume five units on fire at the same no time. No. So that so it is up based on that.

01:11:52:03 - 01:12:10:20

All Gregory for the applicant. As I just explained, large scale fire testing was conducted on this design to demonstrate that fire does not propagate from one best to another. Okay. So therefore the incident model is the complete burn out of a single best enclosure.

01:12:14:28 - 01:12:17:14

Containing the emissions that I've described.

01:12:17:16 - 01:12:54:18

Okay. So again, so I think that kind of probably leads me on to the next point, because I understand that, like you say, through the large scale fire testing which takes into a certain, uh, I understand, um, separation distances between each individual unit. That's correct. Um, I think turning to the layout of the best compound I note in the outline Battery Safety Management Plan, paragraph 3.122, it says that adequate separation distances between enclosures and energy storage equipment have been adopted to conform with those standards.

01:12:54:20 - 01:13:38:01

It's just a question. I note that I don't see anywhere where those distances are actually set out, those commitments within the design parameters of the project, they seem to be just embedded within the outline plan. So my question is why aren't they, if they are being relied upon as effectively partial mitigation to prevent thermal runaway or propagation of units? And I guess added to that would be I also don't see a plan in front of me that perhaps provides any indicative layout of the best compound itself to demonstrate that the number of units that's been identified within the parameters and the design of the scheme can be accommodated within that footprint.

01:13:38:05 - 01:14:11:17

Also, take into account any other infrastructure that might be needed to support it, such as the noise barrier, for example. So there's a couple of points there. One is the outline battery management plan

refers to. You've mentioned large scale site fire testing. Safety has been applied as modelling that assumes distances, those distances. I can't see our commitments within the parameters. Can they be. And two. Can we have a plan that shows that the number of units and the layout that you've as minimum distances is therefore deliverable and achievable within that compound area? Is that clear?

01:14:15:00 - 01:14:45:27

Paul Gregory for the applicant. Yes. So that that is clear. Um, so just to explain, so this, uh, for the DCO purposes, an illustrative current design. So best designs change every 12 to 18 months, so therefore it is not possible to select a design that will be commercially available at detailed design. So, as explained in the documentation. Um the spacing.

01:14:45:29 - 01:15:17:13

So in the outline battery safety management plan, uh it stipulates the uh the equipment spacing based on um, so the illustrative current best design, uh utilized for the OBS, EMP drafting and fire mission modeling demonstrated that fire did not propagate during large scale fire testing. Um, the loss of a single best enclosure is a credible worst case. Uh, and the separation, the illustrative site design, which there is, will have to, um, get the reference number for you.

01:15:17:15 - 01:15:20:18

But there is an illustrative site design that does show you.

01:15:23:12 - 01:15:23:27

Sorry.

01:15:23:29 - 01:15:32:11

That kind of leads to the question because I have not seen that unless I'm missing it. So I would be helpful if you've got an examination library reference number for that layout.

01:15:34:17 - 01:15:35:02

Uh.

01:15:35:10 - 01:16:17:01

Yes, we can get that shortly. Um, so the illustrative site design allows a separation distance of 2.5m between best blocks and 3.5m to energy storage system equipment, such as transformers and 2.5m between adjacent and back to back best enclosures. Okay. Um, section 3.1.22 of the obs MP stipulates uh LSF large scale fire testing of the selected best design to establish minimum equipment spacing, distances and site specific consequence modeling will provide a clear evidence based case for the final best compound installation plans at the detailed design stage, and will be agreed with.

01:16:17:03 - 01:16:41:17

North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, an independent fire protection engineer specializing in best, will validate all UL 948 test results. Large scale fire testing results and or third party test data and site specific consequence modeling which has been provided, and the illustrative site best site design is. App 058.

01:16:41:19 - 01:16:42:11

Sheet.

01:16:46:19 - 01:16:53:12
305059 sheet three of seven.

01:16:56:03 - 01:17:01:06
Sorry. 08058959.

01:17:01:08 - 01:17:01:25
Yes.

01:17:25:04 - 01:17:36:22
Paul Gregory for the applicant. Um, there is also a specific s area design. I'm just trying to find it on my laptop here. Um.

01:17:50:16 - 01:17:51:01
Okay.

01:17:51:03 - 01:18:21:24
Um, so it is the best layout, so it's best specific with a table on distances. Um, fire service, command and control. Um, so we will, um, look to signpost that in the documentation. It's very clear presentation of distances. Um, between equipment and all, um, uh, distances that the fire service, uh, would require for emergency response requirements.

01:18:21:28 - 01:19:15:03
Okay. Thank you. Um, so just again, I understand. So you've talked about that and there's a layout there and it's not highly detailed. And I think it just doesn't necessarily show also that any of the infrastructure that might be needed to be sited within that best count. Uh, best compound for other reasons. So noise barrier, for example. Is that okay to be accommodated taking into that layout? I haven't seen any of the plans. It may be, but if it isn't, that's the kind of thing I'm asking for. So also but also goes back to that point as well as is there a particular issue therefore with not committing to distances within the design commitments parameters at the moment? Or are you saying that that's because it could change at the time at which the technology is available, which might mean distances may be different, that we can't therefore commit to it at this stage?

01:19:15:17 - 01:19:42:08
This is exactly the latter as as Mr. Gregory described. And it's set out in the Outline battery safety management plan. It sets out a process by which the spacing will be agreed. The standard has has a minimum, but it is able to reduce as part of doing the testing and the engagement that's required by the plan. So I suppose if we're trying to secure an outcome, which is the design of the best that is safe and that comes through the process secured by the battery management plan, rather than saying a number now.

01:19:42:28 - 01:19:56:10

And sorry, just on the second reference. So you've got you've given me and I'll go look at that AP five nine sheet. Um, seven I think it was. Well, if it's not three, sorry. Um, what was the other afternoon you said you were going to come back to me on that, did you?

01:19:56:24 - 01:20:27:07

Uh, Paul Gregory for the applicant? Yes. The. I just quickly looked at my colleague's, um, laptop there. That's not the, um, the plan that I have on my laptop here, which does, as you queried, shows noise attenuation barriers, um, water tanks, hydrant positions or, um, fire service commander control. So that gives you on the illustrative design. Exact equipment, spacing, widths of roads, etc. so from a fire risk perspective, absolutely all the information that you require.

01:20:27:09 - 01:20:33:03

Okay, so could I just ask that in the summary or something. Someone signpost with that document. Really helpful. Thank you.

01:20:39:20 - 01:21:17:03

And Paul Gregory for the applicant. Yes. So with regard to equipment spacing. Yes. So with energy density increasing significantly, um, whilst for example, the the maximum parameters of an enclosure design are secured in the DCO, you know, the number of battery cells is reducing because the energy density in each cell is increasing significantly. So from a fire testing perspective, uh, current lithium ion phosphate systems, which predominant at the moment, which we have a lot of large scale fire test data.

01:21:17:05 - 01:21:51:02

You know, you cannot extrapolate, uh, what a design in three years, the heat flux that it will generate and the very specific, um, fire test data that we use to validate equipment spacing. Um, you know that that's why the Osm, um, secures through section five the testing and the risk assessments that must be conducted to validate, uh, that final site design and that must be agreed with. North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service before construction can begin.

01:21:51:17 - 01:22:01:06

Okay. Thank you. I'm going to move on. But before I do any particular comments from the council at this stage on that particular point?

01:22:04:17 - 01:22:12:18

I've got a hand up in the room. If it's if it's very short and I'm just conscious of time. But yeah, if it's relevant to this, for that, I'm happy to take it.

01:22:15:19 - 01:22:20:24

Thank you. Thank you ever so much. Robert Thames and parish council. I just wanted to.

01:22:20:26 - 01:22:22:06

Ask if there's any.

01:22:23:01 - 01:22:25:12

Thought gone into how they can bond.

01:22:25:14 - 01:22:27:02

All this water.

01:22:27:04 - 01:22:28:06

That's going to be.

01:22:28:08 - 01:22:29:12

Very toxic.

01:22:29:27 - 01:22:33:18

To stop it from going into the ground. Because there was a situation.

01:22:33:20 - 01:22:34:05

In.

01:22:34:08 - 01:22:45:00

Australia where there were 10,000l of toxic water that went onto the ground, and they made it all back up because it was so bad. That got into the ground.

01:22:45:19 - 01:22:49:11

But just about to go on to this point, actually. Thank you. Yeah.

01:22:51:19 - 01:22:55:06

In which case I'll add to Mr. Tandi, because that was the next line of question.

01:22:55:08 - 01:22:57:17

Yeah, we'll sort of move towards that now.

01:22:59:23 - 01:23:17:26

Just very briefly then and very quickly hopefully. Could you, the applicant, just explain the basis for the base fire issue, which will only last for four hours, and which paragraph 549 of the outline drainage strategy explains, influences the containment storage capacity that would be required for firefighting water.

01:23:24:20 - 01:23:28:02

Paul Gregory for the applicant. Um.

