Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Whitestone Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 3
Date:	11 November 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.

File Name: WHITESTONE_11NOV_ISH1_PT3.mp3
File Length: 01:51:09

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:03:18 - 00:00:09:06
Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are now resuming Issue Specific Hearing one.

00:00:11:06 - 00:00:29:05
Just before we proceed with the next item on the agenda, we're briefly going to invite mister John Holdsworth to just make a comment he had on the plans that had been produced by the applicant this morning to mister Holdsworth.

00:00:30:10 - 00:01:05:18
Thank you for the opportunity. I'd like to speak on the landscape and visual impact. If Whitestone and Sam took everything into consideration when they did that, Why is the development being put up to the the border of my property? I rent a property on the lane, which I said yesterday, and the impact on that property and the person what's living in wouldn't be able to live there no more because of the views and the impact that the the the development would have on him.

00:01:06:19 - 00:01:15:06
They haven't cared about the the community of Connysborough. The

00:01:17:02 - 00:01:38:28
solar development is seen clearly by all of Connysborough, and using the a six thirty, it will always be seen never to be able to be hit because it's on the hill. So it hasn't been took into consideration as much as they say so, but thank you for letting me put that across. Thank you.

00:01:41:07 - 00:01:44:25
Thank you, mister Holdsworth. Did the applicant want to respond?

00:01:46:28 - 00:02:00:13
Sam Grits on behalf of the applicant. It may it may just be very useful, and I'm gonna take a moment just to for a colleague to pull the works plans onto screen just so we are all on the same page there. The works plans

00:02:02:04 - 00:02:10:11
AS00 where are they? Apologies. I wasn't prepared for that one. Our works plans are AS five.

00:02:12:23 - 00:02:13:12
And

00:02:15:15 - 00:02:31:02

just to make sure that we are on the same page for that one, the page is Page four of the PDF, which is Sheet one of twenty nine of the works plan. It seems just to be loading on the screen.

00:02:32:25 - 00:02:35:26
Just probably worth a point of clarification.

00:02:37:13 - 00:03:07:28
If I'm understanding the representation correctly, we're looking at a property just immediately to the east of Fursby Lane, which is just between how can I articulate this? There's a cutout the order limits. It looks like an upside down T, if you will. The property is immediately to the left, to the northwest of that where there's a triangular cutout of the order limits. And just as a point of clarity, nothing else. I'd make the point that the order limits go to the boundary of the property.

00:03:08:05 - 00:03:30:22
But works number one, within which the proposed amendment is proposing solar and associated infrastructure is not ordering the property. The green hatch there is work number six, which is summarized on the works plans as work to create and maintain areas of green infrastructure and habitat management. So that's the only context I would add to in response to that statement. Thank you.

00:03:37:24 - 00:04:01:09
Thank you. That's helpful. I do note that other people had wanted to speak again on landscape and visual matters, but I'm very conscious that we have spent the whole morning on this topic. And if there are any further points, please put them in writing to us by deadline one. I'd now like to pass to my colleague to take the agenda forward. Thank you.

00:04:04:23 - 00:04:27:10
And just a small procedural point before we move on. Mr. Gulley, we're still mindful that one of your colleagues has got to leave at quarter past four. So what I was proposing, because flooding and groundwater is at the end of the agenda, if we get to a suitable point before that, maybe your colleague would be happy to sort of say their piece sort of out of order maybe for the applicant to pick up. Would that yes,

00:04:29:00 - 00:04:32:09
I'll just check with the applicant's happy with that. But Mr. Walker, would

00:04:32:11 - 00:04:32:26
you be happy

00:04:32:28 - 00:04:34:26
with that arrangement so we hear about flooding?

00:04:34:28 - 00:04:39:08
So we then come back when it is the Yes, flooding that's fine. Thank you.

00:04:39:10 - 00:04:41:05

With that, just so that we can hear Sure,

00:04:41:08 - 00:04:41:23
of course.

00:04:41:25 - 00:04:46:21
Yes. Thank you very much. Thank you. We'll keep an eye on that then and keep an eye on the time. Thank you.

00:04:50:09 - 00:05:23:18
Thank you. So moving on this afternoon to Agenda Item three point two, which is the applicant's assessment of Glinton Glare. I'll invite Mr. Walker to bring forward your colleague, please, to give a ten minute summary regarding the effect of glint and glare, which will outline your preferred approach, assessing key effects on aviation, road, footpath residential receptors, also outlining your key mitigation measures.

00:05:24:23 - 00:05:36:06
And then it'd useful, which I'm sure will come out to, to get an update on any discussions ongoing with Sheffield Aero Club Limited, please. Thank you, sir. Angus Walker for the applicant. If I

00:05:36:08 - 00:05:56:28
may introduce two witnesses this time. So next to Mr. Griffiths is Mr. Philip Charhill, who will start the presentation. And on his left, Mr. Alex Hampson will provide some respond on some of the points as well. You. Mr. Charhill?

00:05:59:05 - 00:06:02:14
You, Philip Charhill, for the applicants. So

00:06:04:11 - 00:06:49:18
is that better? Thank you. So to begin the summary with respect to the applicant's approach to assessing key effects upon the glint and glare. I'll begin first with a general overview of the methodology and then discuss the specific receptor types in a little bit more detail. So the first step of the assessment methodology is to outline the appropriate study areas around the panel areas for each receptor type. Then a study of zones of theoretical visibility is carried out in order to remove areas for ground based receptors where significant visibility of the panel areas is not predicted to be possible.

00:06:51:02 - 00:07:35:11
For the remaining areas within the study areas, a desk based review of imagery is carried out to identify and map receptors within those areas. This involves aerial photography, street view imagery, available maps and databases, etcetera. Once receptors have been mapped, these receptors and the details of the panel area are input to a computer model, which carries out a series of calculations to determine if reflections are geometrically possible towards each receptor and calculate when during the year and day reflections are possible and where relevant also the intensity of any predicted cellular reflections.

00:07:36:05 - 00:07:41:23

If no cellular reflections are possible, then no impact as a result of glint and glare is possible.

00:07:43:08 - 00:08:19:22
For receptors where cell reflections are geometrically possible, the next step is to carry out a review of existing and proposed screening, which may obstruct views of the reflecting areas from the receptor where views are predicted to be significantly obstructed. Reflections are not predicted to occur in practice, and no effect is predicted. This stage of the assessment is conservative in that it assumes that visibility is possible unless it can be conclusively concluded that views are obstructed.

00:08:20:14 - 00:08:35:08
Where visibility is predicted to be possible, the glare scenario is considered. So that will relate the to specific considerations for the receptor type, which I will come back to in a moment, in order to determine whether the predicted reflections are deemed significant or insignificant.

00:08:37:15 - 00:09:08:19
Following this, mitigation is proposed in order to reduce effects where significant GLAS scenarios have been predicted. So that's the overall approach, and I will now turn to the specific receptor types which have been noted. So beginning with aviation receptors, the key criteria is the intensity of the predicted solar reflections. Intensity of glare is categorized as per the industry standard guidance document published by the Federal Aviation Authority.

00:09:09:05 - 00:09:22:14
Glare is categorized as green, yellow or red. Technical definitions are available within the FAA guidance document. Green glare is deemed acceptable. Yellow glare requires further review, and red glare is deemed unacceptable.

00:09:24:14 - 00:09:34:00
With respect to Doncaster Sheffield Airport, no solar reflections are predicted to be geometrically possible, and therefore, no impact is predicted. With respect to Netherfield,

00:09:35:16 - 00:09:57:09
the most recent analysis, which includes the embedded mitigation of the anti reflective coating, which is in accordance with the EN3, a glare intensity of green is predicted towards the aviation receptors at Netherfield Airfield, and therefore, a low impact is predicted upon no significant impact is predicted upon Netherfield.

00:09:59:12 - 00:10:13:04
Moving to residential receptors. The key criteria is the duration of the reflections both throughout the day and throughout the year. Where reflections exceed these thresholds, amenity is predicted to be significantly impacted.

00:10:14:21 - 00:10:47:27
Most of the dwellings which are predicted to be significantly impacted based on the bare earth terrain analysis, so that is before consideration screening, are predicted to experience insignificant effects practice due to the presence of both existing and proposed screening, obstructing views of the reflecting areas. There are nine dwelling receptors, which are predicted to experience a residual

moderate impact as a result of Glitz and And these receptors will Glare. be reviewed in the glint and glare

00:10:47:29 - 00:10:51:18
glare analysis, which will be carried out at the detailed design stage.

00:10:53:03 - 00:11:25:19
Moving to road receptors. The key criteria is, firstly, the whether reflections originate within a driver's primary field of view, since the reflections which occur within the field of view are significant, reflections which occur outside the field of view are not deemed significant. And for reflections within the field of view, again, the intensity the of solar reflection is considered. Similar to aviation receptors, the intensity is classified as green, yellow and red, green being acceptable, yellow requiring review and red being unacceptable.

00:11:26:15 - 00:11:40:04
For all roads predicted to be significantly impacted based on the bare earth terrain geometric analysis, no significant effects are predicted in practice due to the presence of existing and proposed screening.

00:11:41:27 - 00:12:25:23
Finally, turning to the footpath users. The impact is determined by whether reflections are possible and whether reflections are visible from a user along a footpath. If reflections are not possible or are significantly obstructed, such that reflections are not predicted in practice, no impact is predicted. If reflections are possible, geometrically possible and are visible in practice, then a low impact is predicted upon users of the footpaths, which is in accordance with the methodology, the guidance from the British Horse Society and also the precedents set by previously consented DCOs.

00:12:26:26 - 00:12:28:24
For the assessed footpaths,

00:12:32:10 - 00:12:43:06
are predicted to experience visible solar reflections, and therefore, a low impact is predicted upon them. I will now pass to my colleague, Mr. Hampson, to discuss mitigation.

00:12:45:08 - 00:13:25:23
Thank you. Alex Hampson, on behalf of the applicant. Just to summarize the outline of our proposed mitigation measures, I refer to MPS EN three, Section 2.10.126, which requires an applicant to consider mitigation to reduce solar glare, including the use of antireflective panel coatings as well as screening between panels and receptance. The applicant within document APP057, which is the proposed development description chapter of the environmental statement, confirms that all panels will be black, blue or dark gray in color with an anti reflective coating.

