



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	East Pye Solar
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) – Part 5
Date:	17 September 2026

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

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

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

Simon Says

Transcript Export

<https://www.simonsaysai.com>

My New Project

Created on: 2026-09-17 15:18:03

Project Length: 02:15:04

Account Holder: [REDACTED]

File Name: EPS_17SEP_ISH1_PT5-PINS MP3.mp3

File Length: 02:15:04

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:01:26 - 00:00:06:22

We shall resume the hearing under agenda item four. Thank you.

00:00:21:15 - 00:00:30:19

Thank you very much. I'm looking first to Norfolk County Council and just asking whether you'll be asking questions on the local highway network.

00:00:33:10 - 00:00:35:22

Isaac Nunn from North County Council. I can give a kind

00:00:35:24 - 00:00:36:09

of very

00:00:36:11 - 00:00:49:15

broad statements of our position, but we don't have any specialists with us today because we had the agenda last week. So it was different from what we expected from the rule six.

00:00:50:04 - 00:00:56:07

It's okay. As you are the custodian of people of the local hybrid network, I'm very happy for you to make those comments now, please.

00:00:58:00 - 00:00:58:22

Okay.

00:01:20:09 - 00:01:53:14

I'm not going to get too much into kind of site specific issues, but broadly, we think that the strategy, as far as possible, should be to rely on internal haul routes from suitably sized roads with appropriate capacities for safe access. And then to use internal haul routes throughout the site so that it crosses smaller rural roads rather than traffic traveling along them and taking access for each individual site

00:01:56:13 - 00:02:20:25

individually. And I think we're still not satisfied that amount with among a number of sites, including notably seven to ten. And think some of the others as well. I've got a list some notes on individual sites if you'd like, but to go us to think a highways engineer is probably better place to take you through it.

00:02:22:10 - 00:02:27:19

Thank you. So can I just confirm the points you raised? Are you in active dialogue with the applicant on those particular points?

00:02:29:18 - 00:02:35:04

I believe we are, yes. My highway engineer is on leave this week.

00:02:36:03 - 00:02:36:18

But I

00:02:36:20 - 00:02:37:26

understand that to be the case.

00:02:38:10 - 00:02:42:20

Thank you, indeed. I'll ask the applicant to respond to those brief points. Thank you. Mr. Yates?

00:02:45:03 - 00:02:51:08

It's on behalf of the applicant. I'm joined by Mr. Who can confirm this and other future questions.

00:02:52:26 - 00:02:55:03

Thank you,

00:02:55:05 - 00:03:22:06

sir. So Tim Hapgood on behalf of the applicant. Yes, just to confirm, we are in dialogue with Norfolk County Council Highways on all these matters and have the initial statement of common ground, and we're still working through various points. I guess just to pick up on one issue, we have tried to internalize or provide internal haul routes wherever possible. These are described in the outlined CTMP, which is

00:03:23:24 - 00:03:25:12

bear with me

00:03:29:20 - 00:03:32:23

APP two zero one and

00:03:35:27 - 00:03:51:19

are described in table five point one. They will be utilized in Connect subsites seven, eight, f, including using CRC eleven and CRC twelve and then subsites seven gs to L and subsites eight A and B.

00:03:52:27 - 00:04:05:20

Thank you. In terms of the internal haul routes, are they capable of carrying the abnormal indivisible loads? Is that the primary purpose to keep those ALL vehicles off the local highway network?

00:04:07:25 - 00:04:27:13

Tim Hapgood for the applicant. No, the internal haul routes are for general construction vehicle usage. All of the abnormal load routes that have been assessed are with on the road network, mainly the SRN sorry, strategic road network, then the major road network and only where absolutely necessary on the local road network.

00:04:28:26 - 00:04:36:05

Just to confirm, the internal haul routes are not intended to be capable of carrying those AIR movements. Am I correct?

00:04:37:11 - 00:04:59:20

I think well, there's probably one exception, which would be for the in site, the best site and site 1B, where there would be a route inside that site to enable the abnormal loads to be delivered. And obviously, within the site five as well, there would obviously need to be access for the abnormal load to take the transformers in.

00:05:01:18 - 00:05:10:14

Is the case for that particular haul route to be built to a higher standard, to a more robust standard than the other haul routes? Am I correct?

00:05:12:13 - 00:05:16:11

Tim Happel for the applicant. Yes, it would need to be built to the required standards, which

00:05:16:13 - 00:05:18:13

is set out in the guidance.

00:05:19:15 - 00:05:35:06

Just to perhaps explore a little more the issues raised by the County Council and Highway Authority in relation to sites seven to ten, Is it the case that you don't intend to build any haul routes in site seven or in site ten? Or have you any proposals for haul routes on those sites?

00:05:37:11 - 00:05:49:17

Tim Hapgood for the applicant. Yes, We are proposing internal haul routes for sites seven, a to f using CRC eleven and CRC twelve and sub sites seven gs to l,

00:05:51:11 - 00:05:52:27

but not for site ten.

00:05:52:29 - 00:05:59:04

Thank you. It's regrettable the County Council can't respond in detail. That's a missed opportunity.

00:06:00:20 - 00:06:02:17

One question from Doctor Barry. Thank you.

00:06:02:19 - 00:06:39:05

Thank you. I wanted to ask about the permanence of these haul roads across the fields because, obviously, you'll need to replace equipment and which of these ones will actually be there for the life of the project and which will be removed after initial construction? And my second question was really on-site seven. I wanted to ask how you will manage to create a haul road over the high pressure gas main because it crosses the proposed haul road crosses the high pressure gas main at Site seven? Thank you.

00:06:39:10 - 00:06:42:11

UNIDENTIFIED Doctor Barry, thank you. To the applicants, thank you.

00:06:49:29 - 00:07:21:02

So on behalf of the applicant, I was stepping in before Mr. Hapgood to allow him to take some notes just to confirm in relation to the gas pipeline. So I can't speak to technicalities. Hopefully, Mr. Hapgood can. But the protective provisions are included at Schedule fourteen of the draft DCO. Part one of that includes protection for various undertakers, including gas undertakers. There's also specific bespoke protective provisions for the protection of National Gas under Part five of schedule foreseen.

00:07:21:04 - 00:07:29:16

So to the extent any works are proposed, which Mr. Hapgood can talk through, protective provisions are in place to ensure that the apparatus is suitably protected.

00:07:30:19 - 00:07:34:26

Thank you. Mr. Hatford could provide an explanation, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

00:07:37:13 - 00:07:56:11

Tim Hatford for the applicant. Regarding the point on the internal haul routes for the subsites seven to F and seven gs to L and A and B, once the construction is completed, the internal haul routes would be removed. But then there'd obviously be maintenance tracks associated with the solar sites themselves.

00:07:58:01 - 00:08:07:07

With the other point on the high pressure gas main, yes, I think my colleague, Mr. Yates, has covered it, but we can potentially take it away and get more further feedback, if need be.

00:08:08:04 - 00:08:09:29

Yes. Can it be an action point?

00:08:11:10 - 00:08:12:16

Yes, no problem.

00:08:12:23 - 00:08:15:24

You. Raised hands. Mr. Hook, I believe.

00:08:16:18 - 00:08:51:07

Yes. I'd just like to make the point. And Hemlock Parish Council is very concerned and has expressed its concerns to Norfolk County Council about all road proposals. We consider that they would be as environmentally damaging as the existing using existing roads. Creating new access routes through unspoiled rural tranquil countryside is would have severe landscape visual impacts, and particularly if they lasted throughout the scheme operation phase in order to facilitate maintenance of the site.

00:08:51:09 - 00:09:04:00

So I think both the access roads access plans via existing roads or via haul roads are equally objectionable to our Parish Council.

00:09:04:22 - 00:09:07:09

Mr. Hook, thank you. I'll ask the applicant to respond.

00:09:14:02 - 00:09:15:15

We

00:09:17:23 - 00:09:25:27

appreciate, obviously, the local road network, and we've tried to internalize routes as much as possible to minimize the impact on the local road network.

00:09:27:20 - 00:09:33:08

Where we got to. But I'd say we are in further dialogue with NCC to try and find a strategy which is acceptable.

00:09:35:01 - 00:09:41:08

Thank you. I have a hand raised at the back, sorry. Can you get a hold of the microphone? Thank you.

00:09:42:24 - 00:09:44:14

If you can forward, by all means, yes. Yes.

00:09:51:22 - 00:09:54:09

Can you state your name, please, first? Thank you.

00:09:54:11 - 00:10:15:00

My name is Liz Williams. I'm a resident of Hempnal. I'd just like to focus on one of the likely access routes from the Crones in Hempnal. The Cronze is a very, very narrow road. You cannot get two cars passed, but in the applicant's

00:10:17:27 - 00:10:39:14

map of that. It says it's for two way traffic for the loads to get to site seven. It's a wholly inadequate road. It's got on either side of it is meadows, which are flood plains, which have been left as a nature reserve for the

00:10:39:16 - 00:10:40:01

village of

00:10:40:03 - 00:11:15:20

Hempnoll. It also has a very old bridge, which needs crossing with heaven knows how heavy the lorries are gonna be. And then past the bridge is like a tunnel of very mature trees, which even tractors bash the tree branches. So presumably, they're gonna have to all be cleared. Have the has the applicant done any ecological surveys for the damage caused for the transport routes.

00:11:15:25 - 00:11:19:27

Thank you for your question. I'll return it to the applicant, mister Yates. Thank you.

00:11:44:17 - 00:12:03:21

Tim Hapgood for the applicant. In dialogue with Norfolk County Council, when we were discussing appropriate construction routes, we were considering different options and the crumbs was put forward by Norfolk County Council Highways at the time. So that's why it was suggested.

00:12:04:10 - 00:12:04:25

You.

00:12:08:12 - 00:12:09:02

That

00:12:11:12 - 00:12:11:27

the reply?

00:12:11:29 - 00:12:40:00

To reiterate some of the Yes, that provides a justification for the inclusion of the cronies and access route in response to their comment made about the ecological assessment. Again, don't have the ecologists, the but detail of the assessment on ecology is set out in Chapter eight, and that includes various references to traffic as applicable. It also makes cross references to different technical chapters, including air quality and others where transport and traffic has been captured into those assessments as relevant.

00:12:41:01 - 00:12:51:08

Steve, thank you. As commentary was made to Norfolk County Council, perhaps you may want to come back at deadline one with a substantive reply. Yes, exactly. We'll take it forward as an action point, please.

00:12:52:11 - 00:12:53:05

Yes.

00:12:55:24 - 00:12:57:12

Mrs. Mullard next. Thank you.

00:12:58:08 - 00:13:00:23

Thank you. I would like to talk about

00:13:02:08 - 00:13:33:25

Hull Road, which is from going to the Point of Connection substation, which travels from the b one one three four. That is proposed to be for permanent because the substation is a permanent structure. So my question is, if that is permanent, that means that crosses the best site, the substation sites, one hundred lane, but for permanency. How does that affect your scheme?

00:13:35:29 - 00:13:36:21

Thank you.

00:13:36:23 - 00:13:40:09

Smile, thank you. I wonder if the applicant would care to reply. Thank you.

00:13:42:28 - 00:13:54:19

Yep. Tim Hapgood for the applicant. Yes. For the for the stop station and the best, there will need to be a permanent access road within the scheme at that location as specified.

00:13:56:07 - 00:13:58:23

Thank you. Sorry, Doctor. Berry next.

00:13:59:08 - 00:14:16:22

Thank you. I wanted to ask about the road widening that's proposed in order to facilitate the traffic and transport plan. So probably about a year ago now when during the targeted consultation, when we initially saw the plans for road widening,

00:14:18:14 - 00:14:55:16

a local well, two local botanists, Alex Prendergast and Sean Plant, wrote an open letter to East Paisola saying that there was no botanical survey as part of this application and that this whole area of South Norfolk is particularly known for very rare assemblages of rare botany and especially some of the areas that they were looking to widen the roads were areas where these very rare assemblages of plants are found, and one of them is one hundred Lane.

00:14:55:21 - 00:14:56:24

There are others

00:14:58:11 - 00:15:35:11

basically throughout the scheme. So both of those botanists have worked extensively in this area of South Norfolk and and know the botanical record very thoroughly. And Alex Prendergast, who's a level six botanist, had recommended that full season surveys were carried out before any of these road widening proposals were signed off. But we have received no acknowledgment of this letter from the botanists, and there is still no botanical survey as part of the environmental statement.

00:15:35:13 - 00:15:38:07

I just wanted to ask why that is the case. Thank you.

00:15:38:19 - 00:15:42:21

Doctor Barry, thank you. I'll ask the applicant to respond. Mr Yates, thank you.

00:15:43:25 - 00:15:53:18

Toby Yates, behalf of the applicant, I believe this point has been picked up in the relevant representations responses by the relevant expert. I've got nothing further to add here today.

00:15:56:06 - 00:16:02:18

Steve, just to confirm, did you say that you would submit additional documentation or it's included in the existing documents?

00:16:02:20 - 00:16:07:15

The latter, sir. It's already included in the response to relevant presentations that was submitted.

00:16:09:06 - 00:16:18:03

It would be helpful perhaps if you could point out precisely where that response is within the documentation, perhaps as an action point, just to clarify for the second, Doctor. Barry?

00:16:18:05 - 00:16:19:28

We can signpost. Yes, sir.

00:16:20:22 - 00:16:26:17

We'll even do that today. I'm sure it's information you can get quite quickly from your team. That voids an action point.

00:16:27:25 - 00:16:39:15

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. We've got someone efficient in the background. It's p d a dash zero ten, and it's in response to Block East by Solar Group and number zero fourteen.

00:16:40:27 - 00:16:43:19

C h. Thank you. And miss Reid?

00:16:44:13 - 00:16:45:24

Thank you. Yes. I've got

00:16:45:26 - 00:17:21:01

a query with regards to Lodge Road coming down from land site two. There's an indication that being used as a route. It stops just short or or near Walk Farm. It doesn't proceed. We would like to know why it's been included as a route because there's no indication of why. And Lodge Road is a single track narrow lane with edged by old oak trees. So we want to know why that route is in there, for what purpose. If that could be answered, that would give some indication, or if that's going to be removed as a route.