01:23:30:25 - 01:24:05:11

So you're just referring to the actual, uh, volume of water that's supplied. We're not talking about the drainage, but, um, so, yes, section four, .3.2, um, stipulates that this area will contain four hours water supply. That's 156,000l of water, which is more than 2.5 times the volume recommended by an FCC guidance. Um, and section 4.3.2 of the SMP also stipulates a best design, which may require direct North Yorkshire Fire Rescue Service.

01:24:05:13 - 01:24:50:29

Firefighting engagement tactics will not be selected for for this facility if firefighters are applying water, fog or spray patterns to adjacent bass enclosures, or deploying defensive spray plates that form a water curtain between the affected enclosure and the adjacent base. These tactics are called boundary cooling, and would likely be applied intermittently in 15 minute application periods, with temperature changes measured between the application periods. Section 4.3.1 of the OBS MP confirms that the firefighting water requirement will be fully assessed at the detailed design stage, based upon large scale fire testing of the best design selected, plus any additional fire and explosion test data provided by an independent fire protection engineer.

01:24:51:01 - 01:25:10:22

Water storage volumes will be fully agreed with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service. I can quite happily, um, sort of go down into the nuts and bolts of testing and tactics, if you like, but, um, I do have the notes on this, but bearing in mind perhaps the time frames, We just submit that sort of post?

01:25:10:24 - 01:25:19:17

I just wonder if you could point me to why four hours for firefighting was selected. Is that related to legislation or to guidance or.

01:25:21:23 - 01:26:02:17

FCC guidance recommends a minimum of two hours. So as the best safety, um, consultant on the project, I always recommend that, um, because it's an illustrative supply, that large scale fire testing demonstrates that propagation does not occur. Nonetheless, to add reassurance to the fire service, they're sure that an additional volume of water above the 2.5 times in this case is available. Bearing in mind this this is an illustrative scenario, um, and that all the tests and risk analysis and consequent modeling, including multiple, uh, best fires.

01:26:02:19 - 01:26:33:06

So for example, uh, looking at sort of fault scenarios. So rather than for propagating if say for example, um, ground fault issue caused to best to sort of simultaneously fail that the consequence modeling would demonstrate that the volume of water supply, that detailed design was adequate. And obviously the drainage final drainage design is based around what that agreed volume of water is so currently 456,000l.

01:26:33:08 - 01:26:41:11

But as mentioned in the obs MP, that will be decided at detailed design and agreed with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service.

01:26:44:05 - 01:26:44:28

Thank you.

01:26:52:04 - 01:27:30:11

The Environment Agency suggested in its relevant representation that applications for an activity permit would usually take four months. That could result in delays for resuming operation of the bears or substation facility after a fire. Agency also raised concerns that further rainfall events, or if there were to be a secondary fire event, may result in the drainage system being overwhelmed and a

pollution event occurring. Can the applicant explain how rainwater would be managed whilst the fire water sampling is undertaken, or before a discharge of the water environment is agreed?

01:27:35:14 - 01:28:00:02

Did I bring Mister Gregory in? Um, it's quite complicated. I think it's the answer, but. But the answer. The answer is that we're actually updating the battery safety management plan to reflect what the Environment Agency has asked us to do in terms of making sure there is appropriate system management to deal with that issue. And I believe that is before the environment at the moment to check that their content and that we dealt with that properly.

01:28:01:12 - 01:28:31:13

Paul Gregory for the applicant. Um. Yes. So sections 4.5.5, uh, to 4.5.15, which so additional sections have been added and existing sections amended. This covers the best drainage system requirements for pollution control. These must be fully agreed with the Environment Agency and secured in the OBS MP and the following OBS MP sections have been amended following consultation with the Environment Agency.

01:28:31:21 - 01:29:04:04

These are sections 4.5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9 and 5.11. Um. Ultimately, the OBS MP Outline Battery Safety Management plan reflects the drainage strategy content. So it's not standalone content, it's taken from the drainage strategy. And again, that documentation is being amended as part of the consultation with the Environment Agency. And I'm sure one of my colleagues here can speak more to that point.

01:29:04:12 - 01:29:12:01

So does the strategy still include for the discharge of the firewater to the environment,

01:29:13:26 - 01:29:17:20

to the water environment, whether that be to groundwater or otherwise?

01:29:17:22 - 01:29:48:19

Will MacBain on behalf of the applicant. So what the system is designed so the alarm goes off as an automated valve with a manual backup so it can be contained in the containment. In the surface water runoff containment facility, the lagoon, um, that is sized such that it can take the 100 year plus climate change, peak rainfall intensities and volumes, um, with the fire water on top of that, and having gone through that, then will discharge to a swale or to to a watercourse.

01:29:48:28 - 01:30:13:21

Um, so yes, it is designed so that we can't make that discharge. And the current philosophy is that it will be tested and a discharge wouldn't be made until we were happy to be safe. So this issue that we're discussing with the Environment Agency is about this. If you need to apply for a permit and that delay. So that's what we will need to work through with the Environment Agency to make sure that we don't make any discharges to the environment unless we're happy. It's clean. And what that permitting, how that permitting regime would work.

01:30:14:15 - 01:30:29:06

But I just checked with the Environment Agency. If an application for an activity permit was submitted in this location. Are there any reasons or surmountable issues? No. Now, that could not be adequately regulated under the pollution control framework.

01:30:30:25 - 01:30:48:29

Jane Field, Environment agency. Um, I can confirm that we have received draft documentation and revised management plans from the applicant, which we're currently reviewing. Uh, can I bring in my colleague Susie Batson, who should be able to elaborate a little bit more on the specifics of this? Thank you.

01:30:51:05 - 01:31:30:08

I am Susie Bates and groundwater and contaminated land specialist at the Environment Agency. Um, just to give you a quick background of where we are with the applicant, um, the applicant did propose that the drainage at the best and the substations would be fully sealed, and that any water would be contained and isolated from the water environment. And that's in line with our guidance. But as you pointed out, we did raise a number of issues in our relevant reps, including the controls of the drainage in the event of the fire, the installation of deep hold foundations at the best and substations, and whether they would compromise the integrity of the drainage system.

01:31:30:23 - 01:32:12:13

Um, the testing of prior water prior to disposal or release into their environment, um, and sampling of any contaminated material in the drainage substrate following fire. Um, we are working with the applicant regarding these um, and are on the way to resolving a lot of these issues. Um, mostly via minor updates to document and signposting to relevant documents has already been discussed. This includes the outline of the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan, the battery safety management plan, drainage strategy and patient response plan.

01:32:12:26 - 01:32:45:25

Um. Some matters will require some more amendments following the latest editions. Um, it's the if there is fire water. Going back to the point of whether a permit could be issued, if I water if there is fire water in the system, um, it would have to be fully tested. And, um, as we pointed out, it may take four months before it could be, um, a permit could be obtained. Um, it's not insurmountable, but it wouldn't be the ideal process.

01:32:45:27 - 01:32:59:05

Uh, anchoring off site would be the, um, the quickest option, but that would be up to the applicant to come up with the best way forward for that and show whether a permit would be acceptable.

01:33:04:28 - 01:33:30:16

That's that kind of hierarchy of activities i.e. sampling, discussing the Environment Agency and then agreeing the appropriate approaches is what we're saying. We're just it's almost just an acknowledgement. But in a situation where it's a discharge is needed and we accept that that would need a permit. But this is of course, in the context where there has been a fire at the best when there's a whole bunch of other things that would need to be resolved, and having to wait four months for a permit is probably the least of our concerns.

01:33:34:17 - 01:33:35:04

Okay.

01:33:37:23 - 01:34:08:03

We've talked about the water being contained. So a question to the applicant what attenuation feature is proposed at the Beze and where would this be located. And the reason I'm asking this is that in table five three of the outline drainage strategy, which is app 182. It suggests that approximately 11,000m³ of attenuation would be required in pairs, and that's not insignificant. At the moment we don't. We're sort of looking for a plan.

01:34:08:05 - 01:34:18:24

We think that we might be signposted to a plan for the layout of the beds, but we haven't seen one at the moment that shows where this such a large feature would sit.

01:34:20:21 - 01:34:22:28

Is that something the applicant could advise us on?

01:34:24:17 - 01:34:30:12

I think we'll ensure that's included if it's not already in the plan that Mr. Gregory mentioned.

01:34:32:21 - 01:34:34:22

Thank you. We'll add that as an action.

01:34:35:16 - 01:34:46:23

But I would say that that is in the context that the design of that would be signed off by all the relevant parties pursuant to the signoff of the to the drainage strategy and the management.

01:34:46:27 - 01:34:56:26

Yes. I think it's just, um, Having some certainty that these features are able to be included within those areas. Considering the size of them, um, that'd be useful.

01:34:59:10 - 01:35:05:12

I'll ask the local authority if they have any thoughts, but I don't believe they have someone in mind. Or water?

01:35:08:14 - 01:35:09:00

No.

01:35:14:15 - 01:35:35:14

And just for the same reasons, the same request applies for the attenuation features at the substations. Again, they are quite sizeable in terms of the volumes that have been identified. And there isn't. To my knowledge, unless I can be signposted to on a plan that has been provided for the substations in terms of a layout. And again, that would be useful to have, please.

