

WEBVTT – This file was automatically generated by event.video

0

00:00:00.500 --> 00:00:03.400

Thank you. It's five past 12 hearings resumed and

1

00:00:03.400 --> 00:00:06.700

we're continuing with item three

2

00:00:06.700 --> 00:00:08.800

then historic environment Mrs. Taylor.

3

00:00:10.500 --> 00:00:13.400

Thank you, Mr. King. Now these two items are really

4

00:00:13.400 --> 00:00:16.200

for clarification and update because we had

5

00:00:16.200 --> 00:00:19.800

very full discussions at the

6

00:00:19.800 --> 00:00:22.300

last if you issue specific hearing and

7

00:00:22.300 --> 00:00:26.400

number two in relation to Chippenham Park formal Avenue

8

00:00:26.400 --> 00:00:31.400

and the plane crash site on parcel e05.

9

00:00:29.400 --> 00:00:33.200

So really

10

00:00:32.200 --> 00:00:36.500

what I'd like is for the applicant

11

00:00:35.500 --> 00:00:38.500

to clarify, please.

12

00:00:39.600 --> 00:00:42.300

In relation to the Avenue. This is obviously something

13

00:00:42.300 --> 00:00:45.500

that we looked at on the accompanied site

14

00:00:45.500 --> 00:00:49.200

inspection yesterday and the the specific

15

00:00:48.200 --> 00:00:52.700

issue here is where the cable and

16

00:00:51.700 --> 00:00:54.700

also a proposed access

17

00:00:54.700 --> 00:00:57.600

track would cross the Avenue which is

18

00:00:57.600 --> 00:01:00.800

part of the Chippenham Park registered Park and garden.

19

00:01:01.900 --> 00:01:05.000

And the applicant said that

20

00:01:04.400 --> 00:01:07.100

a more detailed plan. We

21

00:01:07.100 --> 00:01:11.500

requested a more detailed plan. Please be submitted. It's

22

00:01:10.500 --> 00:01:13.200

obviously being a registered Parker and

23

00:01:13.200 --> 00:01:16.100

garden. This is an important aspect. So we would like

24

00:01:16.100 --> 00:01:19.000

to see as much detail as we

25

00:01:19.300 --> 00:01:19.700

can, please.

26

00:01:21.300 --> 00:01:24.600

Could you confirm whether that can be submitted at deadline 7, please?

27

00:01:24.600 --> 00:01:27.900

Yes, we can provide a more detailed

28

00:01:27.900 --> 00:01:30.700

plan showing the crossing points.

29

00:01:30.700 --> 00:01:34.300

Just just very briefly. I think you

30

00:01:34.300 --> 00:01:38.000

you know this but just for everyone's benefit the applicants proposal

31

00:01:37.100 --> 00:01:40.100

in that location. There is a crossing point

32

00:01:40.100 --> 00:01:42.700

which follows the existing track that crosses the

33

00:01:44.500 --> 00:01:47.200

The crosses the Avenue it may be

34

00:01:47.200 --> 00:01:50.400

necessary to do some work to

35

00:01:50.400 --> 00:01:53.200

that track. We would anticipate that

36

00:01:53.200 --> 00:01:56.500

would be through a no dig approach. So be to

37

00:01:56.500 --> 00:01:59.400

lay material on

38

00:01:59.400 --> 00:02:02.700

top of the existing track and maybe slightly

39

00:02:02.700 --> 00:02:06.000

widen it but without digging into the area

40

00:02:05.700 --> 00:02:08.200

beneath that so avoiding impacts on

41

00:02:08.900 --> 00:02:12.500

tree roots for the access

42

00:02:11.500 --> 00:02:12.800

track

43

00:02:13.600 --> 00:02:16.200

in terms of the crossing point of

44

00:02:16.200 --> 00:02:16.600

the cable.

45

00:02:18.500 --> 00:02:21.300

I think we've already confirmed that

46

00:02:21.300 --> 00:02:24.500

we expand that will be through a trenchless technique. But

47

00:02:24.500 --> 00:02:28.100

certainly the commitment is to avoid any impact

48

00:02:27.100 --> 00:02:30.300

on the trees that form part of the Avenue.

49

00:02:35.700 --> 00:02:38.700

Mr. Mohammed, I don't really want to go into discussion about

50

00:02:38.700 --> 00:02:41.400

that. But do you have a do you want any further clarification?

51

00:02:43.200 --> 00:02:46.100

It is about something that we will We would like to

52

00:02:46.100 --> 00:02:49.600

see clarified for the next deadline and it isn't

53

00:02:49.600 --> 00:02:52.700

hopefully does it relate to Chippenham Park Avenue? Yes, it

54

00:02:52.700 --> 00:02:55.700

does. Okay. It's in

55

00:02:55.700 --> 00:02:58.900

relation to just so again when more work

56

00:02:58.900 --> 00:02:59.700

is done.