00:17:22:07 - 00:17:26:28

Mr. Reid, thank you for your question. Again, I'll ask the applicant to reply. Mr. H. Thank you.

00:17:29:15 - 00:18:00:17

Tim Hapgood on behalf of the applicant. The access, I believe, is a zero six on Lodge Road. It's it's there as a potential access for works in CRC two. It is it's intended that the actual access for CRC two would be from access A02 on the B1134 Station Road. But we felt it was prudent to include an additional access on Lodge Road depending on final sequencing and program of works as well.

00:18:00:23 - 00:18:05:29

It is also an access, though, that we are still in dialogue with NCC backed.

00:18:08:02 - 00:18:23:21

Mr. Haggood, in terms of the dialogue with NCC, we seem to be blind to the outcome of this dialogue in terms of statement of common ground. Do you have a statement of common ground, a draft statement of common ground in place with Norfolk County Council?

00:18:25:04 - 00:18:27:09

Tim Hapkin, on behalf of the applicant, yes, yes, we do.

00:18:27:23 - 00:18:34:14

It certainly would help the examining authority if we could have a copy of that statement as soon as possible, but by deadline one. Is that possible?

00:18:35:08 - 00:18:40:19

To be on behalf of the applicants. Yes. So that SSEG and all of the others will be submitted in draft format deadline one.

00:18:41:22 - 00:18:56:29

Staves, thank you. And in terms of the detail that will be contained, will we how thoroughgoing is that document in terms of all the points being raised in the representations, access points and so on? I'm just curious how detailed these statements of common ground will be. You.

00:18:57:21 - 00:19:22:20

There'll be some behalf of the applicant. I suppose it depends on the nature of the discussion, sir. So the draft form of the SOCG has been shared with NCC and all of the relevant parties. So to spend on comments and opportunities for meetings in advance of that deadline, one, I suppose the point I'd make is, obviously, we've got a six month examination process here, we'll continue that dialogue the whole way through submit and updated SOCGs at the relevant points throughout the examination.

00:19:22:28 - 00:19:29:12

I want at this stage to bring in Mr. Blum. Thank you for waiting, Mr. Blum. Mr. Blum, can you hear me?

00:19:30:08 - 00:19:31:29

I can, sir. Thank you.

00:19:32:16 - 00:19:41:10

Bloom, this is your forum. You're representing the National Highways Authority. You may raise questions or make a statement if you wish. Thank you.

00:19:42:09 - 00:19:45:18

Thank you. Jeremy Bloom representing National Highways.

00:19:47:12 - 00:19:47:27

Our relevant

00:19:47:29 - 00:20:19:18

representation does contain some concerns specifically focused on the junction between the a forty seven and the a one forty, which would be the main access point for for the construction vehicles. We have had very constructive dialogue with the applicants transport consults to mister Hapcode who's here today for which I'm very grateful.

00:20:20:15 - 00:20:56:14

Our concern is is just that we think additional analysis is needed to to justify the applicant's position that there'd be no impact. I don't think we are suggesting that the the junction wouldn't be suitable for use, but we we remain unsure as to whether some mitigation temporary mitigation may be required at the junction. So we know that mister Hatwood has taken that away to to to consider further for which we're grateful.

00:20:57:16 - 00:21:37:06

In relation to that, we're particularly concerned, and I know cumulative impacts comes up later on the agenda, but I think it's worth us worth me saying here, we are particularly concerned about the cumulative impact of this project at that location with in combination with the construction traffic related to the Norwich to Tilbury project, which has been mentioned as part of this hearing, and and we think that needs to be considered. So, you know, in summary, not a huge array of concerns about the use of the SRN as strategic road network and the impact of this project.

00:21:37:08 - 00:21:52:13

I think it is very focused on that one particular location, and we're seeking further reassurance that that there won't be adverse impacts and if there are some potential impacts that that that they're being effectively managed.

00:21:53:15 - 00:22:02:02

Thank you. Very, very helpful. Just to confirm, is it the case that you are preparing a draft statement of common ground with the applicant at this time?

00:22:04:09 - 00:22:15:22

Yes. Jeremy Bloom, National Highways. I can confirm that we do have a draft statement of common ground. I'm assuming it will be submitted by the applicant at deadline one.

00:22:16:14 - 00:22:34:12

Mr. Bloom, thank you indeed. That's most helpful. I'll just put those two points back to the applicant in terms of Mr. Bloom's comments on the additional analysis sought by National Highways. And secondly, on the concerns from Mr. Bloom related to the cumulative impacts of this project on the strategic road network.

00:22:40:21 - 00:23:11:19

Tim Hapgood on behalf of the applicant. Yes, first point to say that we have been liaising with National Highways and Mr. Blum, and it's been very constructive. So it's great. Thank you very much for that. Yes, we have taken undertaken initial assessment of the A47, A140 junction. But as Mr. Bloom alluded to, we are continuing to understand whether further appraisal is required. We have also been in liaison with the Norwich to Tilby scheme to understand their trip generation numbers and the overlap with the scheme.

00:23:11:21 - 00:23:30:03

Yes, that has been taken into consideration. We did there is a technical note specifically for that we've supplied to National Highways, which is in appendix b four of the transport assessment, which is a p p zero one seven four

00:23:31:26 - 00:23:32:17

for reference.

00:23:34:22 - 00:23:38:24

Yeah. And we will we will continue that dialogue through the SOCG process.

00:23:39:08 - 00:23:46:05

Good. Thank you. And in terms of the cumulative assessment, you've mentioned you're you're in dialogue with Norwich Tilbury. Am I correct?

00:23:46:07 - 00:23:47:16

Yes. That is correct. Yeah.

00:23:47:18 - 00:23:50:25

Okay. Mr. Bloom, do have any further questions?

00:23:52:04 - 00:24:01:29

No. No further questions or comments at this stage. We'll continue to work constructively with Mr. Hatwood and the applicant to resolve everything.

00:24:02:29 - 00:24:05:13

Mr. Blum, thank you. That's good to hear. Thank you.

00:24:05:15 - 00:24:06:10

Thank you.

00:24:06:26 - 00:24:16:19

Thank you, indeed. I'm just going draw this agenda item to a close and let's move on to next agenda item which concerns mental health and well-being.

00:24:18:24 - 00:24:19:27

And

00:24:24:02 - 00:24:31:18

I do apologize. I missed those raised hands. Thank you. If you want to get hold of a microphone, please. There's one coming.

00:24:36:10 - 00:24:37:13

Helen Pye.

00:24:37:20 - 00:24:38:24

Ms. Pye, thank you.

00:24:38:26 - 00:24:48:20

The War Memorial, Saxlingham, Neffgate. Could we ask please for clarification on AIL routes and where we stand with those at the moment?

00:24:49:22 - 00:24:53:22

Ms. Pai, thanks for your question. I'll pass over to the applicant to answer. Thank you.

00:25:00:26 - 00:25:34:00

Tim Hapgood on behalf of the applicant. Yeah. Regarding Saxonyl and Nethergate, I think the first point to make would be that we are not proposing it as a general construction traffic route. However, the it has been identified as a viable abnormal load route for the one hundred thirty two kV substation in site 7F. Abnormal load specialist wins have undertaken vehicle swap path work based on the transformer specification and associated abnormal load vehicle configuration.

00:25:34:26 - 00:25:44:19

The drawings are provided in part three of the transport assessment, which is environmental statement volume three, appendix eleven point one.

00:25:48:06 - 00:26:05:08

Mr. Hat, could Ms. Paine mention the War Memorial? I understand there were queries have been raised at a potential hearing concerning a footpath alongside the War Memorial and a query as to whether it is part of the local highway network. Can you address that query, please?

00:26:09:27 - 00:26:24:27

Tim Hapgood on behalf of the applicant. So it was the so the abnormal load route analysis work that's been done to date shows that the abnormal load can safely navigate the route shown through Churchill and Saxon and navigate.

00:26:27:05 - 00:26:36:23

Mr. Hapgood, just wonder, in terms of the assessment, was that done with a live vehicle or on a desktop study using software? Can you confirm how that assessment was done? Thank you.

00:26:38:02 - 00:26:52:23

Tim Hapgood for the applicant. I'd it was undertaken by WINS who are abnormal load specialist WINS, WY double N S. They went out to site and would have audited the route and then also undertaking vehicle tracking work with their specialist software.

00:26:55:09 - 00:27:01:00

Just to confirm, so WINS have undertaken a site visit and a tracking assessment. Am I correct?

00:27:02:18 - 00:27:05:02

Tim, how could we happen? Sorry, could you repeat the question?

00:27:05:04 - 00:27:11:03

Sorry, Mr. Happel. Just to confirm that WINS did undertake a site visit, mentioned a site inspection?

00:27:11:05 - 00:27:14:24

Yes. They went out and they drove the route and assessed it.

00:27:14:26 - 00:27:26:26

And is the result of their assessment an inspection included in application? You mentioned part three of the transport assessment. Is there a specific mention of their site inspection in that assessment? Thank you.

00:27:28:02 - 00:27:32:14

Tim Hapgood. For the applicant, yes, believe it is in the report stating that.

00:27:32:16 - 00:27:36:17

Tim Hapgood, thank you. I've got two of the hands raised at the back of the call. Sir?

00:27:38:18 - 00:27:52:03

Hello. I'm John Fry. I'm asking about the same route. I think that was new information that the that route through Saxon Neathgate is not being used for trucks. Is that a recent change?

00:27:53:17 - 00:27:56:27

Thank you for your question. Back to the applicant to answer. Thank you.

00:27:57:26 - 00:28:04:03

Tim Hapgood for the applicant. No, I don't think Saxon and Nevergate has ever been in as a general construction route.

00:28:05:26 - 00:28:08:27

Thank you. There's one further hand raised at the back.

00:28:13:14 - 00:28:15:14

You. I'd also wish to speak about Sorry.

00:28:15:16 - 00:28:17:16

Can you state your name? Thank you so much.

00:28:17:18 - 00:28:18:03

I beg

00:28:18:05 - 00:28:51:16

your pardon. I'm Kathleen Reynolds. I also live on Churchill. I appreciate that somebody has actually come out and done a sweat look and a desktop exercise, but I'm not aware that anybody has come out to assess the significant risk to the properties along that route, which are very historical and very close to the road, that there's no assessment of the infrastructure, our asbestos sewage and above ground type sewage works. And there's been no assessment at all to safety. I live on a blind bend where it's also very, very dangerous.

00:28:51:18 - 00:29:13:20

The three properties get in and out. And I think that this wet path is going to come right up to my building. And I think there's also a huge risk to the footpath and all the children going to school. And I think this is a pure desktop exercise that has not taken any impact of the effect of the humans and our properties. And I wish you to come out, and we requested that visit yesterday.

00:29:14:02 - 00:29:17:22

Thank you indeed. I will ask the applicant to respond to those particular points. Thank you.

00:29:25:26 - 00:29:28:25

Applicant to reply to that last comment? Thank you.

00:29:29:21 - 00:29:41:23

Yes. Tim Hapgood on behalf of the applicant. I I guess I could point towards the outline CTMP point six point four, which outlines all of the abnormal load management measures that would be in place.

00:29:44:03 - 00:29:52:05

And also, I I I guess what we could do is we could we could take this away and we could ask WINS, the abnormal load specialist, to provide more information on this particular point.

00:29:52:08 - 00:29:56:03

That would be greatly appreciated. Yes, indeed. We could place it as an action point, thank you.

00:29:58:20 - 00:30:01:28

So Barry, please, Doctor. Barry had her hand up for quite some time. Thank you.

00:30:02:26 - 00:30:36:27

Thank you. So it's just a point of clarification. So the response to our relevant representation about the lack of botany survey was that desktop surveys have carried out and that they haven't looked at road

widening because the assumption is that the project is entirely on fields. And my clarification is that the botanical records are not online. The botanists have the South Norfolk botanical record. So it's not possible for you to know without actually liaising with them what the botanical record is.

00:30:36:29 - 00:30:49:21

And if you are proposing road widening, that is work that isn't in fields, and that those areas do need to be surveyed to ensure that you're not going to be destroying rare botany. Thank you.

00:30:50:12 - 00:30:52:29

Doctor Barry, thank you for your question. I'll ask the applicant to respond.

00:30:54:24 - 00:31:08:00

David, it's on behalf of the applicant. I'd just suggest that that report, if it's impossible to view online, would be useful to be submitted into the examination. And then our ecologist and wider team can review that and address it as necessary.

00:31:08:28 - 00:31:14:11

Mr. Yates, thank you. I'll put that back to Doctor. Berry, please. Would you be willing to submit the report by deadline one, please?

00:31:14:13 - 00:31:38:03

I'm sorry, can't because the botanical record is thousands of records that the botanists hold which are not digitized. So the only way to have access to them is actually to engage with these two botanists who are the most respected South Norfolk botanists, Alex Prendergast and Sean Plant. They know exactly where the areas of rare botany are. Please, will you engage with them? Thank you.

00:31:38:17 - 00:31:45:08

Doctor Barry, I can come back to the applicant. Is that clear in terms of information you received from Doctor Barry? Do you have enough information to track

00:31:46:26 - 00:31:49:01

down those records? It'll

00:31:49:03 - 00:31:58:27

be on behalf of the applicant. I can agree to engagement. We always welcome the engagement. I agree can't to anything beyond that. The applicant's position, immuno oncology is in the relevant response.

00:31:58:29 - 00:32:04:20

That's helpful. Thank you. Very quickly, Ms. Pye, please. Very quickly. Thank you.

00:32:04:22 - 00:32:51:12

Could I just respectfully ask that when the applicant produces the more detailed survey results from WINS, that it includes what they intend to actually physically use as terms of land and what they intend to remove in order to do so. I think of ditches, I think of walls, I think of pavements, I think of all sorts, that these are details which actually affect not only the day to day life because I realize that

the vehicles won't be a danger to us because they'll be in the middle of the night, but the lack of drainage, the lack of pavement, the lack of walls, etcetera, is our everyday life?