01:35:37:23 - 01:36:10:22

MacBain on behalf of the applicant, there is a we are following the drainage hierarchy, so it is fully anticipated we will try and get as much of this water to to to Apart from the sealed systems which you talked about for the buzzers, but for the rest of it, we will be looking to achieve infiltration, which means that it's quite difficult to size the lagoon. I know on HS2 we assume that it would be fully impermeable. You end up with quite big lagoons. But we will. We will make some assumptions and can show some attenuation features within the general arrangement.

01:36:10:29 - 01:36:11:20

Okay. Shall have.

01:36:11:22 - 01:36:12:07

That.

01:36:12:09 - 01:36:13:12

To the action.

01:36:21:11 - 01:36:27:16

Okay. I'll just have one final opportunity for the Environment Agency or local authority to make a comment.

01:36:29:11 - 01:36:33:16

I move offshore to environment. No. Anybody else?

01:36:35:04 - 01:36:40:21

No. Thank you. I shall now hand it over to Mr. Medlin for the next agenda item, which is 4.7.

01:36:42:03 - 01:37:15:13

Thank you, Mr. Tandy. So moving on to agenda item 4.7 questions Concerning Landscape and Visual Interest. This may be at times abbreviated to L and VI or LVI. Again, questions are aimed towards the applicant as well as North Yorkshire Council. As previously mentioned, Natural England will not be attending this hearing and IPS will be brought in when appropriate. Can I check first through Mr. Fox? Can I ask Mr. Fox to briefly introduce exactly who from your team will be leading on this?

01:37:15:19 - 01:37:20:01

Um, Mr. John Rooney. At the end of the table there. Um. From Eric.

01:37:20:24 - 01:37:21:16

Thank you.

01:37:22:18 - 01:37:23:27

I close the curtain. Yeah.

01:37:26:08 - 01:37:26:24

Thank you.

01:37:28:19 - 01:37:29:04

Yes.

01:37:31:27 - 01:37:44:28

Thank you for confirming. Just for the purposes of transparency. Um, I'd just like to explain that I know of Mr. Rooney in a professional capacity for many years ago. Um, so I to put that on record.

01:37:46:22 - 01:37:55:00

Thank you. And can I just confirm that local authority has all members here needed? Mr. Johns, thank you for holding on.

01:37:56:02 - 01:37:59:18

Sure. Yes. Tim Johns here on behalf of North Yorkshire Council.

01:38:00:08 - 01:38:39:13

Excellent. Thank you. So I won't be, I think, due to the time requesting anything specific on the screen for this. Um, I will be referring to them specific viewpoints which may be referred to as VPCs. And these are all within app dash over chapter ten and app 095 the viewpoints plan. Firstly, I want to talk about landscape character. And this was going to be a question that I think I'm going to read this question out and seek a written response from both the applicant and North Yorkshire Council, before moving on to more substantive questions.

01:38:39:21 - 01:39:08:18

Question one was due to be landscape baseline, and whether the app can explain briefly what it considers to be the key characteristics and special qualities of the affected landscape character areas. Specifically, which of those characteristics would experience the greatest change as a result of the proposed development, and as a subset to that, to comment on how it considers that the approach is in line. The approach that is taken, its in line with GL, VA three guidance

01:39:10:09 - 01:39:10:24

about that.

01:39:10:26 - 01:39:19:05

So just check on that last very last point when you say the approach. Yeah. Of course the Jevi guidance that covers the whole process.

01:39:19:07 - 01:39:34:09

The overall approach. So it would have been asked orally, it's now going to be responded to in writing. I welcome Mr. Jones, your views on that as well as we would have gone through those questions.

01:39:34:18 - 01:39:41:19

The whole process of that is you're asking is in how we studied it exactly, not just about how character characterization. Yeah.

01:39:43:02 - 01:40:37:02

So turning on to substantive questions. I have a question on cumulative landscape effects. This was discussed at yesterday's open floor hearing. And at Tuesday's preliminary meeting, the examining authority confirmed its view that report on interrelationships would assist the examination and has set out what they should cover. First of all, can the applicant explain how the assessment has considered the interaction between this scheme and other existing, consented or reasonably foreseeable developments in the wider area? We should consider not only in SIPs, but there are other proposals and consented schemes that adjoin or are very close to the proposed development, and then set out at what point the applicant considers that the amount of solar development might begin to fundamentally alter the character of the landscape, rather than introduce change.

01:40:37:26 - 01:40:46:11

Mr. Rooney, I'll turn to you first. And if you could set that out reasonably briefly, that would be welcomed.

01:40:55:02 - 01:40:57:03

Sir John Rooney for the applicant.

01:40:57:19 - 01:40:59:24

I, in response to the question.

01:40:59:26 - 01:41:30:02

That you're now asking, writing would have provided a little bit more context to understand how the baseline is informed, the cumulative assessment. But fundamentally, we've assessed the cumulative effects on the landscape and views within section 10.14 of chapter ten. That's at reference 48, and the approach follows the methodology and shortlist in chapter 17. That's at 005055.

01:41:31:13 - 01:42:04:27

The shortlisting was developed with reference to the long list that's in appendix 17.1, and the process of shortlisting the sites considered as part of the cumulative assessment for landscape effects has followed the advice in Geo three, section seven. Um, so what JLB three says is you don't need to assess every development for cumulative effects. You need to look at where there might be some interaction and some similarity in development type to make the assessment proportionate.

01:42:04:29 - 01:42:32:23

So following that process through, we identified seven projects in total. Uh, they are generally industrial development, uh development with a similar character that could affect the landscape in a similar way. Um, the assessment does adopt a worst case approach, assuming that all those cumulative developments would be built out and, uh, the construction of those developments would be carried out at the same time.

01:42:34:27 - 01:43:03:05

Published landscape character assessments were used to identify the receptors. They're the same receptors as we've used for assessing the effects on of the proposed development. And for consistency, we use the landscape character areas defined in the Selby Landscape Character Assessment, which now forms part of the evidence base for the North Yorkshire Local Plan, and the boundaries for each solar development site were also used.

01:43:05:11 - 01:43:40:08

The assessment of potential cumulative effects associated with the development identified um, a short list of landscape character areas where, um, there could be some cumulative landscape effects. So out of the nine character areas affected, uh, within the study area, uh, for were shortlisted and only one of those we've determined would experience a change in the magnitude of impact, and that would be la LCA 11.

01:43:40:10 - 01:44:19:04

That's Sherborne Farmland and that's the location of site six and seven, site two. So there were a number of other schemes in that area around Gascoigne Wood mine, uh, some aerobic digestion facilities that are proposed mushroom composting facility. And so we felt that with those developments alongside the proposed development in year one of operations. So in winter, without the mitigation for the proposed element established in the landscape, there is the potential for additional effects in that scenario.

01:44:19:15 - 01:44:52:17

However, we felt that with the mitigation proposed as part of the proposed development, once that's established by year 15 of operation, that those effects would fall away. So we're not anticipating any further effects from the proposed development that could be cumulative with the other effects. During year 15, as part of our residual assessment. There were two consented solar farm schemes that we looked at as part of the review, both of which are consented and formed part of the future baseline for our assessment.

01:44:52:19 - 01:45:03:12

That's the scale Park Solar and best scheme, which lies to the north of Hambleton, and the Hallam Solar Farm, which lies to the to the east of Hallam.

01:45:06:20 - 01:45:47:28

Thank you. Okay. I think you touched on the year one and year 15 changes and landscaping that would reduce impacts over time before turning to the local authority and other IPS. Can you explain the evidence for assuming that that mitigation will perform as anticipated? How long is it expected to take before it becomes effective? What the landscape effects would be if the planting does not establish as successfully as predicted. On this, there is a continuum of obvious continuum between year one and year 15, and within that continuum, the applicant considers that certain viewpoints or certain areas are assessed.

01:45:48:00 - 01:45:49:14

The effects would reduce.

01:45:51:10 - 01:46:20:16

So that is to say, there is a point at time within that period that the assessment concludes that the effects reduce. There is no explanation or indication of where on that continuum this occurs, simply that it's some time between year one and year 15. I'd like to to seek your views on that. And further, the examining authority is aware that section 51 advice was issued to the applicant to seek additional photo montages.

01:46:22:03 - 01:46:45:25

Whilst I now and now the examining authority understand the applicant's response about following VA VA guidance. I still think it would be beneficial for the examining authority and other interested parties to have site some additional photo montages. And just to remind you, the section 51 advice sought year 15 winter photo montages.

01:46:47:10 - 01:47:00:04

This was also touched on at the open floor hearing, and I would appreciate you enlightening the examination, examining authority further as to any resistance to provide that request.

01:47:02:20 - 01:47:45:21

Thank you sir. John Rooney for the applicant. There are two quite separate different questions, so maybe I'll pause after my response to the first one. So as I understand it, you like to understand at what point the the mitigation, the planting becomes effective in mitigating those effects essentially. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Uh, it's common practice in landscape and visual assessment to assess the worst case in the year one of opening. Um, and uh, to do that in the winter scenario. So, uh, at that stage, uh, any planting would have been implemented, but not effective or not not established in, in soil, uh, such that it could provide, uh, good landscape integration and visual screening.