57

00:03:02.300 --> 00:03:06.000

It we've seen that what stated about about the

58

00:03:05.200 --> 00:03:08.900

question about the beach beach trees. I

59

00:03:08.900 --> 00:03:12.300

don't know. If you see in the line of beech trees on there. What we've

60

00:03:11.300 --> 00:03:14.700

been trying to understand is whether there's any evidence

61

00:03:14.700 --> 00:03:17.300

that they're only beached. It's only a beach

62

00:03:17.300 --> 00:03:20.700

tree Avenue and the the tree officer

63

00:03:20.700 --> 00:03:23.400

was was asking about the importance of the existing Avenue

64

00:03:23.400 --> 00:03:24.800

feature relates to it being

65

00:03:25.600 --> 00:03:28.400

a feature not the species now included and

66

00:03:28.400 --> 00:03:32.700
whether they were going to look at other species beyond

67
00:03:32.700 --> 00:03:36.100
the mature Beach. That's the first thing second

68
00:03:35.100 --> 00:03:38.400
is the the Yarborough cultural impact

69
00:03:38.400 --> 00:03:38.900
report.

70
00:03:39.800 --> 00:03:42.300
Suggests that there will that the Avenue

71
00:03:42.300 --> 00:03:46.000
will not suffer tree losses yet the environmental master plan

72
00:03:45.400 --> 00:03:49.000
still shows that there will be some losses. We

73
00:03:48.300 --> 00:03:50.200
were trying to reconcile.

74
00:03:50.900 --> 00:03:52.700
the two

75
00:03:53.700 --> 00:03:54.300
and then

76
00:03:55.600 --> 00:03:58.500
the third Point relates to the same

77
00:03:58.500 --> 00:04:01.500
report, which says which states that the cable route

78
00:04:01.500 --> 00:04:04.300
will be achieved without tree loss using the root of

79
00:04:04.300 --> 00:04:07.300
the existing track, which is something that's just been

80

00:04:07.300 --> 00:04:11.100

mentioned and horizontal directional drilling, but

81

00:04:10.100 --> 00:04:13.300

the indicated cable route appears to

82

00:04:13.300 --> 00:04:16.500

be aligned. So it's quite difficult for us to sort

83

00:04:16.500 --> 00:04:19.300

of be able to understand how the directional drilling is

84

00:04:19.300 --> 00:04:22.800

shown on the tree protection removals plan particularly plan

85

00:04:22.800 --> 00:04:23.400

six.

86

00:04:24.100 --> 00:04:27.500

Is going to work and more

87

00:04:27.500 --> 00:04:30.700

specifically in relation to the dogleg bend near tree

88

00:04:30.700 --> 00:04:32.200

t259.

89

00:04:33.400 --> 00:04:36.300

So those are the three sort of clarification points and we can

90

00:04:36.300 --> 00:04:39.500

put that in an email to the applicant again, just so

91

00:04:39.500 --> 00:04:42.500

that we can clarify on the Avenue and in

92

00:04:42.500 --> 00:04:44.300

specifically in relation to the trees on the Avenue.

93

00:04:45.400 --> 00:04:48.200

Thank you. Yes, if you could submit that is your

94

00:04:48.200 --> 00:04:51.500

in your post hearing response. It

95

00:04:51.500 --> 00:04:54.300

is for those sorts of details that we have asked for the

96

00:04:54.300 --> 00:04:57.600

more detailed plan because as we observed yesterday, it's

97

00:04:58.400 --> 00:05:02.300

it's important to for us to know where the

98

00:05:01.300 --> 00:05:04.600

even if it is horizontal directional

99

00:05:04.600 --> 00:05:07.200

drilling, you know, the length of that the beginning

100

00:05:07.200 --> 00:05:10.500

and end points and the position of the track and

101

00:05:10.500 --> 00:05:11.700

sort of surfacing.

102

00:05:12.500 --> 00:05:13.100

involved

103

00:05:14.800 --> 00:05:17.600

and Bridge turning for the applicant rather than asking

104

00:05:17.600 --> 00:05:20.400

Mr. Wakefield to come back on any of those points now, I think it's better

105

00:05:20.400 --> 00:05:23.500

for us to reconcile that as you suggest

106

00:05:23.500 --> 00:05:26.100

in the plan that we submit. So hopefully that

107

00:05:26.100 --> 00:05:28.200

will address Mr. Mohammed's client's concerns as well.

108

00:05:28.900 --> 00:05:29.000

Thank you.

109

00:05:30.700 --> 00:05:33.400

So moving on to the plane crash

110

00:05:33.400 --> 00:05:36.000

site parcel e05.

111

00:05:37.100 --> 00:05:40.000

The applicant has now submitted to

112

00:05:41.700 --> 00:05:45.000

possible exclusion zones the 50

113

00:05:44.200 --> 00:05:47.600

meter square and then more

114

00:05:47.600 --> 00:05:50.800

recently a larger.

115

00:05:51.500 --> 00:05:51.900

Circle

116

00:05:53.200 --> 00:05:56.700

And Mr. Tony, could you please update Us in terms of where things

117

00:05:56.700 --> 00:05:59.300

have reached with the exclusion Zone and

118

00:05:59.300 --> 00:06:00.400

are both of those still?

119

00:06:01.400 --> 00:06:04.400

Possibilities Rich attorney for

120

00:06:04.400 --> 00:06:08.000

the applicant. Yes only in

121

00:06:07.400 --> 00:06:11.200

this sense that we have applied to the JC

122

00:06:10.200 --> 00:06:12.100

CC.

123

00:06:13.900 --> 00:06:14.100

which

124

00:06:15.600 --> 00:06:17.400

I don't know Mr. Mays. Can you remind me?