00:13:27:02 - 00:14:09:13
Document reference APP046 is the outline landscape and ecology management plan we've heard referred to already. This presents the glint and glare mitigation strategy. Avoidance and mitigation of glare impacts has been embedded through the design process. All significant impacts on aviation receptors have been mitigated through the design commitment of anti reflective coating on panels, as

previously mentioned by my colleague. Potential significant impacts on people driving on roads have been mitigated by the introduction of screening in the form of fencing and or new planting, which is shown on the illustrative master plan within the OLEMP, APP forty six.

00:14:11:14 - 00:14:52:20
Potential significant impacts on people traveling on public rights of way and residential properties have been reduced as far as practicable through the layout of solar panels and the introduction of planting secured within the Olimp, APP forty six. There is a commitment within the OLEMP, APP forty six, that at the detailed design stage, the glint and glare assessment will be rerun based on the final design and solar layout and appropriate mitigation confirmed within the final landscape and ecological management plan to ensure impacts are as predicted or no worse than predicted in the current assessment you have in front of you.

00:14:53:12 - 00:15:16:07
And this commitment to production of a final landscape and ecology management plan securing that glint and glare rerun is secured through Schedule two requirement seven of the draft DCO, which is AS009. I'll go back to my colleague, Mr. Charhill, for the final item of the presentation, which is an update on our consultee engagement.

00:15:17:23 - 00:15:19:20
Philip Charhill for the applicant.

00:15:21:12 - 00:15:54:09
The key stakeholders with whom consultation has been carried out with respect to Blinston Glare are National Highways, the Sheffield Aero Club and also the local planning authorities, specifically City of Doncaster and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council. I will begin with Sheffield Aero Club. So the applicant first engaged with the Sheffield Aero Club in December of twenty twenty five, where the initial modeling results with respect to Glint and Glare impacts upon aviation receptors at Netherfield Airfield were shared.

00:15:54:24 - 00:16:27:09
The club responded to this report and requested that mitigation be implemented to reduce impacts. The applicant then subsequently carried out further analysis of Clinton Glare impacts at North Thorpe Airfield, which included the embedded mitigation measure of the anti reflective coating. The results of that analysis concluded no significant impact upon aviation researchers in Earththorpe Airfield, and that report was shared with the airfield in March of twenty twenty six.

00:16:28:03 - 00:16:38:01
Most recently, the applicant has responded to the club's relevant representation, which was made where the club's initial position was repeated.

00:16:40:01 - 00:17:10:01
Turning to National Highways. The applicant has engaged with National Highways following its review of the Clinton Glare impact assessment, where National Highways requested some clarifications and additional information be presented with respect to potential impacts on road

receptors. The applicant has committed to the production of an updated Glens and Clair impact assessment report, which will action these points of clarification and will be provided by deadline one.

00:17:11:02 - 00:17:24:15
It is noted that these points do not affect the significance of the predicted effects or mitigation recommendations made within the report. And engagement with National Highways continues with respect to points around mitigation.

00:17:26:12 - 00:18:04:07
Finally, turning to the local planning authorities, Doncaster and Rotherham. Engagement has occurred via the relevant representations made by the two LPAs, where they have reviewed the Clinton Glare Impact Assessment report and provided their feedback, which included some requests for further clarifications and additional information, such as information potential regarding effects upon the upper storeys of residential receptors. The applicant has committed to the provision of an updated Clinton Clare impact assessment, which will action these points and request for clarification.

00:18:04:22 - 00:18:16:08
Once again, it is noted that these changes do not significantly impact the conclusions of the report or the mitigation recommendations made. Thank you.

00:18:20:19 - 00:18:26:29
Thank you. May I firstly invite a comment from Mr. Gulley, your team.

00:18:28:12 - 00:18:42:09
You, sir. Rob Gulley for Doncaster and Rutherland Councils. I'm going to pass immediately to mister Michael McGee, who is from a subconsultant specialist called Neo Environmental, and I believe I can see him online.

00:18:43:27 - 00:19:16:24
Hi. How are you doing? Michael McGee on behalf of Doncaster and Rotherham council. I feel quick response to this because we pretty much agreed with most of the the Atkins methodology in GlenGray. There's just three points I'd like to bring up, and I'd like to do it in order of importance. The first point is just based on how the ease of reading for the group... The viewer. The applicant mentions ground based zones of no reflection and also a ZTV, which eliminated the...

00:19:16:26 - 00:19:47:03
Some receptors from the assessment. However, we feel it would be it would be easier to to view these if both of these were located on the the figures within the report. And the minute, there's limited detail in the grounds... The ground based receptors zones of reflection, whereas the ZTV has held somewhere else in the report, which is just quite hard to to make sense of it. The second point is based on the aviation assessment, where there was a green glare.

00:19:47:29 - 00:20:23:17
And then the report, the the applicant stated that there was a a none impact. It's good to hear that it said as if the applicant's changed us to low just based on the response there. And in subsequent responses, they have stated that they would they would do this in the report. However, I just thought

I'd bring this to people's attention. The floods and last point is based on the the impact on road receptors. It seems like some of the local roads have been eliminated from the assessment, some of which are at sixty miles per hour roads and go straight through fields of the solar farm.

00:20:23:20 - 00:20:36:13
We would expect a lot of these roads to be included in the assessment, especially roads at sixty miles per hour just true to safety implications. I'd rather have been dazzled. And... Yeah. So thanks a lot.

00:20:39:21 - 00:20:45:26
Thank you, mister Walker. Mr. Charhill, do you like to respond,

00:20:47:14 - 00:20:48:08
please?

00:20:48:27 - 00:21:21:19
Philip Charhill for the applicant. Thank you. Yes. As was stated, these are points which have been raised in the relevant representation. The first two points are being actioned in terms of the updated Glint and Glare report, which will be issued at deadline one. The applicant agrees particularly with the comment that Green Glare is of low impact rather than no impact, and this is being actioned within the report, although it does not change the significance of the conclusion.

00:21:23:09 - 00:21:52:01
The applicant notes the position raised with respect to local roads, and its detailed position is within its relevant representation to each of the local planning authorities. It is noted that the assessment methodology with respect to defining a local road is one which is established through DCO precedents, for example, the Frotzschum Solar DCO, which was consented quite recently.

00:21:54:07 - 00:22:05:21
If further detail and discussion is required with respect to specific roads, then the applicant is happy to engage in further engagement with the local planning authorities.

00:22:07:10 - 00:22:17:27
Just to add, Angus Walker for TLT, the document reference to our response to relevant representations, including those of the local planning authorities, is PD1014.

00:22:21:12 - 00:22:22:06
Thank you.

00:22:24:13 - 00:22:26:15
Mr. Gully, you okay with that?

00:22:29:12 - 00:22:39:16
No further points. Thank you. Could I invite any comment from North East Derbyshire District Council on this agenda item?

00:22:40:20 - 00:22:50:15

Thank you. It's Angelina Lambert representing North East Derbyshire District Council. There's no further comment on this issue from us. Thank you.

00:22:53:16 - 00:22:54:15
Thank you.

00:22:56:07 - 00:23:02:05
We have mister Corsa online, I believe, from National Highways. You did want to come in on this item.

00:23:04:24 - 00:23:38:04
Thank you, sir. Yes, Ross Goss from behalf of National Highways. I'd just like to make two very brief points, if I may. First is just to confirm the applicant's position on technical assessment. And second, just to update the examining authority on National Highway's position on securing mechanisms for glinting glare mitigation for road receptors. Just in relation the to first point and the technical assessment, as Mr. Charlottesville said, we are awaiting further information in relation to Glinton Glare.

00:23:38:28 - 00:24:04:05
The applicant in National Highways are continuing to discuss the updated technical Glinton Glare report assessment methodology and mitigation, and we hope to update the examining authority on whether any further locations on the SRN require consideration. We intend to update the examining authority in our written representation of deadline one or as soon as possible thereafter once that technical information has been reviewed.

00:24:05:26 - 00:24:11:04
Just in relation to the second point, which is on securing mitigation,

00:24:13:12 - 00:24:52:26
I just wanted to briefly update you on the respective approaches put forward by the applicant and National Highway to date just to explain how mitigation along the strategic road network is to be secured. And without wanting to sort of steer the discussion into protective provisions, I I know they're going to be covered at a different time, but I'll I'll just be making very brief references to them now in a Glint and Glare contact. To date, the applicant's approach to our concern with regard to glint and glare has been to direct those controls in schedule eleven part eight of the DCO, which is projected provisions for National Highway's benefit.

00:24:54:17 - 00:25:30:21
The examining authority will be aware that in our relevant representation, we proposed a slightly different approach, which would be to include an approval right over requirement seven, which is the OLMP insofar as matters relate to national highway functions. In respect of glint and glare matters, particularly, this approach was recommended by the examining authority and approved by the secretary of state on the Great North Road, so the DCO two weeks ago. And this was found to be justified in particular on grounds of road safety, notwithstanding any comparatively minor delays that could arise to the approvals process.

00:25:32:19 - 00:26:05:20
National Isles is is very open to discussing different approaches to to mitigating impacts to road users. But but at present, we feel that if if this is to be addressed in schedule eleven, as is currently the case, then the the drafting on those commitments doesn't doesn't go far enough. So just just by an the applicant's definition of SRN works could be interpreted to mean that the the the details to be approved by National Highways in respect of of boundary environmental and and mitigation fencing.

00:26:05:25 - 00:26:31:18
It only applies with respect to work that is undertaken on the SRA itself. We expect this isn't quite what the applicant intends and that the intended protection is to apply to to any boundary environments for mitigation fencing across the authorized development as is required to to mitigate impacts to to users of the strategic road network. But we would expect also that it'd be

00:26:31:20 - 00:26:32:05
made

00:26:32:07 - 00:26:34:14
clearer in that regard.