01:47:46:11 - 01:48:26:24

Uh, it's also common practice then to reassess those effects at a point in the future that often is 15 years later. That's standard practice, or it's not specified or stipulated in the guidelines for Landscape and Visual impact assessment, which are, um, uh, to a form a landscape practitioner's approach, not a rule book. Um, so we're confident that by assessing the effects of these two stages, we can understand how the effects can be mitigated. However, there is information which I can provide you within the assessment to understand better how that planting could become effective over time.

01:48:26:26 - 01:49:07:06

So we make a conservative estimate of a growth rate of 0.3m per year, and we're confident we can achieve that through the implementation of the prescriptions and management principles in the Landscape and ecological management plan. So that includes, um, prescriptions around how the plants would be planted in the field, uh, the quality of the plant stop material, um, the mulching and the irrigation that would be carried out to, to establish those plants, uh, with, um, a focus in the first year, five years of establishment.

01:49:07:08 - 01:49:38:03

So that's the period when most plants fail. So there's, um, a requirement in the outline landscape, in the project management plan to replace any failures during that period. Um, so, um, most of the plants would go in as transplants, forestry transplants. They are established better in the field. There are smaller plants with less well developed root systems, but the management plan also specifies the number of larger trees to assist in providing some more immediate impact.

01:49:38:18 - 01:50:09:04

Um, that, um, those prescriptions then follow through, uh, over the course of the lifetime of the project to ensure that those plants would become established in the field. So there isn't any, uh, uh, we

haven't provided any tables in the documentation to say this is the height the planting would reach. Because plants are natural material. We can't determine what, uh, each year will bring in terms of the climate. Um, but they're the conservative assumptions based on our professional experience.

01:50:09:23 - 01:50:27:22

Okay. Thank you. Would it be possible? Yeah, to provide some of that information or signposting to those assumptions on those growth rates that you've referred to. And the part of the question on the additional photo montages. Next, please.

01:50:28:22 - 01:51:06:06

Yes, sir. Yes. Um, we've obviously received and read the section 51 letter and understood your, um, your request. It's, uh, it's not common practice for for us to be, uh, for that request to be made. Um, we, as I mentioned before, you know, we've assessed the worst case effects in year one of operation. So we understand what the maximum visibility is. The purpose of a year 15 scenario is to understand how that mitigation can be effective. The photo montages are, um, additional material really to assist stakeholders as much as anything in understanding the effects.

01:51:06:19 - 01:51:26:03

Um, but we as professionals, um, who are assessing, uh, these developments in the field, understand how to assess evidence in both scenarios in winter and the summer scenario. So we're we're confident we have a robust assessment. Um, and I think I'll leave it there.

01:51:26:25 - 01:51:37:11

Okay. Thank you. I will now turn to North Yorkshire Council for any comments that Mr. Jones may wish to make on what we've discussed so far.

01:51:39:03 - 01:52:15:21

Yes. Tim Jones from North Yorkshire Council. Um, yes. Thank you for the opportunity. Um, certainly we are, uh, we accept the, um, process that, um, the applicant has made in terms of those, uh, the route through the cumulative landscape assessments, uh, the reference to to the different receptors there in terms of the character areas and then the different sites. Um, we we have reviewed the table on the selected, shortlisted, um, projects that have been considered in the cumulative effects, and we would beg to differ.

01:52:15:23 - 01:52:58:29

Certainly in our our local impact report, we will be, um. Uh, challenging the challenging that short list. Um, so that will be coming through from us shortly. Um, just in terms of the discussion around, um, you know, predicting the, um, the impacts of mitigation. Certainly don't disagree with what the applicant just set out there. Obviously, what we would say is that, um, fairly stating the obvious is, as we know, we are into sort of our third or fourth heat wave of the year, so critical that, uh, any new landscape planting, when it goes in the first sort of three years are absolutely critical.

01:52:59:01 - 01:53:33:18

So that, uh, kind of irrigation is so important. Uh, obviously that's the time when the planting material is at its most vulnerable. So, um, certainly, in summary, really follow the process that the applicant has set out. Would challenge some of the short list of identified cumulative projects that interact

cumulatively. And again, I've just sent out what my thoughts are in terms of expected expectancies with the, um, uh, the mitigate or the establishment of planting as part of mitigation.

01:53:36:18 - 01:53:46:29

Thank you. So I had a note also that Hambleton Parish Council, is it Mrs. Farris would like to talk on cumulative landscape.

01:53:47:20 - 01:53:49:14

No, not at this moment. Thank you.

01:53:49:24 - 01:53:51:00

Okay. Thank you.

01:53:53:20 - 01:53:59:00

In that case, I'll just go and, um, we'll aim to move on. But, Mr. Fox.

01:53:59:08 - 01:54:48:00

Just two quick points. First. First, I just wanted to confirm on the interrelationships report. Um, it was referenced as interrelationships with other entities which wanted to confirm to yourselves and the room. That is part of that we are going to include in that essentially the nearby 50 megawatt solar schemes that Mr. Rooney just mentioned, because I appreciate that some of the concerns were raised this week and I imagine would be would be on your mind as well. So, um, so just to confirm that, um, and then just, just, just, just on a point of principle, I really wanted to make this point, which is that, um, the question of is, is the mitigation going to work is essentially fundamental to the, to the ES assessment, and there has to be some level of understanding that mitigation measures committed to this type of mitigation measure that's committed to the schemes across the country.

01:54:48:09 - 01:55:19:18

Um, and if we start to doubt that any mitigation measures are going to be effective or work, then we'd be doubting every assessment that's ever done. And I say that because appreciate some of the risks that were just raised there. And more generally, for the visual impacts here, the planting is so important. But the importance there is about making sure that we've got robust maintenance and, um, monitoring and management regimes to make sure that the mitigation is doing the job that we say it will, which is a kind of monitor and check approach.

01:55:19:20 - 01:55:32:08

But from a starting point, the starting point needs to be that these mitigation measures that are standard work, because we don't have that starting point. Then you as I say, you'd be questioning every assessment, every mitigation for every scheme that there is.

01:55:32:18 - 01:55:33:09

Okay.

01:55:39:03 - 01:55:41:22

Mr. Willis would like us to ask a question.

01:55:41:24 - 01:56:12:29

Yeah, only because it seems pertinent. Now, later on in the agenda, we've got glint and glare assessment. And I had got a question around the advanced planting, because I think advanced planting has been promoted as a mitigation for addressing some of the effects that have been identified in, particularly on rail and road users, to offset or to sorry to mitigate the glint glare effects on those users. So I had actually got a question around the answers. The question has been answered about the assume growth rates and period of maintenance.

01:56:13:03 - 01:56:47:13

But I think the glint and glare assessment effectively said by the end of year one of operation, those effects that have been identified would be mitigated. So my question is, well, how have you assumed that would be mitigated then if like the plantings going in? What rates have you assumed? If it's not assumed, then there's potential that those effects could last for a longer period than it's been assessed. But also the other question was, um, the effects of glint of glare exist from the presumably the point at which they're installed, not from the operation.

01:56:47:15 - 01:56:56:07

So there could be installed and then not operating for 12 months. Another, for example. So you see the point I'm getting that. Yes.

01:56:56:19 - 01:57:28:01

Mr. Fox, and half of the applicant say section 4.2.3 of the lamp sets out our commitment there in terms of, I'm undertaking a new assessment based on the detailed design. Um, and if those effects expected to rise, and we're not able to work with the landowners to change the existing planting that we would put in place planting. And the crucial point is, um, to put in place the planting that is needed to cause to achieve the mitigation impact.

01:57:28:11 - 01:57:58:23

I'm trying to say that, um, so there's two points there. So that's either three, um, the appropriate species, um, you know, mature species, for example. Uh, and or coming back to the discussion from this morning around preliminary works, being able to kind of crack on and put those in, um, crucially, um, that commitment to advance planting. Um, is there to be put in place prior to the installation of the panels, not before their operations and before the panels are installed.

01:58:00:07 - 01:58:30:19

And I think that I understand that will come on to it. There's some slight tweaks here, but that doesn't matter. But again, that's the point. I understand the advanced planting goes in before those works take place, but it was just about well, if those if the advanced planting needs to achieve a certain level to mitigate the glint and glare effects. In particular, I'm looking at the effects on the A63. For example, to the south of abutment one. It says those effects would be addressed by the end of year one of operation.

01:58:30:27 - 01:58:42:06

So it's just knowing that there's a what level of you assumed that the planting would achieve to address those effects, to get rid of any glint and glare effects by the end of year one operation?