125

00:06:18.100 --> 00:06:21.300

What it stands for Andy May is on behalf of the applicant. Yes.

126

00:06:21.300 --> 00:06:21.800

It's the

127

00:06:23.500 --> 00:06:26.900

joint compassionate and Casualty Center

128

00:06:28.300 --> 00:06:29.200

so did

129

00:06:32.800 --> 00:06:36.200

Quite it's the joint casualty and compassionate Center.

130

00:06:36.200 --> 00:06:39.700

Yes. So this is the organization that

131

00:06:39.700 --> 00:06:43.600

gives a license to deal

132

00:06:42.600 --> 00:06:46.500

with areas that are

133

00:06:45.500 --> 00:06:49.000

potentially identified as being all

134

00:06:48.400 --> 00:06:51.400

grave. So I have to escape to be War Graves and

135

00:06:51.400 --> 00:06:54.800

if that license is

136

00:06:54.800 --> 00:06:57.600

not forthcoming, then the 100 meter

137

00:06:57.600 --> 00:06:59.000

exclusion Zone will be used.

138

00:06:59.900 --> 00:07:02.400

We expect that the license would

139

00:07:02.400 --> 00:07:05.700

be granted. We provided made the application and we

140

00:07:05.700 --> 00:07:08.100

hope to hear before the end of the examination that it has

141

00:07:08.100 --> 00:07:12.100

been granted which will mean that from the jccc's perspective.

142

00:07:11.100 --> 00:07:15.300

There is no concern about

143

00:07:15.300 --> 00:07:18.600

impact on a on a wargrave.

144

00:07:19.600 --> 00:07:23.700

Then the 50 meter square is the

145

00:07:22.700 --> 00:07:25.300

applicants proposal, which is

146

00:07:25.300 --> 00:07:29.300

really then concerned with the below ground archeology.

147

00:07:28.300 --> 00:07:31.600

The anomaly that's

148

00:07:31.600 --> 00:07:34.700

been identified in the ground that would

149

00:07:34.700 --> 00:07:36.000

appear to correspond with

150

00:07:36.800 --> 00:07:39.800

Part of the bomber that

151

00:07:39.800 --> 00:07:41.000

was lost in the war.

152

00:07:43.100 --> 00:07:46.700

And that exclusion is is therefore provided for dealing

153

00:07:46.700 --> 00:07:49.700

with the archaeological interest. But it

154

00:07:49.700 --> 00:07:55.300

also serves the purpose of showing

155

00:07:53.300 --> 00:07:57.300

that compassion and

156

00:07:57.300 --> 00:08:00.400

respect that's required given that it is the scene

157

00:08:00.400 --> 00:08:03.900

of a wartime accident resolved

158

00:08:03.900 --> 00:08:07.800

in loss of life. So we keep

159

00:08:07.800 --> 00:08:10.000

the panels off that area it will

160

00:08:10.100 --> 00:08:13.300

be grasped. It will be marked as such and then

161

00:08:13.300 --> 00:08:16.900

from the edge of the array the solar array

162

00:08:16.900 --> 00:08:19.400

and the edge of the parcel. We will

163

00:08:19.400 --> 00:08:22.400

provide an interpretive board that will

164

00:08:22.400 --> 00:08:25.600

inheritance terms better reveal

165

00:08:25.600 --> 00:08:28.200

the significance of that asset in the sense that no

166

00:08:28.200 --> 00:08:31.500

one at the moment would know it's there but they

167

00:08:31.500 --> 00:08:34.100

will people using the nearby Roots will be

168

00:08:34.100 --> 00:08:38.900

able to the permissive path will be able to stand and see the

169

00:08:37.900 --> 00:08:41.000

area where the where the

170

00:08:40.200 --> 00:08:43.000

crash occurred and it'll

171

00:08:43.200 --> 00:08:44.000

terms of such

172

00:08:49.900 --> 00:08:53.700

your waiting to hear further from the jccc

173

00:08:52.700 --> 00:08:55.300

that that's correct and

174

00:08:55.300 --> 00:08:59.100

that will determine which of the two exclusion zones

175

00:08:58.100 --> 00:08:59.800

are applied.

176

00:09:03.300 --> 00:09:06.300

Thank you. We did have a full discussion on the

177

00:09:06.300 --> 00:09:10.500

playing crash site at ish 2 if there

178

00:09:10.500 --> 00:09:14.100

are any further matters of clarification. Yes,

179

00:09:13.100 --> 00:09:17.600

I can see some hands up over there Iceland Parish

180

00:09:17.600 --> 00:09:19.900

Council. I really don't want to to

181

00:09:20.700 --> 00:09:23.600

go over the the full discussion again

182

00:09:23.600 --> 00:09:26.400

was that were there any specific questions that

183

00:09:26.400 --> 00:09:28.500

you had in relation to what you've just heard.

184

00:09:29.500 --> 00:09:32.000

Or just yes, I'm Richard Livingston on the

185

00:09:32.300 --> 00:09:35.300

parish Clark at Islam's and we're just too Corrections for

186

00:09:35.300 --> 00:09:38.300

start firstly. It wasn't it is not a war site. It

187

00:09:38.300 --> 00:09:40.100

was the crash was in 1949.

188

00:09:40.900 --> 00:09:43.500

Cold War technically and actually

189

00:09:43.500 --> 00:09:46.900

people do know that it's there the it's a

190

00:09:46.900 --> 00:09:49.300

significant site for the residents of Iceland.