00:26:36:28 - 00:26:38:04
Further, I think,

00:26:39:20 - 00:26:44:07
the approach that the applicants put forward in relation to

00:26:46:08 - 00:27:22:25
the protected provisions. We would expect that National Highway's position won't just be taken into account in terms of the mitigation proposed, but that it will actually be taken forward and implemented. So I think fundamentally, the the drafting needs to be tightened up in in in that respect. And and it's worth also pointing out that all of this would be qualified by an obligation on National Harries to act reasonably in its request to the applicant. So in our view, it is entirely reasonable that National Highways' proposals have been incorporated into any mitigation solution and not merely consulted on.

00:27:22:27 - 00:27:29:23
And an example of of what this might look like would be the the opaque screening, which presently in

00:27:31:08 - 00:27:43:09
the OLEN paragraph five, the wording in that is sort of quantified by the applicant may install opaque screening

00:27:45:14 - 00:28:15:18
to to to mitigate any impacts, temporary or otherwise, while planting is is established. For obvious reasons, I think we'd want to have a more robust security mechanism to ensure that those impacts were properly mitigated. So I'll leave a point there and just say that for the time being, at least,

National Highway reserves its position with regard to the submissions made on requirement seven just until such time as an appropriate alternative solution has been agreed between the parties.

00:28:16:23 - 00:28:22:16
And we continue to work with the applicant to agree these matters going forward. So thank you very much.

00:28:24:18 - 00:28:28:11
Thank you, Mr. Corso. That is useful. Can I pass back to the applicant?

00:28:28:13 - 00:28:59:24
Yes. Thank you. Angus Walker for the applicant. And from what Mr. Khorser has said, I think we can we are likely to be able to reach agreement on those points. I mean, we are certainly willing to have National Highways sign off. Our only caution is not to have two bodies signing off the same thing in case they don't agree with each other or something. So we would have to separate that out in some way. But I'm sure that's eminently possible with drafting.

00:29:00:13 - 00:29:07:14
So And we are confident that we will agree reach agreement with National Highmas on Glinton Glare quite soon. Thank you.

00:29:10:08 - 00:29:19:00
Thank you. I think we will now turn to Parish councils. Just checking, mister Knight, you didn't want to come in on this point, did you?

00:29:19:17 - 00:29:29:00
I didn't say I wanted to speak. Sorry. Philip Knight, Carriage of Parish Council. I didn't say I didn't want to speak. But if I can just make one I raised one question.

00:29:29:02 - 00:29:29:17
Go ahead.

00:29:30:03 - 00:30:03:21
And sorry, this is part of the problem as well when we're dealing with very technical matters like this in terms of, obviously, residents, members of the community that are impacted by all of this. All of that was very technical, and it's difficult to understand a lot of that. So sometimes you just need to bear these things in mouth. Very... Bear in mind those things. Very often, we feel a bit like David and Goliath in these situations. There's lots of technical references, it's difficult for members of the community sometimes to understand a lot of this. But one of the questions I have is in relation to Doncaster Sheffield Airport.

00:30:03:29 - 00:30:12:20
And if I understood what was being said, I understand that there was a suggestion that there's no impact whatsoever. I'd just like to understand that a little bit more as to what

00:30:14:19 - 00:30:41:26

research has been done, who's been consulted, given the airport is not up and running effectively yet, but will be potentially up and running by twenty twenty eight for passenger journey. So I'd just like to understand that a little bit more. In layman's terms, what work has been done in relation to Sheffield Doncaster Sheffield Airport? And why there's been a suggestion there's no impact for Glinton Glare? And if there's evidence, you've obviously talked about mitigation in terms of

00:30:43:28 - 00:30:55:18
putting films, coatings on the solar panels. Can we be supplied with evidence to show how is that effective? How effective is? What evidence is that to show that effectiveness as well?

00:30:57:24 - 00:30:59:10
Thanks, Mr. Knight. Yes, a couple of

00:30:59:12 - 00:31:03:08
things there for the applicant, please. Thank you. Mr. Charhill?

00:31:05:05 - 00:31:40:25
You. Philip Charhill on behalf of the applicants. With respect to the assessment approach for Doncaster Sheffield Airport, it has been assessed within the model as if it were an operational airport. So it has been assessed in accordance with the standard assessment approach for a licensed airport, which is to assess the two mile approach paths towards each runway and the geometric model, which carries out calculations to determine if it is possible for sunlight to reflect off the panels and then towards this receptor, I.

00:31:40:27 - 00:32:04:22
E, the two mile approach paths, which is carried out for each minute of each day throughout the day and year, concludes that so reflections are not geometrically possible. Therefore, it is not mathematically or geometrically possible for solar reflections to bounce off the panels and towards those flight paths at the airport. Therefore, no impact upon operations at Doncaster Sheffield Airport are predicted.

00:32:08:23 - 00:32:15:00
And there was the second point just around the degradation potential of the anti reflective coating.

00:32:23:27 - 00:32:40:17
Philip Scharkel for the applicant. Thank you. Yes. With respect to the Anti Reflexive Coating, if I may request a clarification, is that specifically with respect to impacts on Doncaster Sheffield Airport? Or is that generally with respect to aviation receptors, please?

00:32:40:19 - 00:32:43:18
I think it would just be interesting to know generally, I think.

00:32:45:28 - 00:32:47:28
Filter trial held for the applicant.

00:32:51:18 - 00:33:23:11

Initial analysis carried out with respect to both ground based receptors and aviation receptors did not include the anti reflective coating. So the initial analysis was more conservative in that regard as the embedded mitigation of the anti reflective coating was not included. The embedded mitigation of the anti reflective coating was to added the further analysis carried out for Netherfield as significant impacts were predicted there under the more conservative model.

00:33:23:18 - 00:33:41:15
So to model without the use of it could be deemed more conservative than to model with the use of it, If it would be useful for further information with respect to the reflective properties of a panel with or without anti reflective coating to be supplied, then the applicant will be happy to provide that information.

00:33:43:18 - 00:33:56:17
UNIDENTIFIED I think that would be of use. Thank you. And also, just for my benefit, how often would those particular panels be monitored, be checked, I guess, well would be interested?

00:33:58:29 - 00:34:00:20
Philip Chako, for the applicant?

00:34:03:18 - 00:34:31:27
Ewen Snedden, for the applicant. Basically, every module nowadays is fitted with an anti reflection coating. And what that is, is basically two different types of glass that are layered on top of each other. So you don't need to monitor how that is impacted because it's a physical structure. It's not like a film that might wash off or degrade. It's two separate types of glass that create the antireflection coatings.

00:34:34:18 - 00:34:35:19
Okay. Thank you.

00:34:38:04 - 00:34:42:13
We invite comment from mister Northcote, please, now.

00:34:44:16 - 00:35:10:17
Thank you, sir. Anthony Northcote for the three joint parishes. In our area, we're we're very familiar with the issue of glint and glare. We have a number of very large water bodies, which generate glint and glare. We're also very mindful that the Bobbie West decision yesterday afternoon, the Secretary of State, The issue of aviation safety is very important. And in our area,

00:35:12:22 - 00:36:00:17
right, the Nether Thorpe Airfields just outside of the area, but Sheffield Aero Club, all of their flights that they undertake are over the villages that we're talking about in our area. There are no prescribed flight sort of lanes or designated ways in and out. It's not like a typical airport. They They do fly around. And as a consequence, glint and glare needs to be considered in a wider context for them. Obviously, that's a technical issue really for them to comment on, but we do make the point that it needs to be considered not just in terms of planes landing and taking off in a typical airport, but in how they may fly over the communities that my parish councils represent.

00:36:02:24 - 00:36:35:22
You were directed towards the outlined landscape and ecology management plan. But in terms of the glint and glare strategy in there, it's six very brief paragraphs. It's not exactly comprehensive as one would expect a strategy to be. Overall, this issue has perhaps rightly been led as a safety based issue when you're talking about receptors such as railway lines, roads, etcetera.

00:36:36:14 - 00:36:45:01
But mustn't forget the impact that Glintocker has on the residential receptors. It's an amenity issue as well as a safety issue. I'm

00:36:45:03 - 00:36:45:18
not going

00:36:45:20 - 00:37:18:28
to go through it now, sir, because in our relevant representation, we did visit some of the residential receptors that we'd identified, and we made a commentary on those. We didn't have the wherewithal to go to all the residential receptors, but we've given you some commentary to look at. We are very concerned, however, with sort of three main elements. One is rights of way are effectively being dismissed almost entirety as being a problem.

00:37:19:03 - 00:37:25:06
In the initial assessment, forty one rights of way receptors experience a yellow glare.

00:37:26:23 - 00:37:28:04
But in essence,

00:37:30:06 - 00:38:01:27
our reading of of the position is that's been sort of discounted on the basis that that's not particularly significant. But ultimately, those users of rights of way are perhaps going to, on walk, they're going to encounter multiple bits of glare. It's not just a simple little bit of passing. It might be a whole sequence in a similar way to we talked about landscape impact this morning. So we think that really hasn't been assessed properly and needs to be considered further.

00:38:03:03 - 00:38:06:28
The second is the consideration to roads.

00:38:08:19 - 00:38:39:25
The local roads have effectively been classified as low just because they're a local road. But again, people used to need to use those roads daily. They're narrow in themselves. That's the only way in and out of settlements. It seems a bit disingenuous to say that because they're a local road, which only takes you to a village, that automatically means it's of low consideration when the a fifty seven, just because it's a strategic road, is more greater consideration.

00:38:40:09 - 00:39:12:19
In the wider context of the road, we are very concerned about the overall safety impacts on the a fifty seven because that's a very heavily trafficked road. It goes through the center of It splits north and

south Anston. But many times, it experiences queuing, unexpected queuing. You come around a corner where yesterday, it would have been free flowing, but today, you you join in the back of a a queue that's massively long.

00:39:13:03 - 00:39:35:14
And people cannot afford to be distracted for a split second because you'll be in the back of somebody. And and the topography in that area in particular, I'm... We're not convinced that the mitigation would be sufficient to prevent that. Finally, moving on to mitigation.