00:32:51:27 - 00:32:55:12

Mr. Pye, thank you for your question. Ken, back to the applicant, please. Toby,

00:32:57:29 - 00:33:31:27

it's on behalf of the applicant. I'll pass to Mr. Hapgood in a second just to touch on the nature of the works that are actually envisaged in that specific area. And in the meantime, what I would say is the powers in the consent order that would allow any alterations as may be required are inherently limited. For example, they include the need for the undertaker to restore any street that has been temporarily altered as may be the case. Mr. Halcud can talk to that. And that must be done to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority.

00:33:31:29 - 00:33:41:05

So it is in the case, as maybe suggested, that those works could be done and it'd be left in the worst position. There's an obligation to restore and there's an element of control of the street authority as well.

00:33:41:12 - 00:33:50:14

Yes. Can I just confirm? So just to be clear, you can't alter the highway without the consent of the highway authority, which is Norfolk County Council. Am I correct?

00:33:58:18 - 00:34:32:03

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. It's correct in part, sir. The power to alter the layout of streets in Article ten includes effectively two elements to that power. One is by reference to specific works where details are known, and that's included in Schedule four of the draft DCO. Consent for those isn't required in exercise of the power because the information is already available. We're consulting with the highway authority. In relation to those, the management plans and measures are already available for the mechanism effectively are already in place.

00:34:32:20 - 00:34:49:08

However, there's also a general power in Article ten to alter the layout of streets. And in respect of that, subparagraph four of Article ten provides that those powers may not be exercised without the consent of the street authority. So there's a slight distinction.

00:34:49:20 - 00:34:55:05

Thank you for the clarification. I'm grateful. At this stage, we have to move to the next agenda item. Thank you.

00:35:04:02 - 00:35:29:08

So it's a slight change to the running order, but we're next going to deal with mental well-being effects. So I'm going pose a number of questions to the applicant and then invite questions, if I may. So to the applicant, in terms of the assessment methodology within your application, can you explain briefly how the Human Health Summary Statement and the Quality Impact Assessment operate together? You.

00:35:31:06 - 00:35:42:13

Obvious on behalf of the applicant, I'm joined by Mr. Bookley, who can talk to this at a high level. As I've raised at the preliminary meeting, the more technical expert isn't available, but Mr. Buckley can talk through it initially.

00:35:42:18 - 00:35:44:10

Thank you. Mr. Buckley?

00:35:46:10 - 00:35:57:16

Mr. Buckley, on behalf of the applicant, I can explain how we got to the position of providing a human health statement, if that would be helpful for people to understand? Or would you prefer I just go Essentially,

00:35:58:12 - 00:36:25:26

if I'm clear where I'm going with this, my next question was in respect to why there's no stand alone mental well-being impact assessment. I really want to understand how in the current application, the human health summary statement and the EIA actually work together the sufficiency of those two documents being separate. My next question then was why there is no stand alone mental well-being assessment. That's where I'm going with this.

00:36:26:06 - 00:36:58:11

Okay. Mr. Buckley, behalf of the applicant. So the human health statement came about because when we provided our scoping opinion, we were originally looking to sorry, our scoping report rather, we were originally scoped out. And then the planning inspector came back and said that based on the scheme being designed to minimize impacts on human health and on relevant interactions being assessed within the appropriate environmental topic chapters that they were happy to scope human health house as a standalone chapter.

00:36:59:04 - 00:37:40:25

So essentially, we were left in a position where Human Health could have been addressed purely within the technical chapters themselves. Instead, what we did was we prepared the Human Health statement as a part of the OEM chapter or other environmental matters chapter, which is the chapter that we prepared for those matters that weren't considered or require a chapter answer themselves, but nonetheless, do require some consideration. Alongside that, we also provided the Equalities Impact Assessment. And I think it's important to note that between the two, the way the human health statement works is that it pulls all of the information through from all of the technical chapters within DES.

00:37:41:09 - 00:38:15:05

Two of them weren't pulled through because there were no significant effects of note, which were cultural heritage and biodiversity. But the human health statement essentially is an overview document that pulls all of those effects that we identified throughout the whole ES together and looks at them in an overarching fashion. The Equalities Impact Assessment is closely related. They both deal with mental health and well-being, but the Equalities Impact Assessment looks at it purely from

an Equalities point of view rather than overall health and is thus looking at it more in terms of vulnerable groups.

00:38:15:19 - 00:38:27:12

So in that sense, they operate very closely side by side. They just take, when it comes to mental health and well-being in particular, a slightly different view on what they're focusing on, you might say.

00:38:30:07 - 00:38:43:18

Okay. Thank you. So in terms of the stand alone mental well-being impact assessment, can you ask my question as to why a single document wasn't compiled to bring all those aspects into one application document? Thank you.

00:38:44:11 - 00:38:49:03

Tobi, it's on behalf of the applicant. It's because it was scoped out in the scoping opinion.

00:38:50:04 - 00:38:51:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:38:53:22 - 00:39:26:01

I just wanted to focus on one particular point. It's the population level conclusions that the assessment in the application appears to acknowledge that some individuals may experience adverse effects in relation to matters such as landscape change, place attachment, perceived risks or anxiety regarding the scheme. And the applicant explained how it moved from acknowledging the potential for adverse effects on some individuals to concluding that significant adverse effects would not occur at the population level.

00:39:26:03 - 00:39:37:04

There seemed to be a shift from acknowledging impacts on individuals. At population level, there seemed to be no significant adverse level effect. You.

00:39:43:08 - 00:39:48:12

There'll be some half of the applicant. That's one for the author of that assessment, I believe. So we'll have to take that one away.

00:39:48:26 - 00:40:27:24

Okay. Thank you. So we'll confirm that as an action point. Perhaps there's two follow-up questions principally arising from the open floor hearings held this week. One is in respect of perceived risk at both open floor hearings. This week, we heard concerns related to best fire events of novel indivisible load movements and those riding forces on the public highway. Just so the examination authority are clear, was any separate consideration given to the effects of concern or anxiety arising from perceived risks irrespective of the likelihood of those risks materializing? Thank you.

00:40:35:07 - 00:41:14:12

So on behalf of the applicant, confirm in writing if the answer is yes. But I suppose the point builds on what Mr. Buckley was saying that it's not so simple to deal with it in an isolated way because it was scoped out from the scope of the environmental statement. Each individual technical topic chapter

does deal with those matters as applicable. So for example, use of bridal ways for the purposes of a landscape assessment, how that would impact visual experience for a bridal way user has been captured into the assessment equally an assessment of the use of public rights of way more generally, measures in that regard are then secured through the outlined public rights of way permissive path management plan.

00:41:14:22 - 00:41:35:27

That's also then captured as appropriate across the other range of environmental chapters as is summarized in the statement in Chapter eighteen. So it's a bit more granular than an isolated way because of the reasons that Mr. Booklier explained it wasn't scoped in to do with the sole health and well-being or equivalent assessment.

00:41:37:07 - 00:41:55:24

Okay, Mr. Tate. It's okay. So the second point particularly raised at yesterday's open floor hearing in relation to mental health impacts on vulnerable groups. So can the applicant point as to where the assessment explains why impacts on identified vulnerable groups was not considered significant. Thank you.

00:42:03:27 - 00:42:41:29

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. Again, sir, this has been picked up in the response to relevant representations. For example, HQM-three, which is in Part five, which is the relevant representation documents, which was done by theme. That's PDA-twelve, and won't repeat it in full, but effectively, that points to the quality impact assessment, which is APP-two fourteen, and that does recognize matters around construction noise and vibration and how they may be experienced differently from more sensitive receptors.

00:42:42:07 - 00:43:01:06

It then goes on to point to the secured documents and mechanisms within the likes of the outline construction environmental management plan, outlined operational environmental management plan and outlined decommissioning environmental management plan. And it's the application or embedded of those mitigation measures that leads to the conclusion that's been reached.

00:43:02:17 - 00:43:09:02

Thank you. I'll ask any questions from interested parties. I believe Ms. Thomas?

00:43:12:20 - 00:43:47:08

Margaret Thomas, county councilor for West Deptway, deputy cabinet member for adult social care and public health. I'd like to ask if the applicant acknowledges that because there is scant peer reviewed evidence, they will conduct their own thorough cumulative combined and projected future impact survey on mental and physical health across the whole development and the burden this would place on existing service provision and accessibility.

00:43:48:14 - 00:44:01:08

This needs to be evaluated rather than just the impact from individual sites and individual phases of the development, which minimizes and distorts the true effect.

00:44:02:16 - 00:44:06:11

Thomas, thanks for your submission and question. To the applicant, please.

00:44:08:26 - 00:44:45:23

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. But no further commitment to make here, sir. The individual technical chapters have already carried out an assessment in respect of the receptors that are caught within the framework of those individual topic chapters. And each of those also then deals with cumulative impacts as is appropriate for those topic chapters. There's also Chapter nineteen and in combination effects assessment, which is APP-fifty five, and that relates to what I believe some people may be referring to as cumulative, but there's a slight difference.

00:44:46:03 - 00:45:13:26

That chapter deals with effects from interactions between different elements of the scheme and the different technical topics, how they could combine to lead to a combined effect or in combination effect. Cumulative effect, as Mr. Bookley will come on to later, relates more to external third party projects. But to confirm that those assessments effectively have already been carried out as explained in the chapters on both an individual technical chapter basis and also on a cumulative basis as well.

00:45:14:25 - 00:45:20:13

Thank you. Ms. Thomas, further questions? I'll look back to Doctor. Barry, please.

00:45:21:05 - 00:45:55:04

Thank you. Talking to residents, there's also a perceived risk among well, a feeling of risk among women in terms of using footpaths once they've been fenced on both sides. So you would effectively be in a tunnel and unable to exit that in an emergency if someone else is in there as well. So I think that's something that needs to be looked at because a lot of women are now feeling that they're not going to be able to use the footpaths if they're fenced into them. And the other issue is with bridal way.

00:45:55:11 - 00:46:28:07

Bridal ways, it's not just it's not just visual effects on the bridal way, which is all they seem to have assessed. It's actual physical safety. So equally, you can't ride a horse down a narrow area, which has high fences either side because if the whole horse bolts, you can't turn them to stop them. But there's no space for you to be able to control the horse. It is just going to keep going. And I speak as a rider. You've also got large infrastructure which could be moving potentially maybe slowly, maybe it's making strange noises, maybe it's glinting.

00:46:28:09 - 00:46:42:08

These are exactly the sorts of things which are going to make a horse bolt, and you'll have no way of stopping them if you're within a confined fenced tunnel like space. So I think those really need to be taken into consideration because it will completely change how we can use our environment.

00:46:48:27 - 00:47:22:01

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicants. Yes, so taking each in turn on the concern raised around female safety. What I'd say there is that the applicant is a benefit if the scheme is proposing to provide three new permissive paths and the applicant is engaging with NCC as highway authority in relation to

those and welcomes feedback on those to determine sort of the suitability of those permissive paths to make sure that they are as beneficial as can be proposed given those concerns?

00:47:22:11 - 00:47:26:15

I'm sorry. That will be included in the statement of common ground, I trust.

00:47:27:09 - 00:47:29:05

If it isn't already, we can add it in, sir.

00:47:29:07 - 00:47:29:22

Yes, sir.

00:47:32:18 - 00:48:10:22

And then secondly, in respect of Bridal Wave safety, again, this comes to the point that each of the different chapters will have assessed impacts in relation to different sectors. So it's traffic and transport to the extent it impacts the public rights of way, which include right of ways, has already been considered, and that is set out within the traffic and transport assessment. And I suppose relations to horse bolting point as well, worked back on Sonicare Energy Farm in twenty twenty three, and that was considered in lots of detail there. And there was expert submissions made looking at this point in quite a lot of detail in those submissions with the impact of the likes of Blink and St.

00:48:10:24 - 00:48:17:14

Clair doesn't impact on horses from an equine perspective. We can add a cross reference to that in our written submissions.

00:48:18:19 - 00:48:21:20

Steve, to confirm, so you will add those to your submissions?

00:48:22:29 - 00:48:23:25

Yes, sir.

00:48:23:28 - 00:48:37:23

Thank you. That can be an action point. Thank you, indeed. Sorry, there's lot of hand raised, sorry. There's one hand raised sorry, raised hand at the back, sorry. Do you want to come forward, Or thank you.

00:48:41:15 - 00:48:44:02

Thank you. Can you please state your name before speaking?

00:48:45:17 - 00:48:51:19

My name is Carolyn Robinson. I'm a retired nurse, general nurse,

00:48:53:05 - 00:49:19:29

and I live in Farston. I just wondered what baseline research the is health and well-being of general public is the applicant's research based on? Have they done any surveys of the local communities and the effects that the bill that would have on them in the immediate term, in the long term, and in the

00:49:20:01 - 00:49:21:26

ongoing effects.

00:49:24:23 - 00:49:25:08

And,

00:49:28:01 - 00:49:30:08

yes, I think that was why.

00:49:30:10 - 00:49:35:09

Thank you for your questions. Thank you. Perhaps to the applicant, if you want to consider those questions. Thank you.

00:49:41:01 - 00:49:41:27

Mr. Buckley.

00:49:41:29 - 00:49:53:03

Thank you. Mr. Buckley, on behalf of the applicant, so where the human health statement or human health as a standard ES chapter with Scope Town, we've prepared the human health statement. It relies so

00:49:54:19 - 00:50:10:29

all of the information it's based on is set out there and within the chapter. But in terms of the surveys, it pulls upon because it itself pulls upon the information presented in the other technical chapters, it pulls upon those surveys. So that's the basis on which it was produced.

00:50:12:07 - 00:50:17:18

Mr. Buckley, sorry. In terms of the local surveys, is that based on local survey work?

00:50:19:09 - 00:50:30:08

There were no additional bespoke local surveys produced specifically for the human health statement. As I say, it pulls on the other information from the other chapters.