191

00:09:49.800 --> 00:09:53.600

We've obviously considered the Amendments we're

192

00:09:52.600 --> 00:09:56.500

certainly aware of the 50 meter zone now

193

00:09:55.500 --> 00:09:58.100

aware of the hundred meter one, but we would

194

00:09:58.100 --> 00:10:01.100

still argue that the entire site out of respect for the families.

195

00:10:01.900 --> 00:10:05.500

Out of honoring the victims out

196

00:10:04.500 --> 00:10:07.800

of retaining a

197

00:10:07.800 --> 00:10:10.500

connection of physical connection and visual connection with

198

00:10:10.500 --> 00:10:13.800

the village that the entire eo5 site

199

00:10:13.800 --> 00:10:15.000

should be removed from the application.

200

00:10:16.100 --> 00:10:17.700

Thank you. Thank you.

201

00:10:19.800 --> 00:10:21.700

Any further? Yes.

202

00:10:23.300 --> 00:10:25.800

Richard hoggett first say no to Sonica and

203

00:10:26.700 --> 00:10:30.500

following on from the correction there. I previously we

204

00:10:29.500 --> 00:10:32.100

had an undertaking from the applicant to

205

00:10:32.100 --> 00:10:36.200

share with us the copy of the mods initial reports

206

00:10:35.200 --> 00:10:38.400

on the crash, which was

207

00:10:38.400 --> 00:10:41.900

promised to forthcoming deadline as yet unspecified. I

208

00:10:41.900 --> 00:10:44.100

wonder if that's something which we might be able to see it the next

209

00:10:44.100 --> 00:10:44.700

deadline, please.

210

00:10:45.900 --> 00:10:46.200

Thank you.

211

00:10:47.600 --> 00:10:51.300

We can provide that I think that's that dog

212

00:10:50.300 --> 00:10:54.100

was that one on the documents was submitted to the jccc

213

00:10:53.100 --> 00:10:57.300

so we can provide those documents that were submitted

214

00:10:57.300 --> 00:11:00.700

for the consideration of the license. Just

215

00:11:00.700 --> 00:11:03.500

another point that I just say is that in terms

216

00:11:03.500 --> 00:11:06.900

of that license process and the consideration of of this

217

00:11:06.900 --> 00:11:07.200

issue.

218

00:11:08.300 --> 00:11:11.500

The position is that in the requirement that we've drafted

219

00:11:11.500 --> 00:11:15.200

it cases for either eventuality. So

220

00:11:14.200 --> 00:11:17.200

whilst we expect that we will get

221

00:11:17.200 --> 00:11:20.300

a response from the jccc before the end of the examination.

222

00:11:21.400 --> 00:11:24.500

If that response is still outstanding the requirement

223

00:11:24.500 --> 00:11:26.600

would cater for either alternative.

224

00:11:29.500 --> 00:11:30.700

Thank you.

225

00:11:32.200 --> 00:11:35.900

In that case, I would like to move on now. Sorry Mr. Kendrick.

226

00:11:36.700 --> 00:11:39.000

I think Mr. Quick Mr. King has a quick

227

00:11:39.300 --> 00:11:39.900

question. Very quick question.

228

00:11:41.600 --> 00:11:43.700

Mr. Bedford mmm

229

00:11:45.800 --> 00:11:48.300

Just just so I can clarify my own mind

230

00:11:48.300 --> 00:11:51.500

you you produced at some

231

00:11:51.500 --> 00:11:53.400

stage what I might refer to.

232

00:11:54.700 --> 00:11:56.900

brightly or wrongly as a halfway house in terms of

233

00:11:58.800 --> 00:12:02.500

Moving down the hierarchy from avoidance and

234

00:12:01.500 --> 00:12:04.200

potential removal of

235

00:12:04.200 --> 00:12:07.200

eo5. There was a there was a figure that

236

00:12:07.200 --> 00:12:10.300

demonstrated further mitigation to

237

00:12:10.300 --> 00:12:13.200

be provided in the response to

238

00:12:13.200 --> 00:12:16.800

to a question of ours. I think. Well, I

239

00:12:16.800 --> 00:12:20.000

think the northern half was shown as with the panels.

240

00:12:19.600 --> 00:12:22.200

Yeah. I suspect that was

241

00:12:22.200 --> 00:12:26.000
in our answer to execute 209. That

242
00:12:25.200 --> 00:12:28.900
sound is rep Five 0 84. Thank

243
00:12:28.900 --> 00:12:32.400
you very much that Rings about I don't I don't mentally

244
00:12:31.400 --> 00:12:34.800
at the moment have an image of the

245
00:12:34.800 --> 00:12:37.200
diagram that we Illustrated to you there, but

246
00:12:37.200 --> 00:12:40.500
it's in that right. I don't know whether those around

247
00:12:40.500 --> 00:12:43.200
you might might be able to help. I just want

248
00:12:43.200 --> 00:12:45.400
to clarify my own mind whether or not

249
00:12:46.300 --> 00:12:47.300
that impacts

250
00:12:48.100 --> 00:12:52.900
and if so how the the positive

251
00:12:51.900 --> 00:12:54.300
exclusion site.