00:39:37:09 - 00:40:16:11
So the mitigation is proposed for a mixture of planting and opaque fencing. Now unless I've missed it somewhere, there are no details of what that opaque fencing looked like, what height it will be. We don't know whether that's going to be solid fencing of some sort. Is it going to be three meters high, four meters high in order to deal with the topography? It's an issue on which there just seems to be no detail at all. But any fencing that effectively is opaque and blocks views through has a landscape impact, and that's not been taken into account.

00:40:16:16 - 00:40:17:12
We would

00:40:19:03 - 00:40:48:22
contest in the landscape and visual impact assessment. And this is the problem which I do sympathize with the applicant. These issues are looked at in silos, but of course, mitigation for one aspect can actually have an adverse effect on another. And I'd urge you to give serious consideration to to that thought. I was gonna bring up a bit about reflective coating, but I am satisfied with the answer that was given about it being glass rather than the coatings. Thank you very much.

00:40:55:10 - 00:41:00:01
You, Mr. Northcote. Useful comments. I can invite Mr. Walker, please.

00:41:00:03 - 00:41:09:19
Thank you, sir. If I could ask Mr. Char Hill and Mr. Hampson to respond on perhaps the first two for Mr. Char Hill and the third one for Mr. Hampson. Thank you.

00:41:12:06 - 00:41:45:11
You. Philip Char Hill on behalf of the applicant. So beginning with the significance of reflections towards users of public rights of way. Within the methodology, it is determined that the user of a public right of way experiencing a solar reflection does not significantly impact their safety or amenity. This is due to a number of factors, which include to list some of them.

00:41:45:16 - 00:42:18:18
One, as noted, these users are transients, so they are moving along. They are not a static observer in, say, the way that an observer within a residential property is. Secondly, the density of users along these footpaths at any one time is typically low. Further, users of parts are accustomed to experiencing sources of bright light and reflections such as from lakes, ponds, glass windows, glass roofs, etcetera, which are commonly encountered while navigating an environment.

00:42:19:19 - 00:42:50:05
Further to this, it is noted that for fixed south facing panels, the predicted subtle reflections towards ground based receptors very heavily coincide with direct sunlight, I. E, reflections are occurring during the first and last hours of daylight when the sun is low in the sky. So therefore, the significance of an observed reflection is reduced by the presence of the sun at a similar angle, which is also, of course, a very significant source of light.

00:42:52:14 - 00:43:18:22
Further to this, the methodology for the public rights of way has been reviewed by Neo Environmental on behalf of the local planning authorities, which agreed with the methodology. The methodology also follows DCO precedents with respect to the Little Crow solar farm, the Bears Gill solar farm and the Pear Tree Hill solar farm as well, which followed very similar methodologies for the assessment of public rights of way.

00:43:23:28 - 00:43:55:00
Moving to the consideration of local roads. A local road is a road of a category whereby a solar reflection may be experienced without a significant impact upon a driver's ability to safely navigate. So a local road is defined as one where there is a sufficiently low workload for the driver such that a solar reflection could be experienced without a significant impact.

00:43:55:23 - 00:44:36:16
For example, along a local road, there is a lack of signs detailed signs to be read, multiple lanes of potentially overtaking traffic, regular junctions of traffic entering or joining and variations to speed limits. These are factors which are not present along a local road and therefore reduce the workload of a driver. It is noted that although local many local roads are subject to a speed limit of sixty miles an hour, drivers are expected to exercise their judgment in determining a safe speed based on the conditions and visibility along the road.

00:44:37:04 - 00:45:04:26
And similar to the point previously raised with respect to public rise of way, fixed south facing panels, solar reflections very commonly coincide with direct sunlight when the sun is low in the sky. These factors allow us to conclude that certain reflections may be experienced along a local road without a significant impact upon safety. This methodology is consistent with DCO precedents, including the fraudulent DCO, which was consented earlier this year.

00:45:08:13 - 00:45:12:25
With respect to mitigation, I will pass to my colleague, Mr. Hampson.

00:45:14:27 - 00:45:20:18
Alex Hampson, on behalf of the applicant, yes, thank you for the question on fencing.

00:45:22:14 - 00:45:57:26
By way of response here, I would direct the examining authority to the outline design parameters, which is what... And all parties to a... Which is AP one five eight, And we specify in relation to Glinton Glare fencing that the location of such fencing would not be within five meters of the edge of

a carriageway. And equally, in terms of scale, we confirm the parameter that the mitigation fencing, if required, would measure up to four meters above the ground level.

00:45:58:13 - 00:46:06:21
And therefore, design parameters have fed into the overall landscape and visual assessment. Thank you.

00:46:09:05 - 00:46:22:22
You. And regarding the point about local roads, I think we welcome the commitment to ongoing dialogue with the local authorities on that point. I did have one question, if I may, related to this topic.

00:46:24:08 - 00:46:28:20
And it was from AS sixty

00:46:30:05 - 00:46:41:14
sixteen two three seven eight, which I think is primarily interested in the medium impact on the nine residential receptors.

00:46:43:10 - 00:46:58:26
But that section talks about exploring mitigation solutions post consent, which may be off-site. Just wondering if you could elaborate on exactly what that means, where are we talking about off-site,

00:47:00:21 - 00:47:08:04
whether that land is in your control and how those mitigations would be secured?

00:47:12:23 - 00:47:15:09
If I can pass to Mr. Hampson to answer that one.

00:47:15:12 - 00:47:38:21
Thank you. Alex Hampson, on behalf of the applicant, to clarify the commitment within the document you referenced, AS06O and also within the OLM APP two zero four six is to rerun the glint and glare assessment at detailed design to identify

00:47:40:14 - 00:47:58:03
whether additional mitigation is required to bring the level of impact to what is presented within the application documents. The reference to exploring through consultation off-site mitigation with relevant receptors would

00:48:01:12 - 00:48:19:15
be out with the commitment to reducing the impact to what is already presented in the assessment. So that would be an engagement at a kind of receptor level between the applicant and relevant identified receptors.

00:48:23:14 - 00:48:28:13
And just a particular point about off-site, is there anything you can add to that?

00:48:30:27 - 00:48:50:29
Well, Sarah, if I can possibly answer Angus walk off the applicant list. So this would be if there are any glint and glare effects at a property, we would discuss with the owner if they would wish to have some screening. But that wouldn't be part of the DCO. So that's why it's outside the order limits.

00:48:54:18 - 00:48:55:07
Thank you.

00:49:00:13 - 00:49:14:14
Going to move on to any interested parties who've also expressed an interest on talking on this item. Just from my list from earlier, I think Janet Greenwood would like to come in here.

00:49:16:26 - 00:49:52:27
Janet Greenwood, I'll answer this as a resident of Middlebury. I didn't think I'd have a lot of questions to ask on this, but as it's progressed, I'm getting more and more anxious and more and more worried of being a resident and... Of Mittlebring. And from the previous... From a previous statement and the response from mister Griffith is that I feel very much discounted and insignificant because we're seen as being... Is it less than two three kilometers away from the DCO line.

00:49:53:02 - 00:50:18:17
I would like you to be able to show me those distances because I think that my garden and my house is nearer to to that that line. But more important for Micklebring is that we're elevated, we look across Conyersville parks, we look across the m eighteen. The m eighteen has had some screening over the past fifteen years, and it's taken fifteen years for those trees to grow.

00:50:20:06 - 00:50:26:01
I don't think I'm gonna be around maybe for the next fifteen years. Who knows? But

00:50:27:29 - 00:51:02:07
certainly, worry about the mitigation that you're talking about and that it's very dismissive, that it's all about around the the road the roads, etcetera. It's very technical, but what I want to say is that I won't be a navigating person. I will be looking out of my window every day, looking across the parks with potential glint and glare. We get glint and glare from certain things that are already on the parks which you wouldn't imagine.

00:51:03:04 - 00:51:27:21
And you often think, where is that coming from? It may be a tin lid or something. I don't know. But if that is going to be there for a number of hours when the sun's there, then it's it's going to be very difficult. And I don't want screening on my windows. I built my property because of those views. I don't want them covering because of glint and glare. Thank you.

00:51:31:27 - 00:51:40:09
Thank you, Mrs. Greenwood. Mr. Walker, should we, as before, go through the interest parties and then perhaps we could...

00:51:40:11 - 00:51:41:01
Yes, sir.

00:51:43:10 - 00:51:53:26
I think have... Missus Eastwood would like to speak, followed by mister Eastwood, and I'm aware you want to also come in as well, Canton. Can we invite missus Eastwood, please?

00:52:01:05 - 00:52:35:07
Angela Eastwood. Firstly, I'll speak on behalf of Save Our Bridal Ways. One thing that I would like to ask that I potentially missed off my previous questions is What actually equestrian counts have you done across all three sites? How do you know how many horse riders there are? I know we've already discussed about over four thousand passported horses over the project scheme. But what equestrian counts have you done on bridleways? How do you know where we ride, when we ride, etcetera? I'd be quite interested in that.

00:52:35:12 - 00:53:06:01
One of the things that I will say is that my horse can spook at a puddle. Remember, I told you that he's seventy three hands to the wither. He's eleven stone, I think thirteen pounds. You're saying that my horse is not gonna be worried about glint and glare. You've also actually discussed pedestrians, so I'm gonna disagree with your methodology. And I'm gonna continue to say that I think that there will be a serious and fatal ax... Or potentially fatal accident due to this scheme.

00:53:06:18 - 00:53:40:13
And I'm aware that what you're gonna quote back to me is the British Horse Society guidelines on glint and glare. What I'm going to quote back at you now is that those guidelines, I believe, actually refer to smaller size solar farms, not ones where you are riding for eight hundred acres within small areas with fifteen foot offset, whatever it's going to be. I'm just going to say, quite frankly, I disagree with your methodology. And I will go on to the specific questions.

00:53:40:15 - 00:54:16:11
The other question that I've got is, if you are so confident that this is not going to cause danger to myself and other questions across the Whitestone area, I'd like to know if the applicant is happy to have a condition and clause in the DCO that can't be removed after this project is agreed, that is insurance for horse riders, should they encounter an accident due to this project. But on behalf of Save Our Bridleways, I'm going to ask whether the applicant's glint and glare assessment has specifically considered horse riders using the existing bridleway network.