00:50:30:10 - 00:50:32:12

Can you explain why there's no local surveys?

00:50:36:03 - 00:50:48:12

It'll be on behalf of the applicant because a stand alone human health chapter was scoped out of the assessment. So and and and, therefore, the applicant has carried out the necessary surveys that were appropriate for the matters that were scoped into the assessment.

00:50:52:16 - 00:51:22:28

Just a small point on the scoping out. Can just make it clear that just because something was scoped out doesn't necessarily mean it can't be scoped back in? Because obviously there's been quite

significant concerns on impacts on mental. Thank you. Sorry. I don't I I really even if it's for me, I really don't need applause, etcetera. I just because it's been scoped out doesn't mean to say that it can't be scoped back in. There's always been quite significant concern about the impacts on health and well-being. Everyone's heard it orally and in writing.

00:51:23:22 - 00:51:33:22

I think that it would be helpful to actually scope this back in. It can, of course, be a material consideration. It'd be quite interesting too to get from any party

00:51:35:09 - 00:52:10:19

policy context to this in terms of mental health and well-being. I suspect the applicant would provide that anyway, but, obviously, the NPS and even the m the National Planning Policy Framework policy context for health and well-being effects of developments. But I would you know, obviously, it's something that we want to take seriously, and I I really because it was scoped out, I think that's just, in a way, history now. I I I would go as far as saying that it should be scoped in as part of this examination because it is a significant examination effect or a significant issue because it's been raised by so many people.

00:52:10:21 - 00:52:35:03

So if if a chapter has to be done now to bring everything together into one document, I think that would be very helpful to us and indeed to the secretary of state. So can we not sort of hide behind? I don't think you are hiding behind, but I've heard this is being scoped out a lot. I know it was scoped out. That's factual, but, obviously, things change. And as a result of the many representations we've got, I think it really does need to be scoped back in.

00:52:38:02 - 00:53:09:20

David, it's on behalf of the applicant. We'd welcome any sort of specific questions that want to be raised as part of the written questions that give direction as to what exactly wants to be assessed. Obviously, the pre application process and whole intention of the scoping process, scoping report, scoping opinion is to get clarity on what needs to form part of the application that ultimately is decided on by the Secretary of State. The applicants engage with that entirely. The conclusion of that was that, as we've explained, mental health was scoped out as an individual topic chapter.

00:53:10:06 - 00:53:52:27

As you've said, it doesn't then mean that it gets ignored. It is an important consideration. That is why the applicant has built it in to each of its technical chapters and not just excluded it. And also given that signposting clarity in Chapter eighteen to identify where that has effectively been scoped into the assessments that have already been carried out. So the applicant can certainly prepare a document that draws on the different elements of those technical chapters into one place to identify where effectively it has already been scoped in. And I'd also raise that there's been concern at the open floor hearings, and I've raised it in my responses around compulsory acquisition and how that impacts mental health, for example, and the overwhelm that, that can cause.

00:53:53:04 - 00:54:26:23

Again, just because it was scoped out of the scoping opinion doesn't mean that then gets ignored, forms a key part of the consideration of the scope of power sort. Section eight in the statement of

reasons, which is APP-twenty deals with human rights in accordance with the relative European and domestic legislation that requires that to be considered and sets out the test in favor there. So I suppose the applicant summary position is that just because it has been scoped out in terms of the process that applies pre application, it hasn't then led to it being ignored.

00:54:26:25 - 00:54:41:26

The reason we're relying on that here is because we're being asked why an individual topic chapter hasn't been submitted for human health. And the answer is because that was scoped out of the assessment. If the question is focused on has it been considered, the answer is yes. And we can draw upon where that has been considered.

00:54:41:28 - 00:55:17:21

I do think a stand alone document would be helpful. And also, taking into account there, obviously, is quite detailed submissions that have been made in the last few days as well as the ones in relevant representations. It would certainly help us in our reporting to the Secretary of State because we have received quite a significant amount of concerns around this. We're certainly going to have to address it in our report, and it is an issue that we are obviously taking very seriously. So I think bringing everything together as a document as to what is the applicant's approach on this, obviously, summarizing the various mitigation measures.

00:55:17:23 - 00:55:40:25

I know you've done this to a degree already, but bringing this all together and also providing an assessment of the policy context and guidance context and related guidance context on this issue would be helpful to us in certainly in our reporting. And if any of the parties want to raise issues about the things like the policy context and relevant guidance as well that might be applicable, please draw that to our attention as well.

00:55:41:11 - 00:55:43:11

Absolutely, sir. We'll draw that together.

00:55:47:02 - 00:55:49:16

Thank see two hands raised. Mr. Hook, please.

00:55:49:21 - 00:56:20:05

Just a point of information on the three promised permitted paths, presumably to improve people's health and well-being. One of those paths trends southwards from the eastern end of Saxingham Green into site seven. There is already a public right of way right of the of way way on the definitive map for that location. So the permitted path is not adding anything additional.

00:56:20:22 - 00:56:35:29

In fact, referring back to my point about the inadequacy of maps, the public right of way that is already there is not shown on map section C, just the permitted path, which is irrelevant because it's already a public right of way.

00:56:37:22 - 00:56:41:02

You. The applicant wants to respond, please. Thank you.

00:56:42:06 - 00:57:14:24

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. The only initial point I'd raise is that the intention often sits behind the provision of new permissive passes to ensure connectivity with an existing public right of way network. It wouldn't make any practical effect or sense to have an isolated permissive path away from the public right of way network because then individuals wouldn't be able to actually access it in the first place. So the intention is to make sure it is all joined up, but we welcome continued engagement and thoughts with both NCC's highway authority. And if anyone wants to feed into their local authority to influence those discussions, then that'd be welcome.

00:57:15:13 - 00:57:22:07

Mr. Hook, I'll put that back to you. So there's a promise of engagement with your good self through Norfolk County Council. Is that acceptable?

00:57:23:03 - 00:57:30:21

I just wanted to say it's the public right of way network there is already joined up, and it's in our submission how well joined it up it is.

00:57:31:17 - 00:57:34:25

Thank you. Pardon me. Thank you. Doctor Barry, thank you.

00:57:34:27 - 00:58:10:26

Thank you. I don't think the applicant really understands how we actually use footpaths. I was talking in terms of women's safety and their feelings of safety. So we don't have pavements. So we use footpaths to avoid walking on the roads. And particularly, we if you're if we're women, we use footpaths to avoid walking on the roads. So my daughters, when they get off the bus, they will walk along the footpath to get home rather than walking along the road for their own safety because there aren't people who can see them on the footpath.

00:58:10:28 - 00:58:41:27

So having entirely fenced footpaths where they aren't safe because they're in a tunnel, whether you provide a permissive footpath that Saxling and navigate doesn't help us if our local footpath is no longer safe to use. And that's the same for bridalways. And for example, I use the footpath to walk to my friend's house at Lundy Green rather than walking on the road. And that will be fenced on both sides because that's site three.

00:58:42:04 - 00:59:13:05

And I also ride my horse to my friend's house at Lundy Green. And I will also be impacted in that way by road traffic. So the footpaths are not just something that we use for leisure. They are how our villages are connected together. And because we don't have pavements and we don't have street lighting, if women want to move around at night by foot, it's often safer for us not to be on the road. And we know where the footpaths are. And those are safer places for us often to be.

00:59:13:07 - 00:59:15:19

So they have to be considered in that way as well.

00:59:15:24 - 00:59:16:09

Thank you.

00:59:16:11 - 00:59:25:03

That's very thank you. Just perhaps to the applicant. My follow-up here is that the proposal is to put fencing on the footpaths, has that been subject to road safety audit, for example?

00:59:31:08 - 01:00:05:02

On behalf of the applicant, not as far as I'm aware, sir, but what may be useful to point to as well, the example I gave before was one example of various mitigation measures that have been included in the application and another which addresses this point to at least some degree is the design principle parameters and commitments document includes fifteen meter offsets from the public right of way. So where there's a public right of way that is between two fields of solar, that would be a thirty meter wide path, which is widened the most highways.

01:00:05:04 - 01:00:35:09

So hopefully, it would ensure sufficient safety. There's also then controls inherent in the powers in the DCO. So for example, Article eleven that deals with the ability to temporarily close a public right of way that includes a limitation that the undertaking must provide reasonable access for pedestrians going to and from premises. And therefore, there's a control there as well, limits an ability for the applicant to block it off without providing some other reasonable alternative.

01:00:36:15 - 01:00:38:17

Thank you. Ms. Chandlow?

01:00:39:21 - 01:01:07:26

Just going to the blocking off the footpaths. With Site five, the proposed diversion route would actually put walkers onto the B1527, which the applicant has already highlighted has got no footpath and no verge at that point to actually join up between footpath five and the restricted byway five, which is Boyntonhall Lane.

01:01:08:27 - 01:01:12:17

Charlie, thank you. Turn to the applicant for a response. Thank you.

01:01:13:18 - 01:01:44:23

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. I'll give a higher level one now, sir. I appreciate it's going into quite some depth. And just point to the outlined public rights of way and permissive path management plan, that's the appropriate mechanism to ensure that measures are secured and it's not a final document at this stage. It will be supplemented for our examination. So again, any more specific suggestions that can be had to feed into that are most welcome, and we can engage with that NCCS Highway Authority to seek to accommodate those where that's agreeable.

01:01:45:15 - 01:01:56:12

Thank you. The dialogue with the County Council. Can I just confirm, how regularly are you meeting Norfolk County Council on hybrid related matters? How frequently are those visits taking place?

01:02:00:10 - 01:02:17:06

Tim Hapkad on behalf of the applicant. The last meeting we had with NCC in person well, not in person, but online was probably back in June, July. But then we've had correspondence written correspondence since including sort of drafting the SOCG. And then we'll look to set up another meeting with them very soon.

01:02:17:27 - 01:02:25:11

Okay. Thank you for that. I'm not going take any more questions. We do need to draw the agenda item to a close. I need to confer with the lead panel member. Thank you.

01:02:44:02 - 01:03:03:03

Ladies and gentlemen, we do intend to cover flooding, but I'm afraid given the time constraints in the most briefest possible way, I'm looking to Norfolk County Council as a lead local flood authority. Just ask whether you've had any headline comments to make that the applicant can address as briefly as possible. Thank you. Yes. So Isaac Nunn

01:03:03:05 - 01:03:37:00

from Norfolk County Council. So we've we've submitted some very detailed comments on flood issues and the drainage strategy. The headline issues are there. We think that there are inconsistencies between the flood risk assessment and the various chapters in the ES. We think that there is a lack of design detail relating to the impermeability of development platforms, access tracks and construction compounds. We think that it's a failure that there has been no preliminary site specific infiltration testing in these kind of more impermeable areas.

01:03:37:22 - 01:04:14:02

We don't think that the drainage strategy allows us to confirm whether surface water drainage would the discharge where it would discharge to and can't evidence whether it be to the ground or whether to a watercourse. And we think that as a result of that, we can't conclude that there's no increase can't conclude that there is no increase in flood risk off-site. We also just kind of set a little bit of policy context. You might be aware that flood risk is flood safety is something that's explicitly carved out of the critical national priority presumption in EN1.

01:04:14:19 - 01:04:47:25

It's also worth saying that in according to paragraph five thousand eight hundred forty of EN1, where Flood Risk Management Authority, of which the LLFA is one, continues to have concerns and objects to granted development consent on the grounds of flood risk. The Secretary of State can grant consent, but needs to be satisfied before deciding whether or not to do so that all reasonable steps have been taken by the applicant and the authority to try and resolve concerns. So the last meeting that we had with the applicant on flood risk issues was about this time last month.

01:04:47:27 - 01:04:56:12

And as far as we're aware, there's not any kind of proposed plan to address our concerns in respect to the drainage strategy and the flood risk assessment.

01:04:59:22 - 01:05:03:25

Those points disagreements remain at an impasse. Am I correct?

01:05:03:27 - 01:05:08:02

Yes, we have not heard that the applicant is changing their approach.

01:05:08:26 - 01:05:11:10

You for that. I can ask the applicant to respond, please. Thank you.

01:05:13:03 - 01:05:40:07

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I'll pass to Mr. Fisher online in a second. Suppose what I'd just like here is, obviously, we're at the start of the examination process. So there's still a lot of time still remaining. So I'd suggest that engagement does continue. And obviously, we've seen the detailed submissions that have been sent in writing and the relevant reps have replied to those initially and will continue to engage. So it's not an impasse in terms of lack of engagement. Mr. Fisher can talk more about the specifics than I can.

01:05:40:16 - 01:05:51:12

To date's point, not a very clear. So just to confirm, do you intend to meet with the local local authority on a regular basis? Or do you have a meeting planned with them to try and find resolution?

01:05:51:24 - 01:05:53:12

I'll hand to Mr. Fisher to talk about that.

01:05:54:00 - 01:05:55:16

Mister Fisher, please. Thank you.

01:05:55:21 - 01:05:57:06

Hi. Richard Fisher on behalf

01:05:57:08 - 01:05:58:03

of the applicant.

01:05:59:18 - 01:06:06:27

Yes. We've identified some of the points that have been raised by the LFA, and we're working through those. In terms of

01:06:08:18 - 01:06:38:08

infiltration testing, I'm aware that the LFA were after multiple testing points across the site when there was still some uncertainty on where specific elements would be focused at the detailed stage. So the the strategy is to provide a kind of worst case scenario alternative option that is not relying on infiltration drainage and then refine that

01:06:40:05 - 01:07:02:09

as I said at the at the detailed stage once intrusive testing has been undertaken. On the other points, as part of this update, we'll be identifying where the kind of strategic points of disposal would be for various elements. But as I said, that's kind of being worked up at the moment.

01:07:04:24 - 01:07:10:03

Mister Fisher, thank you. I'll just allow the local planning council to respond to those points, please. Thank you.