01:58:42:27 - 01:59:05:05

That that question is understood. I think partly the answer to that is it would depend on the detailed, um, design of the scheme as to which what the extent of that glinting glare would actually arise in the face of the detailed design. I think what we need here, sir, is looking at that wording in section 4.2 of the length is a bit more. Um. Uh,

01:59:06:24 - 01:59:38:24

not. I'm hesitating. I don't use the word detail, but a bit more around what the commitment is. And the commitment is about the outcome, which is that we would put in place the planting that ensures that the significant effect doesn't arise. And what that planting would be would be dependent on the effect. And whether, as we said, we managed to commit to work with the landowners to develop their existing planting. So we can't say right now it would be this type of species, um, because it would need to be part of the discussion that we would have in approving the detailed plan to get approval for those measures.

01:59:39:07 - 01:59:48:10

Um, so I think it's a bit more of making sure that it's very, very clear that the outcome will be achieved. Um, and, um.

01:59:51:05 - 02:00:10:10

And sorry, actually, having said that, 4.2.32 says that if we've done that reassessment. We have been unable to confirm that we've been able to work with landowners to do it. We will include details of location, species type and height, and planting to be put in place to mitigate those effects. So that detail will come later.

02:00:10:12 - 02:00:20:04

And I understand that. But my point is, I think, is that specifically about dwellings, I'm talking about also is about impacts on road.

02:00:20:06 - 02:00:26:29

Yeah, it's all receptors. So it's referencing the locations shown on the figure for advanced planting. Um, which.

02:00:27:01 - 02:00:53:16

Which includes residential receptors road receptors and rail receptors from memory. Yes. Yeah. So the expectation is that advanced planting will go in as part of preliminary works to mitigate. In particular I'm looking at the road here. Yes. Right. Road on the A63. Advanced planting will go in. It's an expectation that would be based on the growth rates that have been assumed at 0.3 per year. Mm.

02:00:55:15 - 02:00:59:03

So you know, well After five years, it could be what? A meter and a half high.

02:01:00:02 - 02:01:15:24

Well, I mean, this is what it comes down to. It's all part of. We'll be presenting both the detailed assessment and what the measures need to be to mitigate the impact. Yeah. Because it might not need

to be that high. Um, by a certain point in time. Or it might be that we've gone and gotten mature planting, but.

02:01:15:26 - 02:01:28:05

But to assume or to assess that the impacts for glint and glare therefore will have ceased by the year end of year one of operation. You must have made some assumption about what that level must be to take away any risk.

02:01:29:23 - 02:01:45:09

I think we can take that away to say what that might be, but I think that's that would have to be assuming that we're not able to find what you are planting, and it's on the basis of a worst case then to get a level of effect so that we then need to put that planting in.

02:02:02:21 - 02:02:56:26

Okay, just before we continue on, I'm just wary of what we've been going on for some time since our last break. Given the time, I'd like to continue if that's in agreement with those in attendance, so that we can conclude as soon as possible, seeing generally that that's supported. We did. Obviously, we have had an aspirational agenda today of items to get through, and we've had lots of good discussion around detailed points. I have been notified that Historic England's representative has been unable to attend um during today, and they needed to step away on that basis, the examining authority had considered it probably what the best course of action is, is to move the questions we would have asked today around cultural heritage to action points, if that would be agreeable, and we can make the best use of the remaining of our time here today on other items.

02:02:57:28 - 02:03:01:02

Firstly, I'll just ask the applicant whether that would be agreeable

02:03:03:01 - 02:03:03:22

to applicant.

02:03:04:00 - 02:03:05:22

Absolutely. Yep.

02:03:06:03 - 02:03:11:10

And I'll just check with North Yorkshire Council. I appreciate um, you've been sat here today

02:03:12:26 - 02:03:19:09

wanting to talk to this item and I do apologize for for that, but hopefully you can understand the position.

02:03:19:25 - 02:03:52:02

Um, Diane Wilson, principal conservation officer for North Yorkshire Council. Yeah. Really appreciate the discussion is required for this application. Um, the only thing I was obviously I don't know where the discussion would have gone with through heritage, but one thing I'd picked up on in the, um, in chapter eight of the chapter eight of the Cultural Heritage report, was that conservation area appraisals were not available online.

02:03:52:07 - 02:04:19:04

For monk, Friston and Eskridge. Um, but I've taken the liberty of photocopying, um, a copy each, which I would have commented on and presented so I can leave them with you today. Unfortunately, then if you did want them. But unfortunately there were too large to email. And it's just with the council still going through a transition of merging, not everything's available online, but if you do want a copy, I've got them there if you want them.

02:04:19:06 - 02:04:28:16

Would it be possible to have those in a digital format and then be submitted for deadline one as part of your written representation?

02:04:28:22 - 02:04:36:12

Um, Diane Wilson for North Yorkshire Council, I can try and, um, work out how to send them digitally. Yeah. No problem.

02:04:37:10 - 02:04:40:12

That can be appreciated. And thank you for your understanding today.

02:04:41:12 - 02:05:12:02

Just to respond to that correctly, Mr. Fox, just to confirm that we have received those, um, and our initial view is that they don't change the conclusions of our assessment. So this is not going to be a big issue. But obviously we will respond in writing. But I just wanted to raise it. It's not going to be a big issue. Um, and so I just want to take a quick opportunity just, just in terms of the things that we might not get to, um, because I'm conscious, um, with ecology, one of the matters we didn't discuss was natural. Natural England's comments about noise and ecology.

02:05:12:08 - 02:05:45:14

I only wanted to mention that because I'm conscious that that is goes to HRA, and you'll be and you'll be worried about reporting on that. And I just wanted to reassure you that we have had very productive discussions with them, um, that we're going to be updating the HRA to take account of what they wanted to see on that point about noise. And we're very confident that the deadline three, then we'll be able to say that they're happy with that, so that you won't have to worry about that. For for that and conscious that I can't remember where the line three fits with your questions and reports on the European sites, I just wanted to reassure you, given how much you're thinking about that, that is on a positive.

02:05:47:09 - 02:06:03:15

Thank you. That is appreciated. Okay. So we will now continue on with item 4.7 and then conclude with 4.8, although it will be short for 4.8 given we've covered a lot of that already. Thank you, Mr. Mellon.

02:06:05:05 - 02:06:16:23

Thank you. So I think I made the point about the request for year 15 photo montages. And I will now just ask once more, is this something that you are prepared to submit?

02:06:22:24 - 02:06:46:11

I mean, I think we're taking the message that it's been asked for on multiple occasions. What I would say is, um, that it does take quite a bit of time to produce, um, photo montages. Um, and we need and we will need to look at the kind of base of photography that we have. So I wouldn't like to say that we could do this for ten times, and it might be deadline three. Okay.

02:06:46:13 - 02:07:02:23

Yeah. If you could provide an update as to how that is going, if and when it could be provided would be appreciated. Mr. Johns, I see you've come back on. Is there anything you wanted to say on landscape character before I move us on to visual impact?

02:07:05:03 - 02:07:39:03

Yes. Tim Johns from North Yorkshire Council. Really just on that topic of the photo montage. Um, as the applicant said earlier, they're very useful for stakeholders to review. So we would be keen to, um, see those. Um EFI photo sorry. Year 15 photomontage photo montages. Winter scene. Um, it may I just go back to a topic on the, um, I'm looking at the agenda if it's if it's appropriate. Um, so I'm looking at 4.7 a, um, bullets, the second bullet.

02:07:39:09 - 02:07:49:28

Um, sorry. Now I'm looking at the first bullet. 4.7 a. uh, there was a question around landscape character effects beyond the operational phase and how they've been assessed. Is it appropriate to ask about that now?

02:07:51:06 - 02:07:55:01

Is this a comment that you wish to make on that point.

02:07:55:09 - 02:07:56:05

If I may?

02:07:56:21 - 02:07:59:11

Yes, please. In that case, before we move on, that would be helpful.

02:07:59:13 - 02:08:30:01

Yeah, certainly. So I understand from this morning I am going to paraphrase it, but I understand from the applicant that the the intention set in terms of mitigation planting, um, going in um, you know, before operation that that potentially could, could some of it or even all of it could be removed once decon decommissioning phase starts. So it was really just to um, we certainly will be asking in our local impact report just to, to to understand that that matter better.

02:08:30:03 - 02:09:13:06

It seems at the moment that in the decommissioning, uh, environmental management plan, there's a fairly, um, non-committal statement about it's really up to the landowner to decide about whether mitigation planting is retained or not. Just just to briefly say that, I think we'd all say in the room that hedgerow planting, woodland planting have, um, amazing effects in terms of mitigation and support of landscape character, but many multifunctional benefits too. We've just been talking about the water environment and the like, so just would be keen that that matter would be, um, considered in

terms of decommissioning, the possibility of retaining infrastructure wherever green infrastructure, wherever possible.

02:09:14:00 - 02:09:18:16

Thank you. Thank you for that point, Mr. Fox.

02:09:18:18 - 02:09:55:10

Mr. Smith. Try to keep it brief. Um, I think we agree that there is benefits from landscaping, but I would reflect this is in general context, some of the questions we had this morning about agricultural land, for example, that we've agreed these agreements with landowners to come onto their land and then to go away again. Um, And to impose things that they might not want in 60 years time, um, would be changing their land use, um, and would mean that, you know, you're balancing that versus the fact that that would mean that all that land, which was agricultural land, is not able to return to agricultural land.