00:54:16:23 - 00:54:47:06
Horses react differently from pedestrians or vehicle occupants to unexpected visual stimuli, particularly where routes pass close to solar panels. We ask whether equestrian receptors have been individually identified, whether potential effects have been assessed along complete riding routes, and what evidence supports the applicant's conclusions regarding safety and mitigation. And just another question, if I can potentially clarify something that was said earlier.

00:54:48:27 - 00:55:15:25

We looked at the map, and it showed us where things are gonna be within the DCO. Can the applicant confirm to me that everything that's been planned and designed already cannot change if this project is sold immediately when it's been agreed. Thank you. I'll now speak on behalf of myself if you'd just give me two minutes. Well, not two minutes because I don't have that long, but let me get to my part.

00:55:17:12 - 00:55:56:27
Again, I'm going to speak about my house, and I think that the impact that this is going to have. Firstly, my first question is, you've not done a residential assessment on my property. The topography behind my house on panel... On land parcels thirty one and, I believe, thirty two is ascending. The panels are gonna look down on me. How can you say that I'm not one of these nine houses gonna that's have an impact, or am I one of these nine houses that gonna have impact? Because I'm concerned about possible glint and glare from the panels on the elevated land around Firsbury.

00:55:57:06 - 00:56:00:00
All the houses have different outlooks and viewing angles.

00:56:02:07 - 00:56:24:23
I'd ask you if you have considered my house as a residential receptor. And if you have relied on representative properties, which houses do they actually represent within Thursby, and how do they account for my house's position? I just got one more thing that I'd like to say, if that's okay, in relation to the airport.

00:56:26:11 - 00:57:06:26
So in light of the issues experienced at Amsterdam, is it Schiphol Airport where thousands of solar panels had to be removed or treated following concerns that reflected sunlight or was blinding pilots on approach to the airport, what specific assurances can be provided that the Whitestone Solar Farm's glint and glare assessments have adequately considered aviation safety, and what independent verification has been undertaken to ensure that a similar incident cannot occur? To the residents of Doncaster, the opening of the airport is obviously gonna assist with our regeneration, so that is really important.

00:57:07:13 - 00:57:25:13
And what I'd ask as well is, who would be held accountable if Whitestone solar panels were subsequently found to create an aviation safety risk and what what mechanisms are in place to require immediate remedial action, including the removal of panels if necessary? Thank you.

00:57:30:21 - 00:57:35:03
Thank you, missus Eastwood. Some helpful comments there, mister Eastwood.

00:57:44:28 - 00:58:11:15
Sir, thank you for this opportunity. I'm Nicholas Eastwood Fairsbury Residence Association. This afternoon, the applicant has stated that nine residential properties would experience significant effects. Can they confirm whether any are in Fursby due to the elevated parcels above Fursby, which are thirty one thirty one six two b and thirty four f, which are much higher than the homes and above rooflines?

00:58:13:04 - 00:58:25:09

Bedrooms are overlooked by panels on one Fursby property, in particular has extensive glazing. How has the assessment accounted for its glazing outlook and difference in elevation?

00:58:27:09 - 00:58:46:08
The applicant has referred to completing a standard airport check-in relation to Doncaster Airport. Please, this isn't anything but standard. This is a nationally significant infrastructure project and a commercial airport with flight paths over our house.

00:58:48:03 - 00:59:16:06
I have only had a bit of time to review some of your documents including the draft APP one five two, which identified Doncaster Airport has been around twelve kilometers away from, the development. That's about the same distance as Whitestone one to Brinsworth substation. The report excluded it from detailed assessment because it was closed and said further assessment would be provided in the ES environmental statement.

00:59:18:01 - 00:59:55:03
Has the final assessment addressed the airport's proposed reopening and flight paths, including routes residents previously crossed? So I'm talking about historic flight paths here. Basically, the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority and Oliver Copard who spoke yesterday has approved proceeding with the airport purchase subject to contract. Was the airport operator or SYMCA, I. E, Oliver Copard's office as prospective purchaser ever consulted? If not, can we ask you, sir,

00:59:56:23 - 01:00:01:03
to request their written views before concluding this aviation assessment?

01:00:01:17 - 01:00:02:04
Thank you.

01:00:07:21 - 01:00:12:23
Thank you, Mr. Eastwood. I think the last person who wants to come in is the Councillor

01:00:14:13 - 01:00:15:12
Henderson, thank you.

01:00:18:04 - 01:00:30:14
Nicola Henderson, Anston Parish Council. I just want to add on to Mr Northcote's comments. I've lived in South Anston since nineteen seventy five, so I know the area very, very well.

01:00:31:19 - 01:00:32:04
I

01:00:32:06 - 01:00:35:12
also live very close to the A57.

01:00:37:12 - 01:01:11:07

It is a very, very busy road. There's been a number of fatalities on that road and also the surrounding roads. You say that you don't treat local roads in the same way as the major roads, and I would argue they're perhaps even more dangerous because, for example, the road between Brampton and South Anston, It's known as Brampton Mile, Brampton Straight Mile. It's an old Roman road, and it's straight. People go, especially kids, like, drive fast along there, and then there's a a bend.

01:01:12:17 - 01:01:46:04
And then the roads from there to Todwick crossroads, there's Bad Bends. There was a couple of kids killed on there just a few months ago. So you're proposing to put panels on both sides of that road from Anston all the way to Brampton. So I'm not sure if you're proposing screening or not for that, but, obviously, that creates a hazard. It's a fast road. It's a narrow road. You have people overtaken. If you then got glare and you can't see somebody coming, it's gonna cause an accident.

01:01:51:12 - 01:02:27:22
Just building on the opaque fencing that you you said, I'm still really not clear on what that actually is. But if you're saying that there's a four meter high fence that's going along the a fifty seven currently, along the a fifty seven, as I said, it's agricultural fields with ancient hedgerow hedgerow along both sides. Always saying behind that hedgerow that there's then gonna be a four meter high fence. I don't really under... Fully understand what you're saying. And what is that fence gonna look like? It's gonna completely change the look and feel of the village as you drive in and approach the village.

01:02:31:00 - 01:02:41:25
And, also, I'm not convinced that it will even provide screening because the field, it's not flat land. So I don't think it will effectively screen the panels anyway.

01:02:43:22 - 01:03:15:08
Building on what other people have said about house receptors, In South Anston, Orchid Way, which is on the edge of South Anston, going up to Westbank Drive. All those houses look across those fields. So what effect are they gonna get from Glint and Glare? Also, in Northunston, Pennypeace Lane and the houses... New houses that built on there and going up, they all look down onto the fields. Again, what Glint and Glare are they gonna gonna see?

01:03:18:22 - 01:03:23:21
And then finally, I think the other point that hasn't been considered and also wasn't considered in

01:03:23:23 - 01:03:24:08
the

01:03:24:10 - 01:03:54:19
last... The landscape was Axel Lane, which runs from Todwick to Southampton. It's a very, very busy, popular bridal way used by horse riders, cyclists. When you walk from Todwick to Southamston, for example, you look all across those fields along the a fifty seven. They're not gonna be screened. You're elevated up above it. So you're gonna get Glyn and Glare because they're south facing, and you're looking down onto it. So they're my points.

01:03:54:21 - 01:03:55:06

Thank you.

01:03:59:23 - 01:04:05:26
Thank you, Councillor Henderson. I'll pass back to Mr. Walker if we can summarize the various

01:04:05:28 - 01:04:36:20
points, Thank you, Walker. For the applicant, I will ask Mr. Charlene, but just to say that environmental statement chapter sixteen figures, which is APP085, shows the nine receptors, residential receptors that are reporting Glint and Glare after mitigation. Mr. Charhill, do you have any response to the various comments made?

01:04:38:01 - 01:04:57:09
You. Philip Charhill, on behalf of the applicants, yes. A few points to make reference to. Firstly, with respect to clear durations towards residential properties, the duration throughout the day does not exceed several hours throughout the day

01:04:58:29 - 01:05:14:03
with specific reference to the twin receptors, which were predicted to face significant impact and therefore taken forward for further analysis for each of those receptors. Reflections are predicted for less than sixty minutes on a given day.

01:05:16:13 - 01:05:53:12
With respect to horse rider receptors, there was, I believe, reference made to the receptor point in terms of how that's assessed with respect to horse riders. I would direct the examining authority and any interested reader to document... A moment, please. To document AS dash o six o and specifically paragraph sixteen point two point two four, which discusses the height of a receptor for an equestrian user.

01:05:56:13 - 01:06:19:11
A point was raised with respect to consideration of terrain and elevation with respect to glint and glare. Within the geometric model, which is used to calculate the possibility of glare, the terrain both at the point of the panel and the terrain at the point of the receptor are both included within the model in its termination of where the reflections are possible.

01:06:21:03 - 01:06:32:05
Lastly, before I pass to my colleague with respect to comments made about the impact as a result of Glintz and Glare upon the Amsterdam Schiphol Airport.

01:06:34:13 - 01:06:50:19
Page Power, the company which I work for, carried out independent analysis of the solar farm and potential impact at Schiphol Airport following reports of the incidents. Our modeling concluded

01:06:54:18 - 01:07:26:08
had the solar farm being assessed correctly at its application stage, that a glare intensity of yellow glare would have been predicted. Page Power reviewed the glint and glare reports, which were carried out at the application stage for that, which modeled the Sun Pharma incorrectly and predicted green

glare. With reference to Netherfield, yellow glare was initially predicted, and therefore, embedded mitigation in the form of the anti refractive coating was recommended to reduce that to green glare, which is acceptable.

01:07:27:07 - 01:07:33:22
And now I'll pass to my colleague, Mr. Hampson, to provide some further thoughts. Thank you.

01:07:37:22 - 01:07:48:09
You, Ms. Thompson. On behalf of the applicant, apologies, I'm just reviewing the notes as to what additional to cover. I think I would only pick up,

01:07:50:02 - 01:08:25:29
think, a number of these specific receptors that were called out would be appropriate for us. And if we haven't already through the relevant reps to respond in writing to signpost readers, that's kind of the specific part of the assessment where their relevant receptor is covered. But to provide a summary or at least key references for people to take away for today, I would direct people to APP085, which is a set of figures associated with the glint and glare assessment.