01:07:10:05 - 01:07:49:00

Sure. So as it relates to the ongoing engagement point, I'll just note that I've asked my blood engineer, and I don't think we have a meeting in the diary for any future meeting. With regard to the worst case of no infiltration, the policy does require that the Secretary's State needs to be satisfied that the proposed drainage system complies with any national standards published by ministers. And I believe the discharge hierarchy does form part of that in terms of the kind of SUNS guidance, which does require infiltration to be prioritized above discharge into watercourses or other types of discharge.

01:07:49:05 - 01:08:09:18

So the idea that the drainage strategy would have as a worst case scenario, the discharge to a non infiltration solution seems to me to be in conflict with EN1.

01:08:12:07 - 01:08:21:06

Thank you. Mr. Fischer, is it the intention of the applicant to undertake any infiltration testing on-site prior to the end of the examination?

01:08:21:16 - 01:08:34:16

Rich Fisher on behalf of the applicant. Design team isn't opposed to doing infiltration, but at this stage, said there's some uncertainty on final element. So there's a commitment to do that at the detailed design stage.

01:08:35:02 - 01:08:46:18

Mr. Fischer, thank you. I just pose a final question. Is there a risk that without the knowledge of the infiltration testing that, that could affect the outcome of your conclusions for the water environment?

01:08:49:06 - 01:08:52:05

Richard Fisher on behalf of the applicant. No. As I said,

01:08:53:28 - 01:09:26:11

the basis based on the information over the site, infiltration looks highly unlikely because of the underlying geology. So as I said, even allowing for that, we're we're aiming to mimic existing drainage as far as feasible. But doing this worst case scenario, assuming zero infiltration, provides a kind of contingency. And as I we we'd be able to then reassess if we think infiltration is feasible in due course.

01:09:27:07 - 01:09:36:07

Patricia, thank you. Just wonder in terms of the meetings and dialogue, are these meetings between Norfolk County Council and the applicant in person? Are they virtual? And if so, who is attending?

01:09:37:22 - 01:09:40:14

Who attends the meetings, if that's none at this time?

01:09:42:16 - 01:09:54:23

Are sorry, Isaac, no, Norfolk County Council. Mean, there are no meetings in the diary you for know, going forwards. But usually, I think it would be our flight engineer and I'm not sure you from the applicant side.

01:09:56:11 - 01:10:30:05

David, it's on behalf of the applicant. I think the point to note here is that it's intended to be centered around the statement of common ground process, which narrows down the issues in relation to transport with NCCS Highway Authority, foot risk as LLFA. That was shared with Norfolk County Council on the twenty eighth of August, and we've followed up looking for meetings since then. That's not pointing the finger. We're well aware that NCC have got various other projects and commitments to attend to. I suppose what I'm guessing at is that all reasonable steps are being taken to try and enter those meetings.

01:10:30:07 - 01:11:15:24

The areas of disagreement don't relate to the steps being taken. It's the substance. And as Mr. Fisch has explained, there are commitments, detailed design stage in relation to infiltration testing. And if I may, sir, just one additional point around the effects and the conclusions. And Mr. Fisher has confirmed that, that isn't anticipated. But a point to raise is that either way, the Schedule fifteen of the draft DCO includes a provision that when a final plan is submitted for discharge or for approval, that must include a statement to confirm whether it is likely that the subject matter of the application will give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects.

01:11:15:26 - 01:11:37:25

That's paragraph two, subparagraph four. So any measures in, for example, the final construction of our mental management plan that may include measures in relation to infiltration testing, once that's submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval, that must include that statement as to how it relates to the significant effects that were already reported in the environmental statement.

01:11:38:27 - 01:12:09:12

Steve, thank you. Think my concern is because we're still dealing with unknowns. And you've provided assumptions in your assessment. You've made a conclusion based on those assumptions. The assumptions and the analysis are based on just that assumption. So in the absence of the institute testing such as infiltration testing, our concern is that post consent should those investigations reveal the assumptions are invalid in some way that may well affect the conclusions of the assessment.

01:12:09:17 - 01:12:38:01

I think what I get in terms of the dialogue between the local authority and the applicant. I'm just curious to know what degree of seniority or at what level of management would these meetings be held because I'm conscious that decisions, it seems, again, I get the impression of an impasse. I know you said you projected that, but I'm feeling at this point there's little movement on behalf of the applicant. I wonder whether the meetings for example, you could sub would you be attending the meetings?

01:12:38:18 - 01:12:40:28

I certainly can, yes. Mr. Yates?

01:12:42:10 - 01:12:51:02

Sorry, Yates, on behalf of the applicant, I probably wouldn't personally, but I take the point and that's something that we can certainly resolve offline and get a very contact detail shared.

01:12:51:04 - 01:12:59:12

That would be helpful. Thank you. I have no further questions on this particular agenda item. Mr. Fischer, thank you very much indeed. Thank

01:13:05:12 - 01:13:36:16

you. Is everybody happy to continue to four o'clock as we are going to finish at four o'clock without taking a further break? We're happy? Okay. So we will continue. Thank you. So moving on to cumulative effects. Obviously, this is a matter we've had numerous representations on, and I don't think this is a session to hear more representations on cumulative effects. It's more how they are approached by the applicant.

01:13:37:08 - 01:13:50:23

The applicant's confirmed in its response at procedural deadline, a, that it will be submitting a DCO interrelationships report into the examination at deadline one. I think that is intended.

01:13:53:24 - 01:14:19:01

Would the applicant just explain in headline terms what this will contain? And if you could confirm when it will be submitted? Obviously, needs to be updated during the examination to respond to other DCOs, etcetera, and the progress. But if you could just explain the content of it and the purpose of it. I know it's quite a frequent thing that we're getting examinations. I understand that. But I'll leave it for you to explain further.

01:14:21:25 - 01:14:27:04

Ian Douglas on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, the interrelationships report

01:14:28:19 - 01:14:35:20

is a type of document that has been used in other DCO projects.

01:14:37:08 - 01:15:04:05

In my own personal experience, ones that I've come across in in Lincolnshire where there have been a significant number of solar DCO projects and TCPAs, And the interrelationship report gathers together the reports on the proliferation of those projects and the highlights the potential areas of significant effect

01:15:06:00 - 01:15:30:01

across various topic areas. It's not an assessment of significant effects, but areas which, say, BMV, agricultural land, for example, where what data there is available that will that can be drawn on to consider across those projects. So the purpose of this one is to cover that for Norfolk as a county.

01:15:32:07 - 01:15:42:17

So it would it will cover Norfolk as a county, DCO projects within Norfolk as a county, not beyond the boundaries of Norfolk County?

01:15:42:21 - 01:15:46:07

Generally, that's how they've been set out, yes, and that was our intention at the moment.

01:15:46:17 - 01:15:55:18

And has the scope of the what is to be included within it being discussed yet with the county council or indeed the district council?

01:15:56:02 - 01:15:57:13

No. It hasn't.

01:15:57:15 - 01:16:38:16

That could be worth doing, I would Yeah. Imagine. I mean, obviously, there is some precedent for these documents already in the DCO regime, and they they can be helpful to examining authorities. Obviously, their limitation, though, is is depends on the scope in terms of geographical area. Sometimes I get slightly nervous when you tell me that it just stops at the boundary of a geographical county area, but, actually, that's got actually not much to do with day to day effects, has it? So just consider whether or not it needs to go beyond the boundary to pick up any potential projects that could be relevant in this case.

01:16:39:01 - 01:16:51:25

I don't know if that's the case or not, but, yeah, I don't think it should necessarily just be linked to Norfolk County because that's just a boundary an administrative boundary. It's not an environmental boundary, etcetera, etcetera.

01:16:53:19 - 01:17:12:06

And I think if councils agree, I think a sharing of that document with them too would be useful to just discuss the scope of it to make sure that they are content. And that will be updated presumably as we go look through the examination depending on what happens with other emerging DCO schemes.

01:17:14:01 - 01:17:16:01

Ian Douglas for the applicant. Yes. Firstly,

01:17:17:29 - 01:17:28:21

yes, we can engage with host authorities on that, and we'll consider the implications beyond the boundary of Norfolk, but if we can take that away and consider that.

01:17:30:11 - 01:17:46:22

And yes, of course, if other BCO projects come forward during the course of the examination, then we would look to consider those. But as I say, it's not a formal cumulative assessment, full assessment in EIA terms in respect to that type of document.

01:17:46:24 - 01:18:19:11

No. Understand that. And there have been representations, I think, from other county authorities. So, like, I can't remember off the top of my head if they relate to cumulative effects of DCO schemes, but that is worth checking. There have been several rather representations from non Norfolk County local authorities or county authorities. And that would pick up DCO applications. In terms of major planning applications, how would those be? Because, obviously, you provided a document with some details of those.

01:18:19:13 - 01:18:33:01

There have been some, I think, representations I've read that the details are not sufficient. But in terms of updating all the progress of major planning applications, how is that being done? Ian Douglas for

01:18:33:03 - 01:18:42:24

the applicant. My recollection of the work we did in Lincolnshire was that it sought to include approved TCPA solar applications

01:18:44:10 - 01:18:54:03

across that geographical area across that administrative area. So yes, we would try to capture that in this document as well.

01:18:58:27 - 01:19:35:09

And before I come to the county council and the district council, and I don't even think doctor Barry might have been putting your hand up before, but I'll I will I will come to you. One of the points that's been raised, actually, was by Block East Pie Solar about insufficient detail that's been provided of other schemes, including there is a document that I I do tend to agree with the point made that I've not got the reference to the document. I apologize. But it's the document we've it's been referred to as dots on maps showing where the schemes are. It does strike me as though that could be elaborated to be a little bit more clear on where those when

01:19:37:09 - 01:20:20:20

we consider potential cumulative effects along with other schemes and as mister Yates rightly pointed out, this is about cumulative effects. Is effects of this scheme along with other proposed schemes as along to in combination effects of, for example, noise and visual effects on the footpath user as a result of this this scheme. But in terms of that document, which shows I think it could be clearer in terms of showing the extent of those schemes even I mean, we can go looking online, of course, of sort of things like Norwich, Tiloby, etcetera, but it would be useful to have a document in examination which clearly shows the extent of other schemes, particularly where they closely relate to this to this scheme.

01:20:20:22 - 01:20:28:16

So it could potentially have could have a potential for effects. So I think that could be updated.

01:20:30:13 - 01:21:01:23

My other question was, obviously, I've read about the Tasway Energy Park, and I think the applicants is treating this down in terms of cumulative assessment as almost a fallen off the bottom of the scale of projects that needs to be considered, the tiers of projects that needs to be considered because at the

moment, there's no application details publicly available as I understand it. Maybe come back to that. But just at this point, would the I will come to you, Doctor.

01:21:01:25 - 01:21:19:26

Barry. I just want to ask the authorities first. Have the starting with the county council. Is there anything you want to say in terms of overarching points about the applicant's approach to cumulative effects? And is there anything further that you want to highlight is required in order to provide for a robust assessment for us to consider?

01:21:20:25 - 01:21:36:27

I think our points about cumulative effects are more kind of detailed about subject specific approaches, like the approach that's recently been taken about to BMV and Secretary of State decisions. Don't think we've got any overarching

01:21:37:13 - 01:21:52:07

points. Yes. And I think those detailed points are going to have to come out in the more they should come out in representations, and that will be considered as necessary at future hearings in terms of, yes, the cumulative effects of on BMV, for example. I don't want to get into the overall approach I want to talk about today.

01:21:52:09 - 01:21:55:01

Yeah. So we we don't really have any points about the overall approach.

01:21:55:13 - 01:22:01:08

Okay. And South can I ask South Norfolk district council? Don't know who wants to speak for South Norfolk. That's correct.

01:22:01:10 - 01:22:33:29

Yes. Richie Park for South Norfolk council. So similarly, new concerns as regards principle or approach that the applicant's taken. But just to flag that we haven't rather, we're still in the process of reviewing all of the possible projects that might give rise to cumulative impacts. See, we will ensure that nothing's been missed off, etcetera. And, of course, if something comes to light, whether there's been oversight, we'll include that in our little impact report. I do know that Claire Koch is in the room also wants to say something, so I'll just defer to her.

01:22:34:01 - 01:22:34:18

Thank you.

01:22:34:21 - 01:22:35:15

Okay. Thank you.

01:22:36:11 - 01:23:21:03

Clair Cairns, South Norfolk District Council. I would say that both Norfolk County Council and South Norfolk both have maps and plans of the development consent orders available. And South Norfolk district council also has one with renewable energy and its sensors on it as well. So you can see the clear most of impact and in terms of proximity to other projects Yeah. Which is readily available on

our website equally. And then as we did with Knowledge of Tilbury, we will list in part the local impact report the projects that are we think are have should be taken into consideration and cross reference those with the app.

01:23:21:05 - 01:23:56:13

Thank you. That would be helpful. And for the applicant, if you could it would help me to refer to the documents that have been referred to on the website, then that might be useful. And obviously, we would expect the local impact reports and written representations where people want to do the more cumulative effects to address in detail the matter of detailed cumulative effects for us then to consider. And just one more question for Safelorka. In terms of Tasway Energy Park, just what is the current situation? Just to clarify it so everybody knows what the current situation is.

01:23:56:15 - 01:24:01:17

And I just suspect that will be agreed between counsel and the applicant in terms of that current situation.

01:24:01:19 - 01:24:47:12

Could you just clarify? So Russell Buckley on behalf of the applicant. So as it stands, Tasway is on indefinite hold, I would is how I would put it after they didn't get their grid offer. think I it's worth adding that on Monday, we had a meeting with SNC and run through the draft statement of common ground. And we did discuss Tasway on that call to get to an agreed position. And the position as we've left it with them, and they haven't seen, point out, our draft wording, so it's not one hundred percent confirmed, but will be submitted to for deadline one, is that we've said that it isn't a cumulative scheme as it stands because it has been withdrawn, because it falls below that Tier three criteria of not appearing on the PIN's website.

01:24:47:14 - 01:25:08:26

However, if it were to come forward during the examination period, then we would give it further consideration, which would be true for indeed any scheme that if additional schemes do appear, then we would consider those as well. We've also got a similar SOCG position with the environment agency who also asked about Tasway, so we've agreed the same with them.