02:09:55:12 - 02:10:06:14

So there is a balance with these things. Um, but it fundamentally comes down to it's not appropriate for the DCO to be imposing restrictions on the landowners who are then getting the land back as they had it.

02:10:06:18 - 02:10:39:02

Okay. Thank you. I think that point has been made and certainly is noted. I'm going to move us on now looking at the time to visual impact. So we, the examining authority, has heard relevant representations. And at yesterday's open floor hearing that a number of property owners adjacent to the proposed development have raised concerns about aspects of the development, including the proposed offset from their properties to the proposed solar arrays.

02:10:39:05 - 02:11:16:21

They provided comparison distances, including other schemes, and referenced, for example, Botley West Solar project. I'd like to ask the applicant about its approach to offsets, whether or not greater offsets have been considered, and if not, then why not? If they were considered, then why were they discounted and looking at offsets if they were increased specifically at residential receptors? What would be the consequences for the proposal? So the proposed 30 meter setback differs to a number of other projects and consented schemes.

02:11:17:03 - 02:11:48:10

Given that there are relatively few residential properties in the vicinity of any of the sites, and the landform is generally flat and there is potentially limited opportunity for screening with vegetation, what reasons are there for not introducing a greater setback. I will then look at a number of those viewpoints in greater detail. So the first point to this question is the setback issue.

02:11:48:24 - 02:12:12:06

The next is that the examining authority has visited a large proportion of viewpoints and want to look at Milford Lodge, Milford Grange and Siddall House. That's the viewpoint. The relevant viewpoints will be 2.46, 3.45 and 47. Around St six.

02:12:13:28 - 02:12:48:10

So I'm not proposing to bring these up on the screen. Viewpoint 45 is a public right of way within SPS six solar Development site six near viewpoint 47, Milford Grange, which is just to the south of Vester six. VP 46 is adjacent to Milford Lodge, which is on the north eastern boundary of SD six. As I say, the examining authority visited these on unaccompanied site inspection, including and access required inspection. Some of the IPS who live there attended yesterday's open floor hearing.

02:12:48:12 - 02:12:53:04

The examining authority also visited Siddall House, which, um.

02:12:55:00 - 02:13:22:04

It has ten to its north east boundary of SDS two. I'd like to ask the applicant to explain the difference in effects of the proposed development at 45, 46, 47 SDS two on the residential and public rights of way receptors. I would like further explanation on conclusions as to how the applicant has arrived at the residual effect. Conclusions. Looking at the differences between

02:13:23:20 - 02:13:57:07

45, 46, 47 and VP ten. So VP 45 at year 15 is minor adverse events a public right of way. BP 46 year 15 minor adverse. That's a residential receptor. VP 47 minor adverse. Again public right of way VP ten is moderate adverse at year one. And moderate adverse still significant at year 15. So I think it was mentioned yesterday. So the farm house is the only residential receptor at year 15 with a moderate adverse residual effect.

02:13:58:02 - 02:14:14:05

Can you explain the differences between the impacts here and those other residential receptors, such as Milford Grange and Milford Lodge? First of all, I'll go to the applicant for discussion around these particular points.

02:14:17:20 - 02:14:29:01

That's, first of all, is the issue around the setbacks and what impact that would have. And the second part is those specific viewpoints and the effects on them.

02:14:34:20 - 02:15:06:24

Thank you, Sir John Rooney, for the applicant. I need you to find the various documents you're referring to. Um, I'll start by just providing a little bit of context to how the visual assessment has been carried out, if that would be helpful. Um, so there's a detailed assessment in appendix 10.1 of the S, which sets out receptor by receptor with reference to the relevant representative viewpoints, uh, the baseline and the entire assessment through three phases of the scheme. Um, the visual assessment was iterative.

02:15:06:26 - 02:15:44:11

So we started with a large study area and then refined that down, uh, through the use of um, zones of theoretical visibility and field work. And this fed into the um, the scheme that you see in the application now. Um, and that includes, uh, applying the objectives of the project to move or keep away from the edges of existing settlements. So, as you said, uh, uh, relatively few residential

receptors are actually affected by this scheme. Um, the assessment has identified 53 representative viewpoints, of which a small number relate to residents.

02:15:45:12 - 02:15:49:19

Uh, those viewpoints are agreed with North Yorkshire Council in November last year.

02:15:51:17 - 02:16:33:18

The um the visual impact assessment is guided by the guidelines for landscape and visual impact assessment. So this looks separately at the sensitivity of the receptors and then the magnitude of impact. And it's important to understand when you're looking at the sensitivity of visual receptors that this is a two part process. First it's looking at the value attached to the views, which is informed by the landscape that the views are across, and then separately, the susceptibility to change of those receptors and the guidelines and our assessment reflect and understand that residents at home are amongst the highest sensitivity receptors.

02:16:33:20 - 02:17:11:03

So sorry, higher susceptibility receptors. But what the assessment has identified is that the landscape across which these receptors view the scheme, and particularly around the sites that you've just described, is of low value. And so therefore, taking the low value attached to the views and the high susceptibility of those receptors comes out as a medium sensitivity to change overall. So I think that's an important point to make. Um, with with respect to the offsets, um, we've also considered the landscape that we're introducing this project into.

02:17:11:06 - 02:17:43:05

This is a flat landscape, as you say. Um, it's a there's very little, uh, uh, topographical variation in the landscape. And what that means is even small amounts of vegetation can have a big impact on on views and the the length of you. So there are some areas where the landscape is very, very open because of the industrialization of the landscape, the removal of the hedgerows. But there are places where hedgerows can provide very successful screening.

02:17:43:07 - 02:18:19:22

And that's what, um, how we've, uh, settled on a 30 meter offset from the curtilage of residential property. So from the back of people's gardens out to the fence line of the projects, there'd be, uh, an additional four metres from that before the, the nearest solar panels. And we we feel that's appropriate. It's led by the, the evidence, the character based evidence. Um, and it's consistent with other projects that we've worked on. And that gives us sufficient space to integrate planting that provides all of the functions that, um, Mr.

02:18:19:24 - 02:18:31:03

Johns has talked about in relation to green infrastructure, but also the visual screening function. I'll pause there in case you have any further questions on that point before we move on to the specific receptors.

02:18:32:12 - 02:18:45:23

I think no questions on that point. Those points that you've raised, if you could just briefly summarize the differences, I suppose, between those specific viewpoints and receptors.

02:18:48:09 - 02:18:57:16

Thank you sir. Um, so perhaps if we take Siddall house, uh, first little farmhouse, uh, I'm going to have to quickly find that in my document.

02:19:00:28 - 02:19:32:09

So a little farmhouse is the, uh, the, uh, the residence of local communities receptor that we've identified in relation to viewpoint ten is the only residential, uh, receptor that we've identified. Uh, long term residual significant effects for, um, in that location. The property faces to the south towards the A63, which is in the middle ground of the views from that property. And as is common with visual impact assessment.

02:19:32:11 - 02:20:06:08

Um, in as part of the process, we've used public locations to to make that assessment from that's consistent with the guidelines for landscape and visual impact assessment and the subsequent notes and clarifications from the Landscape Institute in August 2024. Um, so those views are are open. The that property has no vegetation immediately to the south of the nearest garden or on the field boundaries. There is some substantial vegetation within the garden on the western side.

02:20:06:27 - 02:20:44:13

Um, that does, uh, screen some of the views out across the, the western part of site two. So we have taken that into account in our assessment and identifying high and very high magnitudes of impacts in construction and the first year of operation. Um, we do, um, through the, uh, outline environmental masterplan. We indicate planting along the boundary, and we're confident that by year 15 of operation that will be effective in screening the majority of views from ground level, which is what, um, landscape and visual impact assessment is concerned with.

02:20:47:09 - 02:20:49:16

Would you like to come in or should I move on to the next one?

02:20:50:04 - 02:21:00:18

Yeah. If you just if you could also just summarize as well, I think we'll, um, I need to bring in Mr. Jones as well. So if you could summarize moving on to the next one. Sure.

02:21:00:20 - 02:21:43:07

So if I take, uh, I think you asked for Milford Lodge. Milford Lodge cottage next. Um, these properties sit in a different context there in relation to site six. They lie to the north of site six. Um, both properties overlook, uh, overlook the site. Milford Lodge Cottage is a different context. It has more vegetation within its garden within its domestic curtilage. Um, uh, it does look out over to the to the east and west, but, um, from the from the garden, from our assessment from 3.46 has um, there's more in the foreground and the scheme has avoided the fields immediately to the east of that property.

02:21:43:20 - 02:21:59:18

Again, the offset is 30m from the curtilage. And that also provides us with sufficient space to incorporate vegetation. Um, we are also proposing on the outline environmental masterplan. Excuse me saying.

02:22:03:07 - 02:22:32:13

Planting to the rear of their garden, uh, within the order limit. So more substantial tree and shrub planting to reinforce the vegetation that already exists within their property and on the boundary. And to the west, there's an area that coincides with the the emergency landing strip for Sherborne Airfield, which would be kept open as well. So we're keeping more of that view open by virtue of leaving development out of those areas.