01:08:26:01 - 01:09:01:08
And on those figures, you can see the receptors, particularly the residential receptors that are considered in the glint and glare assessment. And then that can be correlated to the assessment tables. I think specific reference has been made a couple of times to the Firsbee residents. Just to note on that one that the receptors noted or assessed at Firsbee didn't give rise to significant glinting glare based on our output model.

01:09:01:10 - 01:09:25:09
So I'll I'll mention that there, but there is more detail in the assessment. My colleague touched on how the time of day is a very relevant factor and made... And I would, just guide readers to AS06O, the Glint and Glare Assessment, where we have specifically identified where we are predicting glare on receptors,

01:09:26:24 - 01:09:57:28
the very specific times of day and durations that the model shows that and also specifically the sunlight and weather conditions that would give rise to that maximum duration. Again, just reminding the examining authority and all of us that we're based on a worst case assessment. So we've made sure that what you see in that assessment is based on the right sunlight conditions for a worst case assessment.

01:09:58:15 - 01:10:00:10
And I'll pause there. Thank you.

01:10:01:04 - 01:10:06:24
Yes, that is understood. And thanks for everyone's contribution.

01:10:08:17 - 01:10:33:28

There was just a couple of quick things I had. I did note that you had responded to Sheffield's Aero Club post their relevant representation, but I wasn't clear how they then been back in contact because I'm mindful that we haven't asked for a statement of common ground. But it's a subject I think we'll be very keen to get an update on in terms of ongoing discussions and any agreements in place with the Aero Club.

01:10:36:05 - 01:10:54:08
Angus Walker, for the applicant, I'm not aware off the top of my head if the Aero Club answers or what the latest correspondence with them is. We would be happy to have an additional statement of common ground with them if it was desirable to put that matter to bed, so to speak.

01:10:54:10 - 01:11:00:10
I think that will be welcome. Thank you. Thank you. And it's just a final point for me. Just regarding

01:11:02:18 - 01:11:35:18
sixty in the conclusion section, which commences at sixteen point two point three nine two. I mean, unless I'm missing it, I can't seem to glean an overall EIA significance of effect conclusion to sixteen-two thousand three and ninety five concludes that a nine module level glare impacts on residential receptors post mitigation. But we don't seem to come to an overall sort of significant of effect conclusions. Perhaps you could take that away and have a look at that, please.

01:11:36:24 - 01:11:38:10
Yes, sir. We will do.

01:11:43:09 - 01:11:47:02
Thank you. So we're now going to move on

01:11:49:21 - 01:11:53:04
to agenda item three point three this afternoon.

01:11:56:28 - 01:12:00:07
Mister Walker, do you wanna take a couple of moments to let your people move on?

01:12:00:09 - 01:12:04:04
Yes. Thank you, sir. We'll just do a bit of musical chairs.

01:12:51:29 - 01:12:59:14
Thank you, sir. Angus Walker for the applicant. We are now on item three point three, ecology and biodiversity.

01:13:01:17 - 01:13:24:19
To my left is our new witness, Sally Olds, who will do the ten minute presentation on her own. On her left is Matt Slaymaker, who, in response to any questions, particularly on ornithology, may make contributions. But Sally Ms. Olds will be doing the ten minute presentation now. Good

01:13:27:18 - 01:13:30:17

afternoon, everyone. Sally Olds on behalf of the applicant.

01:13:34:15 - 01:13:36:11
First of

01:13:44:01 - 01:14:22:10
is the twenty the proposed half development of on features of ecological importance. The assessment was undertaken by qualified and experienced consultant ecologists who are a member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, CIEEM. The assessment methodology followed the industry standard CIEEM, ECA guidance twenty twenty four and habitat and species best practice. It took account of relevant nature conservation legislation and policy. The assessment methodology is set out in detail in section six point four of chapter six, which I will now summarize.

01:14:24:27 - 01:15:00:25
In terms of establishing the baseline, this was established through desk study to obtain information on designated sites, priority habitats and protected species records, and ecological field surveys were undertaken. The field surveys were conducted between April twenty twenty four and December twenty twenty five. The surveys followed best practice guidance and included habitat surveys to inform the FIA and biodiversity net gain assessment and species surveys to confirm the status of protected or notable species.

01:15:01:26 - 01:15:22:20
In line with the CIEM EKIA guidance, the baseline was evaluated to identify the important ecological features, or IEFs, to take forward for assessment. These include sites designated for the nature conservation value, priority habitats, protected notable species, specifically those features with the potential to interact with the proposed development.

01:15:27:09 - 01:16:10:05
In terms of mitigation, enhancement and compensation, the mitigation hierarchy was applied to avoid, minimize, restore and offset throughout the design and assessment process. For example, the FIA team collaborated with the design team to avoid important ecological features as far as practicable and appropriate buffers applied to protect those features set out in Table two point one of the outlined design parameters, APP one hundred fifty eight. Other embedded mitigation has been committed to reduce the potential effects through measures set out in the outlined construction environmental management plan, OCHEMP APP forty two.

01:16:11:07 - 01:16:27:02
Habitat temporarily affected will be restored and enhanced, and habitat enhancements proposed in the outlined landscape and ecological management plan, OLEMP APP forty six and secured through the DCO will offset significant residual effects.

01:16:28:20 - 01:17:01:19
The assessment methodology followed the industry standard. The applicant's approach in the ES assessed a reasonable worst case scenario based on design information, baseline ecological information and statutory consultation. The assessment of habitat loss is based on the vegetation

removal plans, AS007, and using reasonable worst case parameters. The assessment considers the habitats that will be permanently lost under the footprint of the development, temporarily lost under disturbed and reinstated habitat areas and those habitats which would be retained.

01:17:02:18 - 01:17:40:10
The assessment considered the potential direct and indirect effects of construction, operation and decommissioning of the development on the IEFs identified. The residual effects on the IEFs are reported to take account of the embedded design mitigation and committed enhancements within the OLEMP. The applicant is confident that the approach meets the requirement of the infrastructure planning EIA regs twenty seventeen in providing information reasonably required to reach a reasoned conclusion based on a reasonable worst case scenario, and that's consistent with established precedent and practice of accepted DCO applications and relevant case law.

01:17:41:21 - 01:18:02:03
Regular consultation was undertaken with relevant stakeholders throughout the IA process to discuss the survey approach, key findings and appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. In terms of limitations in baseline survey, the individual survey and assessment limitations are set out in each technical appendix to Chapter six.

01:18:04:01 - 01:18:35:09
In terms of the survey coverage, the FIA published in the ES was based on field data gathered between April twenty four and December twenty five. During this period, access was secured across most of the order limit except for certain sections of the cable corridors. Surveys then continued from January twenty six through to October twenty six as access became available. The findings of the twenty twenty six surveys will be published in the updated technical appendices to Chapter six of the ES at deadline one.

01:18:36:03 - 01:19:07:20
The new survey information validates the assessment. The findings do not alter the baseline assumptions or require any change to the mitigation. The full set of survey findings will inform implementation through the refinement of mitigation should development consent be granted. Including the twenty twenty six surveys, which were completed in October, approximately ninety percent of the order limits has been surveyed. And about ten percent was unsurveyed due to land access restrictions, including health and safety constraints.

01:19:09:01 - 01:19:40:18
The majority of the site surveys were undertaken from mid to late summer, coinciding with the peak flowering season for most botanical species. Surveys of the cable corridor were undertaken in twenty twenty five outside the in December 'twenty five outside the flowering season. However, the key diagnostic vegetative characteristics remain discernible, and habitats were able to be classified to appropriate UK HAB categories. And those habitat categories were also informed by desk based evidence and local knowledge of the wider site.

01:19:41:21 - 01:19:48:15
Habitat surveys of the cable corridors in twenty twenty six were undertaken between March and October.

01:19:51:02 - 01:20:31:15
In terms of the role and function of the different aspects of mitigation and enhancements, In the outlined CHEMP, this sets out the overarching principles and environmental measures that will be applied during the construction phase to mitigate potential effects on environmental receptors set out in Table one point two, environmental measures. It includes commitments to avoid or minimize effects on biodiversity. The Ecological Clerk of Work's role and function is to provide advice on ecological issues prior to and during construction and to oversee protection measures for habitats and species in line with nature conservation legislation, best practice and DCO commitments.

01:20:32:17 - 01:20:57:04
Other measures, including controls on pollution, lighting controls, biosecurity measures, maintenance habitat of connectivity and method statements all have a role in protecting biodiversity during the construction period. The outlined Kemp will be used to inform the Kemp, which is secured via requirement four in Schedule two of the draft DCO and will be submitted for approval prior to commencement of the construction phase.

01:20:58:22 - 01:21:29:10
In terms of the outline LEMP, the purpose is to set out measures to mitigate the effects of the proposed development on landscape and biodiversity features. It also sets out the measures proposed to enhance the biodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure value of the proposed development to secure compliance with relevant national and local planning policies. The extent of the order limits provides the opportunity to deliver landscape scale nature conservation benefits that can positively contribute to the local nature recovery strategy being developed.

01:21:29:26 - 01:21:45:03
In the absence of a published strategy, the proposed development is seeking to contribute to commonly adopted ecological enhancement principles of providing more high quality habitats as part of a connected network. The enhancement measures provide a significant biodiversity net gain.

01:21:46:29 - 01:22:05:15
Section six of the OLEMP outlines the Brampton Common local wildlife site strategy, and Section seven sets out the management prescriptions for retained, enhanced and newly created habitat. Requirement seven-three of the draft DCO requires the approved LEMP to be implemented and maintained.