01:25:09:01 - 01:25:12:19

And there is a possibility that the scheme may come back to life, so to speak, isn't there?

01:25:12:21 - 01:25:14:17

That's Yes. It's not entirely possible.

01:25:14:19 - 01:25:18:14

It's not disappeared completely, has it? It's still sort

01:25:18:16 - 01:25:19:27

of a possibility. The last time I checked, it's a

01:25:19:29 - 01:25:22:16

fairly blank web page saying And

01:25:23:08 - 01:25:36:08

I'm not sure which the two councils is actually leading on would lead on this in terms of reporting accumulative effects, presumably both of you. But do you both agree, starting with the district council, with the applicant's approach to dealing with Tasway as it stands at the moment?

01:25:37:14 - 01:26:08:23

Hi, Curtis. South Norfolk district council. Yes. Because they wrote to us and told us that the project was on permanent pause, and that was because of the fact that they haven't got their gateway connection. Subsequently, that everybody that we dealt with with that in with that group of people, specialists, of being disbanded. So that's, as far as we're aware, that the project has almost unless unless they get another gateway connection, I think, would be the way I would put it.

01:26:08:25 - 01:26:12:04

I think it is on permanent pause. Okay.

01:26:12:07 - 01:26:21:08

So you're happy with the applicant's approach in terms of it's fallen away from the tiers, so it doesn't need to be considered as part of the cumulative assessment, which is what the current situation is as far as what we're

01:26:21:10 - 01:26:28:25

looking We have agreed an appropriate set of wording within then to common ground into that effect.

01:26:28:28 - 01:26:41:00

Okay. And does the County Council agree with that approach as well? We take the same approach. Right. Okay. Doctor Barry, you might not agree with that approach. I suspect you might be telling me. What have you heard what you've said?

01:26:41:28 - 01:27:13:27

Well, this may update what we had been told by Tasway at the time, which was that they were waiting to find out about where the grid connection would be and that they were looking to this application to see where it would end up being before they then went back to put that proposal forward. But I mean, this the discussions they've had with South Norfolk and Norfolk County Council may postdate those things that they had told us. And obviously, it has Gate one, Tasway, but equally the best for this project has Gate one.

01:27:14:02 - 01:27:41:03

So if this is being seen as something that could potentially go forward, then Tasway may potentially be in the same situation. But my other point really was because this project straddles into Waveney Valley, there's also another NSIP in Waveney Valley, which isn't normally incorporated because it's actually on the Suffolk side, and that's Ecopower Yaxley, which is another massive NSIP. So the NSIP is about six miles south of Great Malton. It's very close.

01:27:41:05 - 01:27:41:24

Six miles?

01:27:41:26 - 01:27:47:03

Yes. It's about I mean, that's my own approximation. I haven't measured it, but it's around that distance.

01:27:47:10 - 01:27:54:14

Is that obviously falling out outside of it? That's a good example of my point earlier about boundaries not being quite so relevant. Is that has that been picked up

01:27:54:16 - 01:27:58:29

in the cumulative So Russell Buckley on behalf of the applicants, I can turn it off the top of my head, but I'm sure we'll hear

01:27:59:01 - 01:28:01:27

very shortly. If we can have that as an action point just to

01:28:03:01 - 01:28:04:02

check. And it can't be

01:28:04:04 - 01:28:17:29

checked before we close today. Certainly, this item. You. Mr. Hook, sorry. You're right. You're all sort of have the cameras in between. We're blocked by the camera. You're still there.

01:28:18:17 - 01:28:51:12

Yes. Just to say, we have taken the information that Mrs. Curtis referred to in that South Norfolk has mapped. We've mapped it on a cumulative effects map. It's been widely shown in the press and even on national TV. So we will be supplying that with our written representation. I'd just like to point out that the geographic cumulative effects thing of considering the scheme in conjunction with other schemes in the area and is one element of cumulative effects. But because this is a dispersed scheme, nine of the ten sites will have solar infrastructure on them.

01:28:51:14 - 01:29:15:09

There is a cumulative effect. If they were individual solar farms, we'd be thinking of them as a cumulative effect within the scheme. So that's a second kind of cumulative effect. And then there's a third kind, which is all the elements within the scheme together, such as cultural heritage, landscape, visual health. So cumulative effects, there's more than one kind of cumulative effect. I

01:29:15:18 - 01:29:48:15

yeah. I I understand that. I think I've tried to explain that. I think mister Yates tried to explain that in terms of, yes, there's cumulative effects, which I think in the planning amongst planners, that's is the com the in combination effects of the proposed scheme and other schemes, and there's in combination effects, which in this case could be effects on landscape from site one, site seven, whatever it might be considered together. So that's the way but it is quite confusing. And I think sometimes even within planners, they're probably interchangeably used when maybe they shouldn't.

01:29:49:02 - 01:29:49:18

Thank

01:29:51:18 - 01:29:54:22

you. That's probably as far as

01:29:57:11 - 01:29:59:21

Mrs. Mullet, sorry, I didn't see your hand up there.

01:30:00:03 - 01:30:41:15

I'd just like to bring your attention to the fact that without just outside the boundary of Great Malton and literally, I suppose, five hundred meters from the proposed substation, there is an eight hundred kilowatt battery storage facility also planned. It is in planning. It's held now, I think, until February to see what happens with this proposal, but it is actually with South Norfolk at the moment. The other thing that hasn't been considered is the amount of housing that may well be with the new housing plans that are coming out now within which have been sort of sent through from the Gatler County Council.

01:30:41:18 - 01:30:47:10

There's a substantial amount of housing planned for our villages that hasn't been considered in this effect.

01:30:47:21 - 01:31:20:21

Well, I'm reassured from what the council have said that they will be updating the applicant and indeed us with projects that haven't been included or should be included or projects which come online, so to speak, during the examination. So I think I'm sort of content that they will provide details of that. But the actual details of such schemes in terms of potential transport effects or other effects, they'll be considered in the sort of titopic assessments following the approach of the applicant in doing that within each chapter in the the assessment. But I don't want get on to the discussion of that today as we will not get home by four o'clock.

01:31:20:23 - 01:31:23:20

That is for the that is for the the remainder of the examination.

01:31:25:01 - 01:31:25:16

Okay.

01:31:28:11 - 01:31:30:11

Yes. The lady on the left hand side.

01:31:36:01 - 01:32:07:02

Carolyn Robinson, Fasten resident. I believe that a proposal in examination possibly. Energy firm, RPC and Elmira Energy are exploring sites for a massive solar farm project between Longstratten and DIS with a grid connection point proposed near the village of Kissing. And it's power output up to nine hundred megawatts, which could power more than four hundred thousand homes.

01:32:08:03 - 01:32:10:17

K. That's a future application, is it?

01:32:10:19 - 01:32:14:27

It's I think it's been in discussion for quite a while.

01:32:14:29 - 01:32:15:14

I've heard

01:32:15:16 - 01:32:17:11

about this thing for a while.

01:32:17:13 - 01:32:38:08

Does somebody I don't I don't mind having the councils do it till the applicant does it. Just explain the the very overall to approach what is assessed cumulatively in terms of the tiers. Mr. Yates, do you want to because I think there was agreement on this between the councils and the applicants in terms of that general approach to cumulative effects, just so people understand what schemes are included in the cumulative assessments and which are not. That'd be helpful.

01:32:38:10 - 01:33:13:01

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. Yes, Mr. Buckley can run through each state in a bit more detail. I think the point to address at a high level is that the concern around cumulative is in respect of third party schemes where you've got potentially a combination of one scheme and another scheme and another scheme and the impacts that might arise. When the first scheme in that queue of that example of three comes forward, that can only carry out a cumulative assessment based on other schemes that have a reasonable chance of creating additional effects cumulatively with the scheme that's being sought at that point.

01:33:13:18 - 01:33:57:02

There's got to be a line in the sand effectively drawn at that stage in application of the guidance. And at this point, Tasway isn't sufficiently developed because there isn't enough information available online to include that within the scope of the cumulative assessment for East Pie. What that then means is East Pie can effectively proceed without capturing Tasway in its cumulative because it falls outside of the scope of that guidance. But that doesn't then mean that any risk of Tasway, if it is brought forward, would arise or necessarily materialize in cumulative with East Pie because any application that may or may not come forward for Tasway would be subject to the same guidance and would then have to carry out its own cumulative assessment.

01:33:57:04 - 01:34:28:12

So if East Pie had been consented or because of the stages at the moment, it would have to carry out its own cumulative assessment. And if it was deemed that, that cumulative impact was not consentable, TASFA would be refused potentially refused consent on that basis. And therefore, that concern around having multiple in place at one moment would never come through. And I think it's also worth clarifying as well because there's been a bit of overlap here around the interrelationship report and the cumulative assessment.

01:34:28:29 - 01:35:01:10

And the details of that report will become available at deadline one, and we can share that with parties in advance if it's available. But if not, will be in the public domain at deadline one, I believe in, but if we can confirm that in writing. And the difference there, and I think that's where some confusion has arisen, the cumulative assessment, which is separate from that interrelationship report, has applied a zone of influence, which Mr. Buckley can talk to in more detail, but that isn't limited by geography or council necessarily. It's a radius around the scheme and the East pie scheme.

01:35:02:00 - 01:35:44:25

And therefore, schemes that have been mentioned, so the Ecopower Solar Farm, which is ten kilometers south of 2A, that has been included, that's set out in Appendix two point four cumulative schemes, which is APP-one hundred sixteen, equally with the battery energy storage system that was referred to, that's nine hundred meters north of Sub Site 1B. That's also included in that list because it falls within that sort of influence when you apply the different stages of the guidance. And as I say, that's separate from the interrelationships report, and we've not got the detail for this one in front of us, but you referred to precedent, and there's one for the Cottam solar project, West Burton solar project, Gate Burton Energy Park and Tilbridge solar project.

01:35:45:04 - 01:36:12:23

The intention of that document is to show more of a practical collaboration exercise effectively outside of the planning regime, but to show how these projects may work together, interact and can effectively be brought forward cumulatively alongside one another. That complements the cumulative effects assessment, which identifies whether or not in delivering each of those schemes, there actually will be a cumulative effect anticipated or not.

01:36:13:08 - 01:36:17:15

Thank you. I think that's hopefully helpful for everybody. Thank you.

01:36:19:20 - 01:36:21:29

Just quickly before we move on because we do need to move on,

01:36:22:11 - 01:36:48:06

Sorry. Just wanted to say that I don't think it really recognizes that East Py Solar is basically the gateway project for all of these other projects. Because if this project goes ahead and the National Grid substation is built at Great Malton, all of these other projects will happen. So it really is a cumulative issue. This project isn't coming on its own because there will be a new national grid substation at Great Malton, and all of these other things will connect to it. It will be a permanent substation.

01:36:49:03 - 01:36:55:28

Okay. No, that's noted. You don't need to come back to that, but we've noted it. I'm sure you've noted the point. Okay.

01:36:57:14 - 01:37:02:17

Is that everything on cumulative effects? It is.

01:37:05:07 - 01:37:17:02

Right. If we can move on to item five, that's the draft development consent order, which obviously is an important document.

01:37:20:13 - 01:37:28:11

Because if consent was granted, it'd be the development consent order that would be, obviously, key to how it would be carried out.

01:37:30:11 - 01:37:35:11

And it would have to secure all the relevant mitigation, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. I'm

01:37:36:27 - 01:38:06:15

the the updated the latest updated draft valid consent order, I think, is a s zero three two in the examination library. And there's also a track change version, which is a s zero three three. And as this will be updated, I think mister Yates has already implied, there'll be an update at deadline one. And I suspect there might be further updates during the examination. There'll be a track change version submitted at every

01:38:08:12 - 01:38:44:21

relevant deadline along with a schedule of changes. Both those versions are probably the most useful versions to use at that time because it shows and explains what has changed. So those are important documents to be aware of. Just a caveat is that, obviously, the bank consent order includes things such as requirements, and requirements are what you might have come across as conditions on planning permissions. Parts engagements on this through the examination is and our discussion of this is without prejudice to, obviously, our recommendation on the application.

01:38:44:23 - 01:39:08:27

Rather like I'm sure many of you have been to a planning appeal, there will be a discussion on the conditions and that without prejudice as to whether or it would be granted or consented. So don't feel as though you don't want to you don't aren't able to participate in terms of representations on the development consent order if you object if you're objecting to the scheme. We would still encourage engagement because it's without prejudice.

01:39:11:21 - 01:39:42:17

Sometimes at this point in these examinations, the seven year authority asked the application applicant to do a sort of very quick sort of overview of the main parts and components of the DCO to explain how it works. Very well in this case that both the councils are very familiar with development consent orders. Would it be helpful or not for people, for the applicant just to explain in and I'd probably only give you five minutes just to give a bit general overview of the structure of the development consent order.

01:39:42:19 - 01:40:03:02

I suspect some might be more familiar than others. Would that be would that be helpful? Yes? Yeah. I've had some nods. So, miss Yates, do you want to proceed? But if you can do so in five minutes and this is very, very high level, just give people an understanding of the structure and broadly how it how it works.

01:40:04:07 - 01:40:46:00

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. Yes, sir. So the draft DCO is the statutory instrument which controls how the scheme will be constructed, operated and decommissioned should development consent be granted by the Secretary of State. As you've alluded to, it differs from a planning permission, which may be brought into the Town and Country Planning Act of nineteen ninety, and that it both grants the development consent, so the consent to allow the works to come forward, then it also includes a wide range of other powers, statutory powers, including, I suppose, notably, the distinction from Town and Country Planning is compulsory acquisition powers.

01:40:46:29 - 01:41:04:02

And that reflects what's known as the one stop shop approach in the under the Planning Act of two thousand and eight, whereby the intention is for development consent order to stand on its own two feet insofar as possible and not require separate regimes and separate licenses or permits to apply.