02:22:38:08 - 02:22:51:17

Thank you for that explanation. And that is noted. Mr. Johns, did you have anything to comment on these specific receptors that have been discussed here?

02:22:54:08 - 02:23:13:24

Nothing on the. So you have to bear with me because I am I have several screens, a number of screens open here. So um, nothing in terms of, uh, Siddall House. Hopefully I've pronounced that correctly. Um, could you just remind me of the Milford Cottages? Because I have a masterplan open. Could you remind me which viewpoint that was?

02:23:14:13 - 02:23:19:00

So the VP 45, 46 and 47.

02:23:19:09 - 02:23:20:22

Yeah, yeah.

02:23:25:07 - 02:23:34:00

And just remind me, the applicant just described the view from which receptor. Yeah. Because I have I have site six masterplan open at the moment.

02:23:34:12 - 02:23:38:01

Yeah it was Milford Lodge okay.

02:23:38:26 - 02:23:43:17

And the relevant viewpoint. So. Oh yes I see if you viewpoint 446. Yeah, yeah.

02:23:47:05 - 02:23:52:23

Yeah I mean I, I have no comments at this stage. Uh, no questions, but um, yeah. See you.

02:23:52:25 - 02:24:02:05

Thank you. I will just in see if any of the IP's wish to discuss on this residential receptor issue.

02:24:05:14 - 02:24:06:05

No.

02:24:07:22 - 02:24:08:07

Uh.

02:24:10:07 - 02:24:15:00

Could it be extremely quick based on the time? Thank you. Stuart Stark, the.

02:24:15:02 - 02:24:41:18

Resident of Monk Friston, speaking on on um, this topic, I think from what was just said there, the idea that these views across the landscape being a very low value, first of all, that's very subjective. And I think specifically the people who live in these houses probably view that very much the opposite, that that is specifically of what is very high value, the openness of those grounds.

02:24:43:00 - 02:24:44:01

Thank you for.

02:24:44:16 - 02:24:47:10

That also applies for the other people who get to enjoy those views as well.

02:24:47:12 - 02:24:48:10

Thank you. Okay.

02:24:52:07 - 02:25:27:05

So I think we will be returning to the issue of residential amenity through the examination. For now, I am satisfied that I've got some answers to some of those specific viewpoints. Um, my final item on views is is not really a question. It it relates to viewpoint 41. The examining authority noted the absence of certain views from viewpoint 41 Hamilton Hoff specifically in the photo montages.

02:25:27:23 - 02:25:41:01

SDS eight didn't appear to be shown, whilst in my view it ought to be viewable from VP 41, that's an action point for the applicant.

02:25:42:09 - 02:25:49:09

Sorry, Sir John Rooney for the applicant. Can you just clarify what additional information you're looking for? Are you suggesting that we've made an omission?

02:25:51:03 - 02:26:16:20

It would be to illustrate the how, um, SDS site eight is indeed, in my view, visible from viewpoint 41. So there are views and photo montages from VP 41, which appear not to show certain aspects of the proposed development. You can come back in a note on that. If if you disagree.

02:26:16:22 - 02:26:19:00

I will check that, sir, and we'll come back to you.

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

Thank you.

02:26:23:03 - 02:26:25:22

So can you say again which number that was?

02:26:25:24 - 02:26:27:18

That was viewpoint 4141.

02:26:33:03 - 02:26:37:17

I'll just do one final check and.

02:26:42:03 - 02:26:53:06

Sorry, sir, if I may. Um, I think I've got the answer for you. So, uh, viewpoint one is illustrated with, uh, an annotated photographs and not a photo montage.

02:26:53:27 - 02:27:14:02

Sorry. No, it's viewpoint 41. I'll leave it as an action, which you can just simply respond to in writing following the event. Is there anything further you wanted to say on the views of Mr. Stockdale? Interested person. Interested parties.

02:27:14:08 - 02:27:20:00

Thank you, sir, for the opportunity to come back on that matter. Um, yes. I noted the reference there in

02:27:21:22 - 02:27:52:03

landscape and visual impact assessment is a professionally led, objective process that's based on evidence. Uh, we know that everybody, um, experiences views in different ways and puts different values on them. But the purpose of landscape and visual impact assessment is to understand the value attached to views, um, in relation to the public, essentially, when it moves into a residential community, which, you know, we were starting to talk about, that's a different matter.

02:27:52:05 - 02:28:19:11

But the threshold for residential visual amenity assessment is very high. And, uh, we've determined through our assessment that that threshold has not been met. So, um, yeah, we do have sympathy for, um, the, the this development will change people's views, but ultimately, uh, there is no right to view. And, uh, we've assessed the, uh, the impacts on those views objectively based on the evidence in the in the documentation.

02:28:21:08 - 02:28:23:16

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. One final.

02:28:23:18 - 02:28:54:15

Yes. Sorry. I just wanted to add that, um, to your question earlier as well. I mean, obviously, we've we've applied our professional judgment in the context of the methodology that's required by Govia. Um, and that is set out in app 167 and table one seven, which talks about the values attributed to views. Um, so I'm only raising that just in the context that interested parties might want to look at that, but that that is what has been applied in this assessment and reflects best practice and via assessment.

02:28:55:23 - 02:29:09:26

Okay. Thank you. That concludes the questioning On landscape and visual interest from me for now, and I will move on to agenda item 4.8.

02:29:15:09 - 02:29:47:04

Thank you. So this item we've, um, entitled Glare and Battery Energy Storage. I think actually the battery energy storage questions we've kind of covered off already under landscape and water matters, so I don't particularly want to ask anything on that at this stage. There was actually then in terms of glint and glare, there was just one particular point I wanted to pick up before we close. Um, and that was in relation to the emergency landing, um, airfield that has been referenced yesterday and again today. Actually, um, it was just a point of clarification for my understanding.

02:29:47:10 - 02:30:27:07

As we say, I understand that based on the illustrative layouts and the modelling that's been undertaken, that the environmental statement didn't identify a need for any specific mitigation for the Sherborne Enable Elmet airfield, and also the empirical study that identified that there was no the modelled results didn't suggest there was any real world impact. So my question was really this emergency landing strip that's been identified with an indicative layout? I'm not aware that it's been suggested or identified in the environmental statement as specific mitigation that was needed for any purpose, I was unclear.

02:30:27:09 - 02:30:45:12

The first time I'd seen reference to it was in relevant reps. So I was a you know, where did it come from? It's appeared on the illustrative plans, but also, um, if it is mitigation, how is it secured? Because I think again, at the moment it's shown illustrative on the plan, which isn't fixed.

02:30:47:13 - 02:31:19:18

Mr. Fox, mark the applicant. So, um, I will bring in we've got our colleague on screen. Um, Mr. Malcolm's further and he can explain, um, how it's been accounted. You know why it's been, um. Accounted for within. Within the scheme. Um, I think, um, you can quote me if I'm wrong here, but to call it an emergency landing strip. I mean, it's a strip of area that is not developed as opposed to an actual airstrip. Um, and so in terms of how it's secured, it comes from the limited deviation in the works plans.

02:31:19:20 - 02:31:22:00

I we can't build in that area.

02:31:24:05 - 02:31:29:18

Sorry. So that area is specified within the limits of deviation.

02:31:29:20 - 02:31:40:09

As in as in. It's a strip in the sense it's a strip of land that we are not building on. And what secure is what we are not building on is a limits deviation for the works in the works plans.

02:31:40:18 - 02:31:44:23

Okay. So can you give me that reference. Sorry. Mr.. What is that? Well, so.

02:31:44:25 - 02:32:05:23

So it's because of the general. But it's not we've not it's not that we've, um, committed and said this green area over here is a landing strip. It happens to be able to be used for that, but the fact that its ability to be a landing strip is, is because it's not got anything built on it.

02:32:05:25 - 02:32:23:23

But in terms of its then location, because it's shown illustrative on that layout, that that's not defined in that location is that it could potentially change on detailed design stage. So that position as shown on STS six is layout plan isn't fixed is it?

02:32:26:02 - 02:32:57:05

It's location. Well, in terms of I understand the assessment for glint and glare, first and foremost I think the AF says um, that so there says based on the illustrative layouts and the modelling undertaken, mitigation measures are recommended for Sherburn in Elmet and Burnham Airfield and then goes on to say, however, in the annex, the empirical study identified that in real world there was no effects.

02:32:57:15 - 02:33:12:16

So my question is, well, if there's no effects? Is the is this strip being proposed as mitigation for some purpose to offset effects? And if it is, then how is it secured? Because I wasn't clear.

02:33:12:27 - 02:33:25:11

Mr. Fox I'm half the applicant, so I will bring in just on the point of why it's needed. I'll bring in Mr. Um, because that will then help explain what the answer that I'm trying to give. Uh, Malcolm.

02:33:26:05 - 02:34:03:03

Thank you. Malcolm. Steven, for the applicant. Um, so, just to be clear, um, the what's being called the emergency landing strip, um, is nothing to do with glint and glare. It's not mitigation for glint and glare. It's mitigation for a, uh, an aircraft having an engine failure on takeoff and therefore, in the certainly in the case of a single engined aeroplane, which they mostly are from Sherburn, uh, it therefore requires to find a flat, obstacle free space in which to make a forced landing.