252
00:12:55.100 --> 00:12:55.700
itself

253
00:12:57.200 --> 00:13:00.500
Yeah, so I think rather me attempt to

254
00:13:00.500 --> 00:13:02.900
answer and get it wrong. I'm going to turn to Mrs. Cutting.

255

00:13:03.700 --> 00:13:06.600

To specifically comment on that thanks Miss cutting

256

00:13:06.600 --> 00:13:09.300

Mrs. Cutting for Suffolk County and

257

00:13:09.300 --> 00:13:13.000

East Cambridge a district council. Yes, the

258

00:13:12.900 --> 00:13:15.800

halfway house will be referring to would be

259

00:13:15.800 --> 00:13:18.100

our proposal to in fact

260

00:13:18.100 --> 00:13:21.700

reduce eo5 to in existing

261

00:13:21.700 --> 00:13:24.200

field boundary, which would then mean

262

00:13:24.200 --> 00:13:27.800

that the plane crash side would be outside of eo5,

263

00:13:27.800 --> 00:13:28.300

which would be

264

00:13:30.300 --> 00:13:33.300

yeah much beneficial in terms of recognizing the importance

265

00:13:33.300 --> 00:13:33.800

of that side.

266

00:13:34.700 --> 00:13:37.700

So in other words the proposals about highlighting the

267

00:13:37.700 --> 00:13:40.700

cross site and providing the interpretation and

268

00:13:40.700 --> 00:13:44.000

all the rest of it would in that scenario remain.

269

00:13:45.800 --> 00:13:49.600

It could remain as part of the why the mitigation yes, I

270

00:13:48.600 --> 00:13:50.400

just think at the moment.

271

00:13:51.900 --> 00:13:54.100

This is certainly one of the areas where?

272

00:13:55.200 --> 00:13:57.900

A potential for good design would come in.

273

00:13:58.800 --> 00:14:00.700

And what's been proposed so far?

274

00:14:02.500 --> 00:14:05.300

We wouldn't consider to be very good design. It's sort of

275

00:14:05.300 --> 00:14:08.300

it's a it's a bare minimum the 50/50.

276

00:14:09.200 --> 00:14:09.500

Square

277

00:14:12.600 --> 00:14:15.000

that's been grass within you know surrounded by

278

00:14:15.600 --> 00:14:18.500

solar panels doesn't really offer much. If you don't raise the

279

00:14:18.500 --> 00:14:21.000

viewing point where the interpretation board is, you will

280

00:14:21.300 --> 00:14:24.200

also probably not have any visual links to the to the

281

00:14:24.200 --> 00:14:27.300

grass area because you're standing in front of 2.5 meter high

282

00:14:27.300 --> 00:14:28.100
solar panels.

283

00:14:28.700 --> 00:14:31.700
And we have listed around to

284

00:14:31.700 --> 00:14:34.100
go into the detail. We have listed the questions of how you could

285

00:14:34.100 --> 00:14:37.600
make the site more meaningful without you know, without sort

286

00:14:37.600 --> 00:14:37.700
of

287

00:14:38.600 --> 00:14:42.300
what we fingers that sort of undue demands for

288

00:14:41.300 --> 00:14:44.300
example, just just name one example, which

289

00:14:44.300 --> 00:14:44.600
of

290

00:14:45.400 --> 00:14:48.400
Community roads actually it was her idea is

291

00:14:48.400 --> 00:14:51.400
to to remove panels. So from

292

00:14:51.400 --> 00:14:54.300
from the original flight path of

293

00:14:54.300 --> 00:14:57.800
of the plane, which would be coming from over Iceland

294

00:14:57.800 --> 00:15:00.900
into into the field which would

295

00:15:00.900 --> 00:15:03.500
create a visual link. When you walking

296
00:15:03.500 --> 00:15:06.300
down back road and would create a visual thing

297
00:15:06.300 --> 00:15:09.300
from some of the potential permissive roots that are being proposed

298
00:15:09.300 --> 00:15:12.400
and you know, you would also you would

299
00:15:12.400 --> 00:15:13.200
be actually able to see

300
00:15:14.100 --> 00:15:18.200
Towards the side and that would be the car. If

301
00:15:18.200 --> 00:15:21.300
if eo5 cannot be reduced in size that

302
00:15:21.300 --> 00:15:24.300
would be a minimum of what we would expect is that you

303
00:15:24.300 --> 00:15:27.900
know, you get a direct visual link. Yeah. No,

304
00:15:27.900 --> 00:15:30.500
I've got that discussing. Thank you. It may be something that Mr.

305
00:15:30.500 --> 00:15:33.800
Taylor wants to explore further it in the

306
00:15:33.800 --> 00:15:37.000
session. I just wanted to make sure that that there

307
00:15:36.100 --> 00:15:39.300
was an awareness of that potential relationship and how

308
00:15:39.300 --> 00:15:42.000
that might be integrated. Thank you.

309

00:15:52.900 --> 00:15:55.200

Okay, so we'll now move

310

00:15:55.200 --> 00:15:55.600

on to.

311

00:15:57.200 --> 00:16:01.700

Item four which is to look at the in combination impacts. So

312

00:16:01.700 --> 00:16:05.400

the combined impacts of ecology

313

00:16:04.400 --> 00:16:07.800

and biodiversity historic environment

314

00:16:07.800 --> 00:16:11.200

and landscape and visual impact.