01:41:05:23 - 01:41:36:16

So the DCO then operates more, as I mentioned earlier, more akin to an outline planning permission. As I explained earlier, by granting the consent in this form doesn't then mean that with all the flexibility that's currently sought, that is the final form of development that the applicant then has complete discretion to go and build. What that does is set out a framework or a consent envelope, so a maximum scope of the development within which the final design will then be secured.

01:41:36:18 - 01:42:15:08

And that's dealt with through the requirements, which are set out in Schedule two of the draft development consent order. So Schedule one of the development consent order sets out the different works that are being consented for the scheme or would be consented for the scheme. And then Schedule two sets out, as you alluded to, effectively the planning conditions, which would control the scope or the delivery of those works in Schedule one. The key point to note here is that in many of the requirements, the final details of the scheme, once they're available at detailed design stage, which follows the granting of a consent.

01:42:15:27 - 01:43:03:17

Many of those final plans will pass through the process, which is set out in Schedule fifteen of the draft ECO, which involves a submission of final plans to the relevant planning authority for approval, so that any scheme that is actually eventually delivered will have been seen, reviewed and approved by the relevant planning authority, which again points back to that element of outlined planning permission. So the draft DCO that's been submitted will be updated throughout examination, and it's been drafted by reference to the government guidance on draft development consent orders, PINS Advice Note fifteen and also the practice and precedence of what is a growing number of solar development consent orders with adaptations to make it suitable for the locality.

01:43:04:01 - 01:43:34:26

And in that regard, this scheme benefits from all of the preceding precedent to establish preferences at the Secretary of State, but also learnt experience from previous examinations. And as has been mentioned, IGP has considerable experience on these sorts of projects. So we've taken precedent from the likes of Westburton and Cottam, both of which have already been consented and also is taking

learnings from Limesdown, Greenhill, the droves, etcetera, etcetera. Very quick run through of the provisions of the DCO.

01:43:34:28 - 01:43:44:06

So part one is the preliminary part, and that sets out effectively the name of the order and when it will come into force. And then the defined terms are listed in Article two of

01:43:44:08 - 01:43:46:25

that Part one. Part two of

01:43:46:27 - 01:44:38:10

the order then goes on to include the principal powers, and that's basically granting the actual consent, and that refers to Schedule one and also sets out powers for construction, operation, maintenance as well. It also refers to the application or modification of other statutory provisions. As I mentioned, the intention of this consent is to be able to stand on its own two feet and not rely on other regimes insofar as that's appropriate. The way that that's controlled is that to the extent any prescribed bits of legislation may be modified or disapplied, protected provisions or other protections in the draft amendment consents or are then built in so that you can effectively disapply the separate regime the because protections that would otherwise arise under that regime have been built into the scope of the consent.

01:44:38:12 - 01:45:11:29

So the example I just alluded to was something that's called protected provisions. That's your Schedule fourteen, and that sets out provisions that protect particular apparatus of statutory undertakers. Part three of the development consent that then deals with Streetworks. So this deals with the suite of powers in relation to Streetworks and Highways works, and that's from Articles eight to sixteen. And that's a combination of both general and specific powers with controls built into those articles.

01:45:12:25 - 01:45:29:29

And where there is a specific power, what I mean by that is there's where already at this stage an understanding of how those powers are to be applied. That's then done by reference to schedules three to seven, which sets out additional detail, which is known at this stage as to how that power would be applied in that regard.

01:45:31:23 - 01:46:06:21

Part four then is supplemental powers, and that includes various sort of isolated matters in respect to the discharge of water, removal of human remains, protective works to buildings and authority to survey and investigate land. A lot of those provisions are modeled DCO provisions that have formed part of many, if not all, of the solar DCO precedent to date. And then Part five considers powers of acquisition. So this includes compulsory acquisition powers in respect of land, compulsory acquisition in respect of rights and also temporary possession powers.

01:46:07:01 - 01:46:39:20

And similarly to the way that the Street's provisions operate, these also then point to more specific detail that's set out in schedules eight to eleven. And then finally, you'd be glad to hear part six is

miscellaneous and general, and that includes a range of other provisions, as I mentioned, that have either come from model DCO provisions or that are specific for this scheme. And what I've summarized today and also additional detail in relation to those provisions is captured primarily in the expansion memorandum.

01:46:40:05 - 01:47:01:19

And the latest version of that is document reference AS-thirty four. And that document, similar to how I've done today, but in greater detail, goes through each requirement and each schedule and explains the purpose and intention of each of those from a statutory instrument or effect perspective. Probably all for now, sir.

01:47:02:04 - 01:47:35:09

Okay. You, Mr. Yates. I hope that's helpful as a general high level overview. I'll come to questions in a in a few moments. The expansion memorandum is quite if if you want to engage in the development consent order and seek explanation of various articles, the expansion memorandum is the place to go for that, and that's why it's important. And that's updated as as any changes are made, unless, as I said the other day, it's just a minor sort of typo change. The the two points I would just make for the applicants. The web precedent is mentioned.

01:47:36:04 - 01:48:10:22

Can you please ensure that the circumstances of that other case that might be referred to ensure that those circumstances are not, if you like, different to the circumstances of the current of case? That's not sometimes that can happen. The precedents will refer to this one in some of the DCO. But then you look at that DCO, think, well, it was very it was quite different circumstances behind the reason for putting in a particular article or provisional particular wording. So if you could rather than just say, oh, this DCO this this wording is pressed into these orders, just ensure that actually the circumstances were were the same.

01:48:10:24 - 01:48:17:04

Because sometimes when we go digging around, they're not, and it can can be it can result in a sort of change to the

01:48:18:20 - 01:48:49:26

wording. And also, again, where you refer to other precedents of particular wording, sometimes they're referred to and the wording's actually slightly different, and that wording can be that different wording can be quite important. So I'm not necessarily gonna pick on examples of that, and I don't think there are too many in yours. But from experience, that does actually precedent is quite loosely used, I think, sometimes by applicants in saying, oh, yes. This has been precedence before and agreed by the Secretary of State. And then you dig down and think, well, actually, circumstances are a little bit different.

01:48:49:28 - 01:49:17:27

So some explanation behind the precedent rather than just saying this was also agreed by the Secretary of State and previous orders. I don't propose today at all, partly because it's not that much time left, partly also, everyone's probably getting quite tired because it's been quite a long week. I'm

not gonna go into a detailed DCO drafting session. That will follow later in the examination as required after the written process has flowed out.

01:49:19:22 - 01:49:35:23

And we will ask probably some written questions next week, but I think we'll reserve the biggest chance of DCO written questions until the next round of questions after written representations and local impact reports. Engagement with interested parties is obviously very important on

01:49:38:03 - 01:50:16:25

the content of the DCO and not just the local authorities, but we haven't got any here today, but the statutory parties as well. Can the applicant give some assurance that that is ongoing? Because I think the quicker we get where there's disagreement on the content of the DCO into the examination, the better. And I would say that for the local authorities, you've already provided, I think, some comments which have been very helpful in some of the statutory consultees have, I think, Environment Agency and others have as well, which is very helpful. But if you could include your comments on the draft DCO by deadline one in your local impact report.

01:50:17:02 - 01:50:36:08

I mean, there might be a difference of representation, actually, because they're not really impacts, are they? They're more comments on the DCO. I'm not too bothered where you put them, risk of representation or local impact report. And again, it would be helpful if the statements of common ground, where relevant, has a section on the draft development consent order as well, which I think is normally done, isn't it?

01:50:37:26 - 01:50:57:09

And then the other point is, if there's disagreement after discussion of various bits of the DCO, if is disagreement and it gets to the point where clearly there's not going to be agreement, the other party should suggest alternative suggested drafting where there's just not agreement, and then obviously we'll go away and consider that.

01:50:59:04 - 01:51:18:15

And linked to that, of course, again, there's you mentioned protected provisions. Obviously, I'm not going discuss those in any detail today, but could you just give an update on as well as how engagement is going with other interested parties and what your plans are for that, what the program is for engagement with parties subject to the protective provisions?

01:51:20:08 - 01:51:59:09

OBAs on behalf of the applicants. Yes, sir. So a number of the statutory undertakers that are affected by this scheme are also affected by earlier schemes involving Allen Green Power, so Green Hill Solar Farm, Landon Solar Park and others, including the droves. So the applicant has included bespoke protective provisions where they're understood to be required as a result of the review of the relevant representations from East Pie. The form of those provisions is the result with those undertakers between Ireland Green Power and those statutory undertakers primarily on those previous schemes.

01:51:59:14 - 01:52:31:26

Reason being this, it's not necessary to duplicate those early stage negotiations when the parties both understand the principal concerns that are raised on those schemes and all the others where we work together. The latest position is captured in the land and rights negotiations tracker in very summary form, just PDA-three, and that gets updated throughout the examination. So that's the current state of play, and the applicant is obviously continuing to engage with those parties.

01:52:31:28 - 01:52:43:16

That's relevant on those previous schemes, and it will filter through then also in relation to specific concerns that may be raised in relation to East Pie, which will then result in that sort of understood precedent to be tweaked to be suitable.

01:52:44:12 - 01:53:00:18

If I can just jump in there. Are there any particular protected provisions where agreement you suspect might take longer than others? Are there any particular ones that are being delayed, for example?

01:53:01:24 - 01:53:37:18

Toby, it's on behalf of the applicant. It's perhaps difficult to say too much precision given a lot of the discussions are going on, on other projects primarily. As I understand it, for example, with National Gas, there's a potential point of disagreement that's arisen on another project, which would apply here. So that's one that may take a bit longer. But we expect that agreement can be reached on all of these by the close of examination, as I mentioned earlier. It's not just the other IGP schemes where we have worked with these statutory undertakers before their concerns are well understood.

01:53:37:23 - 01:53:42:02

So we have full confidence that agreement can be reached by the close of examination.

01:53:42:24 - 01:53:46:25

And ideally, well, before the close of examination. That's the intention, of Because course,

01:53:46:27 - 01:53:47:12

course,

01:53:47:14 - 01:54:17:19

if there is disagreement in any protection provisions or any other matter, obviously, as I said before, it's very useful to get suggested alternative drafting from the other party and a final reasoning statement from both parties on that position. And then those are the sorts of things we have to go away and obviously scratch our heads on and come to a conclusion in our recommendation. It'd be helpful if there is. If everything is not, I'm not saying it will be at all, but that things aren't just left till later in the examination process. It is a front loaded process, so it's important to remember that. So earlier on

01:54:17:21 - 01:54:52:12

in examination, the better. That's completely understood, sir. And I suppose just touching on your slightly related point, had very initial conversation with Mr. Nun earlier this week to discuss a conversation that we've offered to have around general DCO provisions, and we've seen that this council representing South Norfolk Council as well. So we're happy to engage with them directly too, in the statement of common ground, do already include matters in relation to the DCO on the sort of

more technical specific matters with the relevant statutory undertakers to the extent they don't already cover the more general DCO provisions.

01:54:52:14 - 01:54:54:02

We're here and happy to have that conversation.

01:54:54:19 - 01:54:59:25

Okay. Thank you. There was a hand up from the lady towards the back.

01:55:03:03 - 01:55:09:29

Can you give your name, please, first of all? Sorry. Can you just give your name away from microphone? Sorry. Or come to the front. Yes. Come to the front.

01:55:12:28 - 01:55:45:28

Yes. Frances Horner. I live in Brook. It's just to say that from the point of view of an average middle aged female, the first part of what you were saying for me was absolute gobbledygook. I'm not informed. I don't speak the same language. And it's just to make you aware that when you are presenting the situation in legal form, what I was hoping for was a five minute summary, which was comprehensible for us as well, please.

01:55:46:00 - 01:55:46:29

I under I understand.

01:55:47:01 - 01:56:00:15

I think the the problem is it's a statutory instrument. It's a statutory instrument, but it would be if it was if it was made, obviously, as an order. It's draft at the moment. So it is a very it is a it is a legal document. As I said before,

01:56:02:11 - 01:56:33:25

the explanatory memorandum is probably the go the place to go to to get a a reasoning explanation of its content. But, also, the planning inspector has issued guidance on the content of a DCO, and, also, there's been some recent guidance, I think, issued by the government, I think, very recently in July this year on content of a DCO. So there is guidance out there. And perhaps, actually, if you talk to one the case of team members at the back of the room, they can point you towards that because there's some quite straightforward guidance.

01:56:34:02 - 01:56:37:27

I mean, there's another document that we issued was the planning inspectorate, which I think is sort of a

01:56:41:08 - 01:56:50:07

a general sort of person's guide to the development consent order. So that's probably the place to go to actually first before the expansion around random. And I'm sure one of my colleagues who's here at

01:56:50:09 - 01:56:50:24

the back of

01:56:50:26 - 01:57:04:25

the room will be able it's quite a short document, but I I understand what you said. It's it's not a simple document at all. So I think the applicant did the best to describe it, but it's probably not the easiest thing to describe in five in five minutes, to be honest with you. So but the point is taken.

01:57:07:10 - 01:57:15:13

Anything further? Just just generally, are the councils? Thank you. Berry?

01:57:15:29 - 01:57:24:23

Just wanted to make one final comment on behalf of the community from having sat in these hearings for the last couple of days.

01:57:26:15 - 01:58:03:20

To me, it feels very sad that it feels that the applicant's approach is really to do the legal bare minimum on pretty much every oh, sorry, to do the legal bare minimum on most aspects to push through this predetermined size and design project with no real care for the community or the actual landscape that it sits within. That has been our experience from the start. We were hoping for a company that would genuinely protect what is here and create something beneficial in collaboration with us.

01:58:03:27 - 01:58:30:13

That hasn't been our experience, and it didn't need to be this way. And it's been very disappointing. And I hope that going forward, rather than always looking to do the absolute minimum of what you have to do legally, you think about us and our wildlife and our countryside and our lives and our heritage here and actually do more than the bare minimum. Make it the best that you can for us. Thank you.

01:58:30:15 - 01:58:44:07

Okay. Thank you, doctor Gray. Thank you. As I've said, thank you. you Do want to briefly come back? Because I have got there's actually two points in the DCO that I do want to come back to before we move on. But do you want to briefly come back to what's just been said?