01:22:07:25 - 01:22:48:29
In terms of a summary of our biodiversity net gain assessment principles and methodology. Biodiversity net gain became mandatory for nationally significant infrastructure projects on the second of November twenty twenty six. NSIP developers who apply for development consent order on or after this date need to deliver at least ten percent net gain in biodiversity. The proposed development is an NSIP and was submitted before that date, meaning that in this case, it is not a legal obligation. To follow best practice and in line with policy, the applicant committed at the outset to delivering at least ten percent on-site, requiring no off-site biodiversity gains outside the audited limits.

01:22:50:05 - 01:23:25:19
The guidance for BNG for developers of NSIPs was published on the twenty seventh of August twenty twenty six after application in June twenty six. In the absence of specific BNG guidance for NSIPs, the assessment was informed by equivalent guidance and established best practice for Town and Country Planning applications. The BNG assessment was prepared using an approach informed by the methodology set out in statutory biodiversity metric user guide. It took account of the CIEM good practice principles for BNG and was undertaken by qualified and experienced psychologists.

01:23:27:17 - 01:23:36:02
The assessment methodology is set out in detail in the biodiversity net gain report document reference a, double p, zero nine six.

01:23:42:01 - 01:23:49:28
This involved establishing the biodiversity baseline units based on field survey findings,

01:23:53:05 - 01:24:01:03
undertaking river condition assessments to inform linear feature calculations for water courses.

01:24:02:28 - 01:24:23:03
It established habitat distinctiveness and identified irreplaceable habitats, all of which need to go into the metric. The habitat losses were based on vegetation removal plans, AP zero one six, and using reasonable worst case parameters on the habitats being lost.

01:24:27:15 - 01:24:53:22
Habitat creation and enhancement measures illustrated in Figure five point one, illustrative master plan of the ES, APP073, informed the post development habitat creation enhancement within the metric, including areas to be retained and enhanced by diversity and proposed new habitat types. For the purposes of completing the metric, habitats within the master plan were converted to those calculations.

01:24:59:03 - 01:25:13:08
Biodiversity net gain assessment predicted the proposed development to deliver a forty three percent biodiversity net gain in habitat units and forty four percent biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and ten percent of watercourse units.

01:25:14:29 - 01:25:51:14
The predicted target conditions of habitats to be created have been selected on a precautionary basis, ensuring the BNG scenario is both realistic and achievable. It should be noted that any habitat creation enhancement proposed will be managed and monitored in line with the current guidelines over a period of thirty years as outlined in the O LEMP. Requirement seven-two of the draft DCO secures minimum biodiversity gains. Requirement seven-three of the draft DCO, App seventeen, requires the approved LEMP to be implemented and maintained during the operation of the authorized development.

01:25:52:11 - 01:25:53:05
Thank you.

01:25:55:19 - 01:26:02:05
Thank you for that useful summary. Now turn to Rotherham and Doncaster, please, Mr. Gulley.

01:26:02:25 - 01:26:09:14
Rob Gulley for Rotherham and Doncaster Councils. I'll turn to my colleague, Duncan MacGoplin, who is online.

01:26:15:08 - 01:26:20:18
Thank you. This is Duncan McLoughlin on behalf of Doncaster and Rotherham Councils.

01:26:22:11 - 01:26:51:27
As Mr. Gulley mentioned earlier this morning, we've provided detailed comments on the whole range of elements of the application through the relevant representation. So we won't cover all of those today. I'll just pick up on a few key points. And also just worth mentioning, we've been the council has been working with the applicants subsequently discussing these comments to help clarify the various positions.

01:26:54:05 - 01:27:23:15
So there's three points I just thought it'd be worth talking through today. Firstly, baseline surveys and data used to inform the environmental statement. We had a number of comments in relation to the scope of surveys and some of the specific limitations, which we felt undermines the confidence in the baseline presented in the environmental chapter six of the environmental statement.

01:27:25:01 - 01:27:28:10
Reference AS twenty one.

01:27:29:28 - 01:27:59:19
The applicant has informed us that update surveys and additional surveys have been undertaken since submission of the environmental statement, which have validated the previous results and have not changed the conclusions of of the ES. And as such, currently, the... Our position is we're we're with this issue subject to the receipt and review of those new reports, which I understand will be provided at deadline one of the examination.

01:28:01:09 - 01:28:13:14
The second point was in relation to impacts to Brampton Common local wildlife site and Skylark, which are a qualifying feature of that site.

01:28:15:07 - 01:28:26:29
The proposed development will result in permanent loss of habitats within the local wildlife sites used by breeding for Skylark.

01:28:28:15 - 01:28:44:12
The proposed development includes compensation through provision of additional Skylark breeding habitats, although this is outside the local wildlife sites and outside of the order limits.

01:28:46:10 - 01:29:04:19
The council sought clarification of the total Skylark mitigation area. The distinction between measures within the local wildlife sites and compensatory land elsewhere, and the location and security of these additional areas.

01:29:09:20 - 01:29:26:02
Are ongoing on on this point, and they would confirm proposed mitigation areas whether off-site land is within, which of the two authority areas it's within, and any and how any of these areas will be secured.

01:29:28:28 - 01:29:43:12
And then my third point that I'd like to raise is in relation to the outlined outlined construction environmental management plan. Application reference, APP zero four two.

01:29:46:28 - 01:29:51:10
Many of the conclusions presented in chapter six of the environment

01:29:55:05 - 01:30:15:07
secured through the outline camp and and then subsequently the camp, which would be secured through requirement. I think the the council's position is that the the... Currently, the outline camp does not contain sufficient detail to support some of those conclusions.

01:30:17:11 - 01:30:41:09
It's not necessarily that it disagrees with the conclusions, but just the information isn't really there to to support that. So for example, the outline camp, there doesn't seem to be any mention of local wildlife sites despite the fact that there are, I think, three, like, wildlife sites within the order limits and and several others adjacent to the order limits.

01:30:42:29 - 01:30:51:01
And there... There's no protected draft species mitigation strategies within the outline can push that... That's the level of detail we'll

01:30:57:21 - 01:31:00:27
Please, some additional detail on these points.

01:31:02:17 - 01:31:05:04
And that was my last point. Thank you.

01:31:06:10 - 01:31:21:10
Thank you, mister McLoughlin. You were dropping out a little there, but I think we caught most of what you were saying. So thank you for that. Can I just, just conscious of time, see what we can fit in before break, Northeast Derbyshire, do you have any comments on this item, please?

01:31:22:14 - 01:31:45:23
Angelina Lambert on behalf of Northeast Derbyshire District Council. Unfortunately, our our ecologist isn't able to attend today, so we intend to pick up any issues with the applicant team,

continue to engage with them with any issues, and include a section on this topic in the local impact report as well to be submitted for deadline one.

01:31:46:22 - 01:31:48:08
Thank you. That will be most welcome.

01:31:52:14 - 01:31:55:05
Yes. And back to Mr. Walker, please.

01:31:55:07 - 01:32:18:20
Thank you. Angus Walker for the applicant. In respect to the council's three points, I don't think we need to come back on the baseline survey first point because that's Mr. McLoughlin accepted that was being dealt with, and he would they would look at our further survey results. On Brampton Common local wildlife site on Skylark,

01:32:20:07 - 01:32:46:25
Mr. Slaymaker may have something to say about ornithological aspects. But in terms of securing any Skylark habitat outside the order limits, we will be trying seeking habitat within only within the order limits, if possible. But if it is necessary to go outside the order limits, we are in discussion with a number of landowners. And an agreement would be made individually with them to provide that habitat

01:32:49:08 - 01:33:09:29
outside the DCO. That would be a separate agreement. So that's how that would be secured. And we will report back on progress on that. And I'll see if Mr. Sleimaker has anything to add. But Mrs. Olds will respond on the third point about the O'KeMP after that.

01:33:12:02 - 01:33:26:05
You. Matt Slaymaker on behalf of the applicant. With regards to Skylark in Brampton Common, given the local wildlife site designation, this has been given consideration in the assessment.

01:33:28:19 - 01:34:02:27
We have updated some surveys in twenty twenty six to validate some of the results, and we've surveyed the entirety of the local wildlife site, not just the order limits. This is to clarify the importance of the local wildlife site for Skylark and look at their relative abundance in different areas and different habitats. For example, much of the order limits which overlap to the local wildlife site is modified grassland, which is a habitat of low value for Skylark.

01:34:02:29 - 01:34:53:20
There's relatively few pairs there compared to other areas of the local wildlife site which contain arable crops, for example. So the design of the site or design of the proposed development is within the lower value habitats within that area. Within the local wildlife site itself, there's over fifteen hectares of habitat which would be managed for Skylark, including grassland. And further to that, through discussion with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and other interested parties, they've raised a previous feature of the local wildlife site, breeding waders, which is not a current feature because they're no longer there due to habitat changes ten to fifteen years ago.

01:34:54:07 - 01:35:04:05
And we've identified an opportunity to restore some of that habitat and potentially restore that feature to the local wildlife site as well. Thank you.

01:35:07:25 - 01:35:42:00
Thank you. I just had a very quick one on this while we're on topic, if you don't mind. Yes, Zero two one six five ninety refers to the the sky lock matter. I think there's two hundred and five sky lock territories identified, a hundred and nineteen within solar PV array area. But then we come up with a compensating measure of one hundred plots just to get a quick thought on that. Do you consider that adequate compensation? Is it based on I think it's two per fifty hectares, is that right?

01:35:43:09 - 01:36:22:04
So yes, the two zero five territories is across the order limits as a whole, and the one hundred and nineteen are within the proposed solar areas. So as a precaution, we're assuming that all one hundred and nineteen territories would be lost or displaced. Within some of the enhancements within the order limits themselves, we're creating various areas of Tuskegee grassland. In fact, twenty five fields more than three hectares in size would be species rich grassland or Tuskegee grassland, which would be used by by Skylark.