315

00:16:13.200 --> 00:16:16.400

I'm going to be focusing particularly on the

316

00:16:16.400 --> 00:16:19.600

parcels of land where the local authorities have suggested

317

00:16:19.600 --> 00:16:22.900

that adequate or appropriate mitigation

318

00:16:22.900 --> 00:16:26.600

is not possible and have therefore suggested.

319

00:16:25.600 --> 00:16:28.100

These Parcels should be

320

00:16:28.100 --> 00:16:30.800

removed completely from the proposals.

321

00:16:32.300 --> 00:16:36.200

I'd like to start by going through the land Parcels concerned

322

00:16:35.200 --> 00:16:37.400
to check that.

323
00:16:38.300 --> 00:16:42.200
Our understanding is complete in those respects

324
00:16:41.200 --> 00:16:44.300
and I'll then ask

325
00:16:44.300 --> 00:16:47.900
the applicant to respond and will then invite other parties to

326
00:16:47.900 --> 00:16:48.300
comment.

327
00:16:50.100 --> 00:16:53.700
So I've divided them into hopefully fairly logical

328
00:16:53.700 --> 00:16:57.000
groups. The first one I think is largely really

329
00:16:56.500 --> 00:16:59.800
covered by the second change application.

330
00:16:59.800 --> 00:17:02.500
This is Seneca West B and

331
00:17:02.500 --> 00:17:05.700
land Parcels W 0 1 W 0

332
00:17:05.700 --> 00:17:08.500
2 and therefore eco4

333
00:17:09.600 --> 00:17:10.700
so

334
00:17:12.300 --> 00:17:15.900
I believe this is largely resolved by the change request does

335
00:17:15.900 --> 00:17:18.500
just one issue Mr. Turney, which

336

00:17:18.500 --> 00:17:21.300

I wondered whether the applicant could Enlighten us

337

00:17:21.300 --> 00:17:23.800

on really which relates to the cable route.

338

00:17:24.500 --> 00:17:27.000

As it passes through what would have been

339

00:17:27.600 --> 00:17:30.000

Seneca Westby the cable route seemed to have a triangle.

340

00:17:30.800 --> 00:17:31.100

in it

341

00:17:33.100 --> 00:17:36.900

as shown on the latest iteration of the environmental master

342

00:17:36.900 --> 00:17:37.300

plan.

343

00:17:38.200 --> 00:17:42.100

And the Planned included in the change.

344

00:17:43.500 --> 00:17:44.100

request document

345

00:17:52.900 --> 00:17:55.600

and we wondered whether you could explain why that triangle

346

00:17:55.600 --> 00:17:56.100

is there.

347

00:18:00.500 --> 00:18:03.600

It's a rich Journey for the applicant is construction access

348

00:18:03.600 --> 00:18:05.400

that's required in that location.

349

00:18:15.400 --> 00:18:17.900

There's there's a field drain that we need to negotiate.

350

00:18:19.200 --> 00:18:23.100

So that the in the cable routes and the the lands

351

00:18:22.100 --> 00:18:25.500

plans for those it will show a right over

352

00:18:25.500 --> 00:18:26.700

that area to allow access.

353

00:18:27.700 --> 00:18:29.200

Right. Okay. Thank you.

354

00:18:31.800 --> 00:18:34.900

So I think we can now move on to the second group

355

00:18:34.900 --> 00:18:37.600

of land Parcels which are

356

00:18:37.600 --> 00:18:41.300

the bulk of the rest of Seneca Westby,

357

00:18:40.300 --> 00:18:44.200

but excluding

358

00:18:43.200 --> 00:18:46.800

apart from parcel w15.

359

00:18:46.800 --> 00:18:50.600

So this would be Parcels w03

360

00:18:49.600 --> 00:18:53.000

to w0 to

361

00:18:52.800 --> 00:18:55.500

W12 and also including

362

00:18:55.500 --> 00:18:57.800

w17 the best site.

363

00:18:58.800 --> 00:19:01.500

Where the local authorities have

364

00:19:01.500 --> 00:19:04.500

identified impacts on Chippenham Park registered

365

00:19:04.500 --> 00:19:07.200

Park and garden and on views from the

366

00:19:07.200 --> 00:19:09.700

line Kilns and water Hall gallops.

367

00:19:12.300 --> 00:19:13.100

the third group

368

00:19:14.700 --> 00:19:17.800

Well, it's land parcel e05 which

369

00:19:17.800 --> 00:19:20.600

we've just heard some some

370

00:19:20.600 --> 00:19:23.700

more about so where the Landscaping

371

00:19:23.700 --> 00:19:26.600

packs biodiversity and protected species

372

00:19:26.600 --> 00:19:29.400

issues and as we've just been hearing about

373

00:19:29.400 --> 00:19:32.300

impact on the Islam plane crash

374

00:19:32.300 --> 00:19:32.800

site.

375

00:19:33.800 --> 00:19:37.300

And then fourthly land Parcels E12

376

00:19:36.300 --> 00:19:39.700
and e13.

377
00:19:41.400 --> 00:19:44.400
Now Parcels e05 E12 and

378
00:19:44.400 --> 00:19:47.400
e13 are three Parcels where

379
00:19:47.400 --> 00:19:50.100
I think Mr. Keen was just referring to that the

380
00:19:50.100 --> 00:19:53.400
halfway house solution if you like that the

381
00:19:53.400 --> 00:19:56.600
local authorities suggested in answer

382
00:19:56.600 --> 00:19:57.900
to our

383
00:19:58.700 --> 00:20:01.100
Question, which is in Suffolk County.