01:58:44:09 - 01:58:46:07

No further comment on that point, Fred.

01:58:48:07 - 01:59:21:29

Thank you. And we we we obviously, we've listened for sort of, you know, to including this day sort of to to all the representation. So also, we understand what's being said by the residents. And, obviously, we'd be asking and we have been asking the applicant to respond to matters as well, and we hope that that sort of proceeds throughout the examination. Just going back to the I didn't want to go into the detail of detail. There's just two sort of small points that I wanted to ask rather than getting into a detailed discussion because I think I'm beyond the point where that would be advantageous.

01:59:22:16 - 01:59:38:29

In terms of this is in relation to the interpretation of commence and permitted preliminary works. I don't want to get into the detail of how that works at the moment. All I wanted to ask you was there's reference, I think, to a

01:59:41:09 - 01:59:46:03

omitted preliminary works environmental management plan,

01:59:50:22 - 02:00:01:14

which I I don't think, unless it's hiding in the annex within the document, I don't think it's before the examination at the moment. Is that proposed for submission at deadline one?

02:00:02:11 - 02:00:06:01

Tobias, on behalf of the applicants, you're correct, sir. We submitted a deadline one.

02:00:06:07 - 02:00:38:07

Right. So that's coming at deadline one. And would that be a outline plan, or will it just be the plan? Because this is obviously this deals with sorry. I've been slightly cryptic here, which is quite easy to do on there. DCO matters, but this relates to certain matters that are certain works that are carried out before the actual commencement of the development. And our concern in the examining authority is to ensure that those matters where they could affect the environment are suitably controlled with appropriate mitigation, which of there's actually quite an interesting section in the recent DCO guidance, which I'm sure you'll have read.

02:00:38:09 - 02:00:49:09

But anyway, let's get into the detail of that because that we can reserve that for another time if necessary. But that plan is coming in at deadline one. So is it outlined? Or will it be the final plan,

02:00:49:11 - 02:01:27:00

so to speak? It'll be on behalf of the applicants. It'll be the final plan. Right. Okay. And that will contain content, which presumably will demonstrate how preliminary works carried out before commencement are appropriately managed and mitigate to avoid environmental effects? There'll be some half of the applicant. That's correct, sir. And requirement thirteen in Schedule two of the draft DCO has already been updated to secure the commitment that says the permitted preliminary works must be carried out in accordance with the permitted preliminary works environmental management plan.

02:01:27:03 - 02:01:32:28

And the reason that's not subject to an approval is because the final details will be included in that plan once it's submitted.

02:01:33:00 - 02:02:04:17

Okay. Thank you. And I probably don't need to draw the attention to the highway authority you that already have in your introduction, but articles eight to sixteen relate to powers relating to streets, highways, etcetera. I suspect you're already aware of those and are already sort of looking at them, etcetera. So I probably don't need to say anymore. But obviously, there's various it's already been sort of referenced to various powers in terms of accesses, highway changes, alterations, etcetera, etcetera,

which obviously would be very helpful to us to get the county highway authorities representations on at deadline one.

02:02:05:01 - 02:02:08:12

Yes. That's done for Norfolk County Council. Yes. That's our intention.

02:02:10:21 - 02:02:55:24

Okay. And before we just talked about the not I'm gonna talk about the schedules today. We can reserve the detail of that. We've covered some elements actually in the scope of development earlier on, so we can come back to those as need be. But the requirements we talked earlier on about requirement five. I think I did actually probably put this on the agenda as a specific thing, so I better ask about it. And we did talk about it earlier on. Is there anything that either the councils want to raise further to what we said, I think, earlier on today about the drafting of requirement five? Because, obviously, this is a very important requirement because this requires the detailed design approval to be of various elements of the scheme to be approved by the local planning authority.

02:02:56:06 - 02:03:06:21

Is there anything further that the councils would like to say? I don't know miss Parikh wants to comment on this. I don't know. There's no need to do if you don't want to do because, obviously, we're asking for representations at deadline one.

02:03:07:06 - 02:03:27:21

So Yeah. Richard Richard Parikh for South Norfolk District Council. So nothing specific to add to what we said this morning and yesterday. But just to highlight, obviously, we will await the drafting because we've not seen that yet before we can make more detailed comments. So it might not be possible in our in the next deadline. We'll have to see the draft, and then it might come after that.

02:03:27:28 - 02:03:59:12

Okay. Thank you. If obviously, we have deadlines where you're talking to key parties about matters, and you have a document that is ready to go to that party to consider. I have obviously no problem with that. Obviously, won't be before the examination. But if it means getting even the wording of that requirement to the council in advance, that might be quite helpful. I mean, in in general, I'm happy for that to happen. Obviously, the formal submission goes in for the deadline, which is when we get it.

02:03:59:14 - 02:04:04:06

But on matters where there's ongoing discussion, sharing of documents can be very useful and can save a

02:04:04:08 - 02:04:33:17

lot of examination time. Maybe it's on behalf of the applicant. Completely agree, sir. We've taken that approach with many of the technical documents and statement of common ground and happy to continue to do so. And also, we'll do that with the development consent order. The reason it hasn't been shared so far is because we wanted to see the outcome of the hearing today. We weren't sure obviously which angle you were going to go down. If there's no further amendments, we can share that and have a discussion. If matters are agreed, then we can comment on that and the shareholder changes the deadline on.

02:04:33:21 - 02:04:43:29

Okay. Thank you. And we would have had further discussion today, but as with all these things, there's lots of other things to discuss. So I've had to compress this so we're not having detailed discussion, but we're early on in examination.

02:04:45:20 - 02:04:47:10

Miss Parak, do you want to say?

02:04:48:04 - 02:05:03:09

So just yes. Richard Parak, out of Norfolk Council. So just to reiterate, we would find that helpful because we have we are liaising already on a statement of common ground that covers DCO matters as my colleague has said. Yes, it would be helpful for us to just have the wording of the new requirements. Thank you.

02:05:03:11 - 02:05:05:14

Okay. Thank you. That's that's helpful. Thank you.

02:05:07:23 - 02:05:26:23

I don't think I'm going to raise anything else. I can raise some things we'll raise some things in in recent questions next week and further detail things in in further recent questions. So I think that's everything I wanted to raise for the draft development consent order. So just turning to the other matters, and these can be dealt with very speedily.

02:05:28:11 - 02:05:32:20

Mister Yates, is there any further on statements of common ground to what we actually discussed at the preliminary meeting?

02:05:34:15 - 02:05:48:15

So it's behalf of the applicants. Just to confirm that all of the recipients listed in the rule six letter have received a copy of the initial draft statement of common ground, and we'll submit that at deadline one and continue to engage.

02:05:49:07 - 02:06:29:14

And that is very important to get early versions to parties so they have an opportunity to comment on those. Anything else on statements of common ground? On outline management plan, this is really a point, and this has already come up and has been mentioned, that the outline management plans, if consent was to be granted, are obviously important documents because they control the management and mitigation of the scheme and effects. obviously, So they're important documents. So I would encourage where people are able to engage with those documents and provide the comments to the applicant on them.

02:06:29:16 - 02:06:46:04

And there's no reason to, back to my previous point for the local authorities, for example, to, yeah, obviously exchange comments outside of examination. You don't need to wait for an examination

deadline. What we really want interested in is what is the end of your discussions, which bits are in disagreement. But that engagement, I think, is very important.

02:06:47:21 - 02:07:11:22

The commitments register, I think this was raised by doctor Barry in the BEP's representation. Is are you happy now with the commitments register as you made a comment about making sure that everything is secured, quite rightly secured in the DCO, etcetera. And I think the document to which the applicant is proposing to do that is the commitments register. I think I'm right in saying. Is there anything you could just briefly explain about what

02:07:11:24 - 02:07:51:12

the commitments register does? Obvious on behalf of the applicant, yes, sir. So the commitments register is intended to be a helpful signposting tool to identify where within the broader suite of application documents any mitigation measures that are deemed to be required as a result of the environmental impact assessment are secured. So it's not a secured document. It's a signposting tool to say that effectively an effect or potential effect has been identified in this assessment, but because of an embedded mitigation measure as reported in the chapter, a conclusion of no significant effect arises, it will then signpost to where that measure is secured.

02:07:52:06 - 02:08:09:24

Needless to say, probably, but please do ensure that every mitigation that's in the environmental statement is properly secured Sometimes things get missed and don't get properly secured. So please keep on top of that. Doctor. Bare, is there anything further you want to say? I read a representation that you made about this.

02:08:10:01 - 02:08:45:20

I'm not entirely sure whether that will be adequate for us to be able to keep track of things. Because there you know, if you signpost to a particular document, it could be anywhere in the document. And equally, your summaries of your in your document don't always actually accurately represent the findings of the surveys. We've sort of found by looking at them in detail. So for us, I think it would be easier rather than signposting us to other places where we may or may not find the information for actually all to be together in the one location so that we can see clearly exactly what's proposed and how it's secured.

02:08:49:01 - 02:08:50:26

Thank you. Mr. Yates?

02:08:51:05 - 02:09:21:24

Debbie, it's on behalf of the applicant. Yes, there's a separate document, the guide to the application. That sets out the full suite of application documents, and it's updated at each deadline to record which application documents are being updated at that deadline. That will be available in a clean and track change version to clearly identify which documents have been updated at that deadline. And then equally, if you look at the guide to the application and see that the outline construction environmental management plan, for example, has been updated.

02:09:21:29 - 02:09:53:11

There will also be a clean and track change version of that outline management plan. That you can go directly to the source document and see the clear changes from the previous version that has been available since the start of the examination. As I was saying, the commitments register is intended to try and help with that signposting exercise to show the linkage between technical assessments and the security of those mitigation measures. If it's not being found to be useful, that's fine. Doesn't need to be used. It's not secured. The focus should be on the content of the secured documents and the management plans.

02:09:53:13 - 02:10:04:08

And by using the guide to the application and the clean and track change versions of this management plans, that's the sort of general approach as to how to identify where changes are being made across the examination.

02:10:04:28 - 02:10:22:05

Okay. Thank you. I mean, that's generally the approach in these examinations, Doctor. Barry, that's taken. Anything further you want to add? Is there any sort of further point of clarification that would help elaborate on that? These things have already been obviously, proved, I'm sure.

02:10:22:07 - 02:10:23:08

But Well, I mean

02:10:26:12 - 02:11:03:15

For us, in order for us to be able to participate in this examination at all, we all have other jobs that we do. So we don't have limitless time that we can flick between this document and another document, finding paragraph across multiple different documents. So actually having one document that we can easily look at to see what the issue is, where it's secured, what the current status is, all in one place without it's like the maps where you have to go to another document to actually find the key to the map. Just everything takes so long, it makes it actually inaccessible for the community to participate in the process.

02:11:04:16 - 02:11:32:14

And it becomes increasingly opaque, because nothing is in the same place. You're always referred to somewhere else. In the same way, when we ask questions, we're referred back to a document we've already read and found that the answer wasn't in there. That's why we're asking the question. So we don't need to be referred to different documents. We just need what the issue is, where is it secured, all in one place, easy to see, so we can actually participate. Thank you.

02:11:32:19 - 02:11:53:06

Okay. Thank you. That's understood. We do recognize there is a lot of material in these examinations and that navigation can be an issue. So we want to try and strive to make this information as clear as possible. Mr. Yates, is that noted? We've talked before about accessibility documents on the first preliminary meeting. Is there anything further you want to say?

02:11:54:06 - 02:11:55:26

Nothing further, sir. Thank you.

02:11:57:05 - 02:12:06:16

Thank you, mate. Any further points on that? The final item was just a very quick reference. Obviously, the National Planning Policy Framework twenty twenty six was published

02:12:08:03 - 02:12:18:25

fairly recently, and I suspect it will be done. But please can, obviously, the applicant make sure at deadline one that any relevant updates are provided

02:12:21:17 - 02:12:53:18

as required. Obviously, the MPS hasn't been updated. It's the national planning policy framework that has. But there are sort of items in it that are still relevant. There's something that we need to take into consideration. And I'm sure the local authorities will already be obviously on top of that with your written representations and local impact reports. That's all I really wanted to say to flag up that there is a new national planning policy framework to make sure that's reflected. Right. I think that is everything that we can cover today or wish to recover.

02:12:53:20 - 02:13:19:01

So thank you, everybody, for bearing with us. We've had to sort of speak for a little bit some of the items in order to get through. But thank you for everyone's patience, and thank you for everyone's contributions both today and throughout the week at the preliminary meeting and the other hearings. They've been very, very helpful to us. Any further sort of procedural housekeeping points anybody wishes to raise?

02:13:19:16 - 02:13:40:09

Can I just thank the three of you for the way you've conducted these three hearings? You've been very inclusive, and that was very encouraging. And I know from speaking to people as we leave and elsewhere that they're very pleased to have been included. So thank you very much. Okay.

02:13:40:11 - 02:13:55:23

Well, thank you. That's very much appreciated, mister Huck. Thank you. Thank you. And it is it is our job to listen to people and listen to all the views and take them all into into account. So we are we are just doing our job, but but but thank you for those remarks, mister Hook. If there's not anything else,

02:13:57:13 - 02:14:21:20

if you've spoken today, it would assist or yesterday if you could provide a written version of your submissions by deadline one or written summary by deadline one, which is the sixth of October two thousand twenty six. The recording of this hearing will be published on our website as soon as it's practical after the hearing. And, also, the action points we're not gonna go through them now, but the action points will be published as well on the website.

02:14:23:14 - 02:14:53:20

The next steps will be next week where we will publish our rule eight letter, which will set out the confirmed timetable for the examination. I think it's fair to say we're not expecting any significant changes to the draft timetable in the in that document. And we'll also be asking our initial written questions at the same time. So that will be, I think, expect around about the middle of next week. So thank you for everyone's participation for your submissions today and throughout the week.

02:14:54:09 - 02:14:57:00

This hearing is now closed. Thank you.