02:34:03:15 - 02:34:48:23

And, uh, the location of it, uh, of this defined so-called emergency landing strip is directly under the climb out the straight climb out from runway one nine, which is the southerly departure heading from Sherburn and Aylmer airfield. Uh, and it's designed so that an engine, an aircraft suffering an engine failure at a critical point on that straight ahead departure, would not be required to make any turns at low level, but would simply be able to make a glide approach straight ahead without turning and landing in that field in the event of an emergency.

02:34:49:27 - 02:35:11:00

Okay. Thank you. So that's helpful because that's clarified it wasn't mitigation for glint and glare. So that's helpful. So then just if I can just to I'm clear then I understand its position going in in relation to the runway. But then in terms of certainty of that being secured, how that would be clear how that marked applicant.

02:35:11:02 - 02:35:43:15

So the point is and again, um, correct me if I'm wrong here, is that in a world where the scheme is not there that you have, they have that, um, climb out route and if something happened, they'd be they would necessarily land in that field. Um, we're now proposing solar infrastructure in the vicinity, in that same field. So to what essentially the the commitment is that we're not going to build in the area that they would use anyway. So it's not it's not it's not something designed.

02:35:43:17 - 02:35:49:29

It's the fact that something that is A feature that is not even a feature. It's something that they could use.

02:35:50:03 - 02:35:56:17

I guess I get that point. I think that's I'm just trying to be really clear then. So you say the commitment is we won't.

02:35:57:06 - 02:35:57:21

Know.

02:35:57:24 - 02:36:14:10

That unless I'm wrong. I've got this shown on an illustrative plan which isn't committed because it's subject to detailed design. So my question is, how do we ensure, therefore, that that stays in that location if it's required at the next stage, or is it defined areas.

02:36:14:12 - 02:36:14:28

But

02:36:16:17 - 02:36:24:27

because the commitment is that we're not going to build in there, the security is the work plans because the limits deviation of the work's plans. So we can only build up to a certain point.

02:36:25:12 - 02:36:34:27

So that's that's the answer is the work plan to define the lateral boundaries which ensure that then you've got that spacing spacing retained. Yeah okay. Thank you.

02:36:34:29 - 02:36:38:17

Because it's not it's just ensuring that they can continue to use what they already use. Yeah.

02:36:38:19 - 02:36:49:02

And that's really I just want to be clear. It's how is that gap maintained effectively. Well by definition of the separation distance between the work plan areas is what you're saying. Okay. Thank you.

02:36:55:26 - 02:37:15:17

Okay. I think that's that's all I got on that at this stage, as I say, because, um, the other questions we've got on this item have been addressed. I was going to ask for some views from Sherburn Aero Club, which, um, I understood were originally going to attend but haven't. So obviously we'll, we'll see. They've made a representation there anyway. Um, but yeah.

02:37:15:19 - 02:37:35:15

We had a, we had a good party and we had a good meeting with them very recently on, on their concerns. Um, and I think a lot of, um, their concerns, we hope they're not here to speak, of course, would be assuaged by just them being able to find the information they need, because I think they're worried about certain modeling, whether that hasn't been done and it has been done.

02:37:35:17 - 02:37:43:07

Okay. Thank you. So that's all I got on this item. So there's any questions I'll move on Mr. Sandy.

02:37:46:14 - 02:38:09:26

Thank you, Mr. Willis. Briefly move on to item five on the agenda, which is to review the actions arising from today. Given the number of action points, rather than go through these in detail now. Um, they will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure website, uh, probably about early next week. Um, now, I presume that's agreeable rather than going through the ball.

02:38:09:28 - 02:38:21:08

But, um, Mr. Fox applicant. Um, yes. Can I just make some request around deadlines for some of them? I'm not proposing to go through all of them. I think as a starting point, um.

02:38:21:25 - 02:38:54:03

If I just tell you our starting point and see that aligns first, because that might answer your some of your questions. So if it's an update to application documents that would be expected for deadline two. If it's answers specifically to points that have been raised in terms of, uh, some of the answers you're going to provide is and for clarity, as we discussed earlier this week, one document submitted a deadline one way possible. Um, does that help? If it's, um, as a general approach.

02:38:54:07 - 02:38:56:21

Mr. Fox, on behalf of the applicant, um.

02:39:00:19 - 02:39:09:04

Yeah. Yes. I'm just trying to really quickly go through them just to check if anywhere I feel that that might be, um, difficult. Um.

02:39:11:25 - 02:39:44:11

We mentioned the photo montages, which I think definitely need to be. Deadline three just because of the time it takes to, um, produce them. Um, I'm quite conscious. The ones I'm particularly concerned about is the the updated figures for the Fra, but I think you've said deadline too. So that's probably, um, workable. The commitment that I, um, voluntarily made, which is around, um, the query raised about the breeding bird data and the, um, implications.

02:39:44:13 - 02:40:03:07

Can I ask that's submitted for deadline two. And the only reason I say that is because because it had been provided by the council. They will make submissions on that, I imagine, at deadline one. Um, and so it will help you, I think, to us to respond to deadline and say, here's what it says and here's why we think it in the context of what the council had to say.

02:40:03:09 - 02:40:05:18

Yeah, that sounds sensible. Are you happy with that, Mr. Medlin?

02:40:05:26 - 02:40:06:11

Um.

02:40:06:17 - 02:40:07:05

It's fine.

02:40:10:02 - 02:40:10:18

Um.

02:40:13:02 - 02:40:42:15

I think I think I would ask that the queries that are around, um, producing possibly new plans, um, if they could be deadline too. So I'm conscious of that request around the illustrative diagram if we can't actually find it in our application documents, and it doesn't quite do everything that you want it to do from our discussion. I know Mr. Gregory mentioned it, but lots of things came up and we had to check and just, you know, they can take a while to produce. And similarly for the substation.

02:40:42:17 - 02:40:45:05

At least it confirms I thought I'd miss something, but yeah.

02:40:45:07 - 02:40:55:08

No, I mean, again, I've not had a chance to double check every diagram yet. Um, but um, and then, um, I think.

02:40:57:29 - 02:41:03:12

I think everything else might be definitely one. Uh, just, um.

02:41:05:25 - 02:41:08:08

The, um, point on, um.

02:41:10:19 - 02:41:20:06

Preliminary works. Um, this morning, um, I'm just conscious of, um, to put this, um,

02:41:22:06 - 02:41:58:27

to the extent that we get to a position where we feel that we need to produce some kind of new document to control the permitted preliminary works. Not. I'm not permitting that we would do that, but it's the Sake of argument and say that we think that we do need to do that. I would ideally like to do that for deadline two if possible, rather than deadline one, just because you'll appreciate that requires multiple input. So I think if you say deadline two for that and where it's um, plans, um, and the updated documents and the ecology um breeding bird note and then everything else will try a deadline.

02:41:58:29 - 02:41:59:16

One seems.

02:41:59:18 - 02:42:00:03

Reasonable.

02:42:00:16 - 02:42:01:01

Just.

02:42:05:28 - 02:42:06:27

Anything further?

02:42:08:16 - 02:42:17:05

It was just that point that we talked about with the conservation area response. But that will come deadline too, because the council will submit it and will respond. So I think that's quite clear.

02:42:21:11 - 02:42:27:17

And that's fine. We're sure like I say, look to publish the actual points by early next week.

02:42:29:24 - 02:42:30:09

Thank you sir.

02:42:30:18 - 02:42:41:29

Examining authority has during its review of the submitted application, noted to Morata in several documents proposed to also append this to the list of actions. I assume this is agreeable.

02:42:44:25 - 02:43:05:22

We've noted during our review of submitted application documents as sort of several errata within those documents. So we're proposing to append that list to the action points so that these can be picked up at the next round of update to the application documents.

02:43:06:07 - 02:43:07:21

Yes, that makes sense. Thank you.

02:43:11:01 - 02:43:21:10

I understand that the compulsory acquisition action points will hopefully be published tomorrow. Um, or certainly latest early next week, but hopefully for tomorrow.

02:43:24:27 - 02:43:35:21

Okay. That moves me on to the closing. So that completes our business for today. I just want to ask whether there's any other matters that parties may wish to raise in relation to matters that we have discussed today.

02:43:38:14 - 02:44:12:26

No, we trust the agenda has largely been covered, with the exception of the item that we've discussed. And we hope that we believe that we've provided an opportunity for all those who have notified us of their desire to comment, to do so today. We'd also like to thank everyone for your attendance today and at the hearings earlier this week. The representations and the professional input are appreciated by the examining authority. We look forward to working with you through the examination. As a reminder, the recording of the live stream will be added to the project web page of the Planning Inspectorate National Infrastructure website as soon as practicable after the hearing.

02:44:13:10 - 02:44:19:20

Time is now 1809 and this issue specific hearing for the light bulb solar project is now closed. Thank you.