01:36:22:06 - 01:36:42:10
So there will continue to be some beds accommodated within the site. And furthermore, the the habitat created under the panels, although it's not expected that skylark would breed between the panels, there's no evidence that they do this, but it does offer a good foraging habitat. So

01:36:43:26 - 01:37:15:25
birds from surrounding fields would still use that area and would still have value. As a little bit of context about Skylark ecology, one of the big reasons for declines in the UK is the transition to winter sown crops around fifty, sixty years ago. So the crops grow too quickly, they become unsuitable for foraging and productivity and survival rates of birds decrease as a result. So creating areas of

01:37:18:07 - 01:37:55:23
more consistent, reliable habitat within the site will provide foraging opportunities for birds in the immediate surrounds, which may otherwise be unsuccessful or have low breeding success in the current agricultural landscape. And this is also where the scarlet plots mentioned previously. So there is a commitment for those, again, in the surrounding landscape, and they will increase productivity and territory densities in those fields where those are secured, which will help to offset some of the losses within the site as well.

01:37:56:00 - 01:38:15:26
There's a couple of different effects that are being considered here. We are potentially losing breeding habitat, but that's going to be offset through a combination of improved productivity as well as areas being able to accommodate more territories as well. Thank you.

01:38:16:24 - 01:38:26:29

Thank you. That is useful. I'm conscious of time. I'm to have a break at about three forty five. But perhaps if we could bring just the environment agency at this point, please.

01:38:27:15 - 01:38:32:19
So Mrs. Olds was going to respond to the council's third point on the Kemp question, Sally if

01:38:36:24 - 01:39:07:16
Olds on behalf of the applicant. Just quickly to say that there are there is a bit more detail in the Chapter six in terms of the mitigation during construction, and some of that's not gone across into the Kemp in any detail. There's an outline Kemp, but we are intending to update that in the future in deadline two of the examination. And there will be some more detail, which is already set out in other documents, but perhaps not explicit in the O Kemp currently. Thank you.

01:39:08:12 - 01:39:14:05
Thank you. Can we bring in the Environment Agency, please, online?

01:39:14:22 - 01:39:54:03
Yes. Hello, I'm Candice Orban, the Environment Agency. Nothing particular to in raise at this point. I just wanted to say we've positively been working with the applicant to resolve the issues we did raise in our relevant representation. So we've had some very productive meetings for that. And I've had a look at the applicant's response to our relevant reps, which we're working through as well. And I can sort of say that we are very close to working through and resolving the issues that we have raised. We do look forward to receiving the further survey work that has been done, the results of that, which they said were to be submitted at deadline one.

01:39:54:27 - 01:40:22:15
We also raised an issue with regards to water crossings and culverts. This again has been another issue that we have been talking to the applicant about, and we've had some positive meetings regarding that. That comes with several aspects. So we've got the biodiversity and fishery side of things, but also there's flood risk and geomorphology that come into that as well. But again, we are working well to resolve that issue.

01:40:24:13 - 01:40:25:21
Thank you. That is useful.

01:40:28:08 - 01:40:37:10
Mindful of time, I know we have a couple of IPs. Mister Collins, mister Cook, missus Eastwood, and mister Buckland, do... Who do you wanna speak on this item?

01:40:49:00 - 01:40:56:23
Perhaps the applicant might have a view. We carry on with those IPs now or we could bring in mister Gully's water

01:40:58:09 - 01:41:00:18
expert at this point? It's entirely up to you.

01:41:01:29 - 01:41:20:01
Sam, well, we want to make as much progress as possible, but we don't want to prevent the water witness from speaking. Is it quarter past four? So I think we could manage the I parties don't know.

01:41:21:28 - 01:41:23:19
Then the water witness after the break?

01:41:27:12 - 01:41:31:24
Yes. We'll go for other wind on Castle Council. We'll seek to have them online so that

01:41:31:26 - 01:41:44:06
they can be ready straight after the break. Okay. That's fine. Let's go to our IPs, but we will take a break soon just to let people stretch their legs. Should we start with Mr. William Collins, please?

01:41:47:19 - 01:42:18:05
William Collins, a resident of Coneybrook Parks and retired farmer. I didn't realize that I had registered to speak on this, but I would just like to make a comment on behalf of Save Our Greenbelt, Coneybrook Parks, which I'm a committee member. Our member isn't here today to speak on this, but we will be putting a full written submission in. We have had members monitoring Coneybrook Parks virtually three sixty five days. So it will be a quite intensive report. Thank you for that. That's all at the moment.

01:42:19:09 - 01:42:27:16
Thank you, Mr. Collins. We look forward to that submission. Mister Cook, you, I think, indicated speak. Please go ahead.

01:42:30:07 - 01:43:08:04
My name is Martin Cook. I'm an interested party. I'm a resident of Weston, which is in... Located in Whitestone two. What has been discussed during this meeting so far has been, focused on either, Whitestone one, two, or three issues, and rightly so. What I am about to say is relevant to the entirety of the order limits. I believe there is a critical omission regarding the recent application for planning permission for the proposed Whitestone solar farm.

01:43:08:21 - 01:43:41:15
The draft environmental assessment submitted by the applicant applicant in support of the application contravenes existing statutory legislation, which shall have legal consequences for both the planning inspectorate and the applicant. Statutory legal protections and wildlife obligations ensure some species of birds are afforded strict enhanced protection under schedule one of the Wildlife and Countryside Act nineteen eighty one as amended.

01:43:43:03 - 01:44:23:21
Enhanced protection under schedule one of the Wildlife and Countryside Act nineteen eighty one is amended. Under section one five of the act, it is a strict liability criminal offense to intentionally or recklessly kill, injure, or take any schedule one species. Take, damage, or destroy the nest of a schedule one species while it is in use or being built. Disturb a schedule one species while it is in or near a nest containing eggs, and disturb the dependent young of a schedule one species.

01:44:25:00 - 01:45:00:09
Land immediately adjacent to the development hold formal statutory... Statutory designation. Because of the mandatory designations, the Wildlife and Countryside Act eighty one provide absolute legal protection to territory and habitats of the schedule one species affected by the development. The close proximity of Whitestone Solar Farm and the substations required for the development create two severe legal and statutory vulnerabilities for any future permissions.

01:45:01:06 - 01:45:11:23
One, direct risk of reckless disturbance under section one five on... And two, failure of material planning consideration.

01:45:13:14 - 01:45:28:08
Under UK law, proceeding with heavy construction in known breeding proximity without appropriate site specific site specific mitigation satisfies the legal threshold for reckless disturbance.

01:45:30:25 - 01:46:09:09
Under the national planning policy framework and the environment act twenty twenty one, planning authorities have a statutory duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity. The presence of schedule one protected species is a material planning consideration. A failure to identify resident breeding species or evaluate the ecological impact on their active hunting habitat during the determination process fundamentally undermines the adequacy of the applicant's environmental impact assessment.

01:46:10:15 - 01:46:51:24
The applicant's construction and environmental management plan will need major consideration to establish clear protocols to avoid criminal liability under section one five of the eighty one act during all ground clearing and development phases. Proceeding with approval of the applicant's submission in ignorance of established schedule one species, exposes developers and contractors to criminal prosecution under the Wildlife and Countryside Act nineteen eighty one as amended and leaves all decisions vulnerable to legal challenge.

01:46:53:20 - 01:46:58:16
The inspectorate should revisit this application. Thank you.

01:47:04:08 - 01:47:06:08
Thank you, mister Cook.

01:47:07:23 - 01:47:12:10
I think, councillor, I think you do want to come in as well, don't you, on this item?

01:47:16:01 - 01:47:51:00
Nicola Henderson on behalf of Aniston Parish Council. I did go into some detail yesterday and also in our relevant representation, but I just wanna give a bit more information. So in our area, we've got a number of wildlife habitats. So we've got Anston stones, which is in the heart of Anston. It's a triple s I in a local nature reserve. It supports a wide wide range of wildlife with diverse habitats. And I don't think, I've not been able to see that this is actually being considered within the submission.

01:47:51:21 - 01:47:57:19
Yet it's only probably half a mile or so from where the solar panels are going be located.

01:48:00:17 - 01:48:09:15
We've also got Chesterfield canal, is a local wildlife site. Just on from there we've got Kiverton community woodland.

01:48:11:20 - 01:48:51:13
Obviously the surrounding fields support that wildlife as well as it being agricultural land. Then we've got Axel Lane, which is quite personal to me because my house backs onto Axel Lane. I've actually got a gate that goes straight out into the field. I walk there every day with my dog. Axel Lane has got a fishing lake and woodland. Within the woodland, we believe there's a, by the by, but an ancient Roman farm. Axel Lane supports a wide range of wildlife and lots of red listed birds, and it's absolutely full of sky larks.

01:48:52:00 - 01:48:53:06
It's unbelievable.

01:48:54:27 - 01:49:11:20
Just two days ago in the night, I had a tawny owl in my tree, there's also loads more of the birds that I've found using the Merlin app. But I don't believe that this area has had a survey done on it. It's where cable route l is going to go.

01:49:15:07 - 01:49:25:29
I think assessing individual fields in isolation also understates their collective importance for the whole wildlife habitat within our area.

01:49:28:07 - 01:49:43:27
Obviously, we'll have construction activities on Axel Lane. We've got solar panels going on the fields on the a fifty seven. We've got all the heavy construction work down at the canal with the tunneling under the canal, the railway, and the reception pit.

01:49:45:13 - 01:49:58:10
And then we've got Brampton Mile, which Brampton Mile absolutely breaks my heart. It was absolutely beautiful road, straight mile, fields on either side, supports a lot of wildlife.

01:49:59:28 - 01:50:20:07
We've already got the Prampton solar farm built on there, which is causing chaos. There's been reports of deer found dead on the road because they just don't know where to go. The habitat's gone. Whitestone are proposing to completely fill the fields on both sides of that road, as I've said before.

01:50:23:07 - 01:50:30:28
Everything is connected. You can't just look at things in separate areas. The whole area is a wildlife habitat and a wildlife corridor.

01:50:32:13 - 01:50:35:14
My concern is where is all the wildlife gonna go?

01:50:37:15 - 01:50:47:05
I just... I don't know. They're just gonna be dead on the road, or they're just gonna stop. We're not gonna have it anymore, and it just breaks my heart. Thank you.

01:50:53:02 - 01:51:05:22
Thank you for that further contribution, Councillor Anderson. We will now take a break, so we will adjourn until four p. M. And then at that point, we'll come in with Mr. Gulley's water specialist. So this unit is now adjourned.