384
00:20:01.100 --> 00:20:04.000
Council's rep 5 0 8 4

385
00:20:05.400 --> 00:20:08.800
where possible reduced areas

386
00:20:08.800 --> 00:20:10.900
were suggested and before I

387
00:20:12.100 --> 00:20:15.600
Invite General comments who have just actually won

388
00:20:15.600 --> 00:20:19.000
item. I would like to clarify from

389
00:20:18.200 --> 00:20:22.200
that particular representation, please.

390

00:20:23.600 --> 00:20:25.800
and that's in relation to

391

00:20:28.100 --> 00:20:29.300
where are we the

392

00:20:32.300 --> 00:20:35.900
public right of way highway the set

393

00:20:35.900 --> 00:20:40.500
but yes the setback from the u6006

394

00:20:38.500 --> 00:20:41.700
parcel e

395

00:20:41.700 --> 00:20:42.200
13

396

00:20:43.600 --> 00:20:44.700
I don't know whether you have your

397

00:20:46.500 --> 00:20:47.700
copy in front of you

398

00:21:06.800 --> 00:21:09.500
It's it's the reply to our question

399

00:21:09.500 --> 00:21:11.200
209.

400

00:21:12.600 --> 00:21:13.100
You have that.

401

00:21:14.800 --> 00:21:17.500
yes, I just wanted to clarify whether

402

00:21:17.500 --> 00:21:20.800
the whether the the little map submitted

403

00:21:20.800 --> 00:21:24.700
in relation to parcel e

404
00:21:24.700 --> 00:21:27.200
13 was correct because the

405
00:21:27.200 --> 00:21:28.900
written description refers to

406
00:21:30.300 --> 00:21:34.000
Increased setback being suggested from

407
00:21:33.900 --> 00:21:36.100
of the solar panels from the

408
00:21:36.100 --> 00:21:39.900
u6006 but only the only

409
00:21:39.900 --> 00:21:42.900
the little map referring to e 12

410
00:21:42.900 --> 00:21:45.700
actually shows that I wasn't

411
00:21:45.700 --> 00:21:48.300
sure whether the map for e13 should have

412
00:21:48.300 --> 00:21:49.900
indicated the setback as well.

413
00:21:53.500 --> 00:21:53.600
well

414
00:21:54.400 --> 00:21:57.200
Unless Mrs. Cutting is able to give you

415
00:21:57.200 --> 00:22:00.400
a complete answer to that now. I suggest that we take that

416
00:22:00.400 --> 00:22:03.400
away and look at could you do that, please but if there's

417

00:22:03.400 --> 00:22:06.200

a quick answer perhaps you can hear it. But if there isn't we'll take

418

00:22:06.200 --> 00:22:06.900

it away and look at it.

419

00:22:08.600 --> 00:22:12.600

Slowly cutting for Suffolk County Council, we asked

420

00:22:11.600 --> 00:22:15.200

from the beginning to have

421

00:22:15.200 --> 00:22:18.200

a further setback for both of those Parcels to give

422

00:22:18.200 --> 00:22:21.300

the to give the lane more room to

423

00:22:21.300 --> 00:22:24.200

breathe that may have been omitted from the

424

00:22:24.200 --> 00:22:28.200

drawing because we were focused on the ecological ecological

425

00:22:27.200 --> 00:22:30.700

issues on e13 when

426

00:22:30.700 --> 00:22:33.300

we drove the map. So yes, I understand the reasoning

427

00:22:33.300 --> 00:22:37.100

I just it would be helpful. If you could just revisit the the

428

00:22:36.100 --> 00:22:39.300

plan that you submitted in the answer to

429

00:22:39.300 --> 00:22:42.300

our question and check that the plan marries up

430

00:22:42.300 --> 00:22:44.100

with what you're asking for in the text.

431

00:22:45.300 --> 00:22:46.100

You shall do that. Thank you.

432

00:22:47.100 --> 00:22:50.700

So these are the various Parcels of land.

433

00:22:52.400 --> 00:22:55.300

I'll be turning to the applicant. But before I do

434

00:22:55.300 --> 00:22:58.000

that to the local authorities, please.

435

00:22:59.400 --> 00:23:02.400

Is that is that list comprehensive are there

436

00:23:02.400 --> 00:23:05.100

any that we have missed from that list in terms

437

00:23:05.100 --> 00:23:08.900

of land Parcels the local authorities have suggested

438

00:23:08.900 --> 00:23:11.500

should be omitted from the site.

439

00:23:11.500 --> 00:23:12.700

So that's the first question.

440

00:23:14.300 --> 00:23:18.600

And then secondly, could you please give us

441

00:23:18.600 --> 00:23:22.700

a general summary as to why that

442

00:23:21.700 --> 00:23:24.000

request has been made?

443

00:23:26.500 --> 00:23:27.700

Thank you, Mr. Beth for

444

00:23:29.700 --> 00:23:32.500

Oh, I'll deal only with the parcels which

445

00:23:32.500 --> 00:23:35.400

are either in or in part

446

00:23:35.400 --> 00:23:40.200

in Suffolk. So if I'm dealing with eo5 E12

447

00:23:39.200 --> 00:23:43.300

and e13 and I'll leave Cambridge year

448

00:23:43.300 --> 00:23:46.900

to talk about the the wo Parcels if

449

00:23:46.900 --> 00:23:52.200

that's acceptable and obviously

450

00:23:50.200 --> 00:23:54.300

we've set out in

451

00:23:53.300 --> 00:23:54.800

our

452

00:23:58.700 --> 00:24:02.600

local impact report and then the subsequent representations following

453

00:24:01.600 --> 00:24:05.600

on from that the concerns

454

00:24:04.600 --> 00:24:07.100

in relation to

455

00:24:08.700 --> 00:24:13.100

those parcels and effectively so

456

00:24:12.100 --> 00:24:15.700

far as E12 and e13

457

00:24:15.700 --> 00:24:18.300
is concerned there are

458

00:24:18.300 --> 00:24:20.100
we see it is conflicting and

459

00:24:21.600 --> 00:24:25.000
fundamentally problematic requirements to

460

00:24:24.700 --> 00:24:27.900
accommodate both landscape and ecology

461

00:24:27.900 --> 00:24:30.400
which is why we see the preferred

462

00:24:30.400 --> 00:24:33.900
option under the mitigation hierarchy being to

463

00:24:33.900 --> 00:24:34.800
avoid

464

00:24:36.500 --> 00:24:36.900
and

465

00:24:38.500 --> 00:24:40.900
I'm just check whether there's a to.

466

00:24:42.800 --> 00:24:43.700
supplement to that

467

00:24:48.900 --> 00:24:51.100
Yes, it's also necessary when one's talking about

468

00:24:51.100 --> 00:24:54.900
ecology to take into account, obviously the presence of eco3 to

469

00:24:54.900 --> 00:24:56.700
the north of E12.

470

00:24:57.700 --> 00:25:01.100

And let's say we see it as there's an irreconcilable conflict

471

00:25:00.100 --> 00:25:03.500

between the requirement for landscape planting

472

00:25:03.500 --> 00:25:07.700

for immunity to provide screening and the

473

00:25:06.700 --> 00:25:10.300

requirements for Ecology. And

474

00:25:09.300 --> 00:25:12.300

so that's why I say we

475

00:25:12.300 --> 00:25:12.500

see that

476

00:25:14.700 --> 00:25:17.300

The particularly E12 should then be

477

00:25:17.300 --> 00:25:20.500

removed and so far as

478

00:25:20.500 --> 00:25:23.900

e13 is

479

00:25:23.900 --> 00:25:24.600

concerned.

480

00:25:26.100 --> 00:25:30.100

again, we see a similar tension arising and

481

00:25:29.100 --> 00:25:31.600

so far as

482

00:25:33.500 --> 00:25:35.300

e05 is concerned.

483

00:25:37.800 --> 00:25:40.100

The separate from the issues in relation to the

484

00:25:40.100 --> 00:25:43.600

plane crash site. We've identified this using relation

485

00:25:43.600 --> 00:25:44.500

to the lead Brook.

486

00:25:45.200 --> 00:25:48.700

And again, we see this as being up a location

487

00:25:48.700 --> 00:25:49.100

where

488

00:25:50.800 --> 00:25:54.500

Avoidance is preferable to mitigation. But

489

00:25:53.500 --> 00:25:56.200

obviously in answer to your questions to

490

00:25:56.200 --> 00:26:01.000

as a executed stage. We have identified. What

491

00:25:59.300 --> 00:26:02.800

would be improved mitigation

492

00:26:02.800 --> 00:26:05.700

compared to where we are now, but we

493

00:26:05.700 --> 00:26:09.400

have made the point that we don't think that mitigation will

494

00:26:09.400 --> 00:26:13.900

be sufficient to avoid the residual impacts.

495

00:26:19.800 --> 00:26:22.100

So we've already heard about the we can

496

00:26:22.100 --> 00:26:23.200

call it the halfway house.

497

00:26:26.300 --> 00:26:30.300
suggestions for e05e12 and

498
00:26:30.300 --> 00:26:30.700
E30

499
00:26:32.300 --> 00:26:35.300
In the local authorities views, are there any

500
00:26:35.300 --> 00:26:38.600
other potential halfway houses in relation

501
00:26:38.600 --> 00:26:41.500
to any of the other sites that are in the list I've

502
00:26:41.500 --> 00:26:42.300
run through.

503
00:26:44.700 --> 00:26:47.600
Well, I've only addressed ones for Suffolk. Yes.

504
00:26:47.600 --> 00:26:50.200
Well, I'm so you're adding that out. Yes, I would

505
00:26:50.200 --> 00:26:53.500
say anything else we would want to say because we've answered that

506
00:26:53.500 --> 00:26:53.700
question.

507
00:26:56.800 --> 00:26:57.600
Mr. Muhammad

508
00:26:58.400 --> 00:27:00.500
That shortest in the most simplest answer is no.

509
00:27:01.400 --> 00:27:04.200
I just want to check Mrs. Cutting had anything else to add to

510
00:27:04.200 --> 00:27:07.200
that. But there you go. That's probably the shortest answer you're

going to get today.

511

00:27:30.800 --> 00:27:32.200

Mr. Turney

512

00:27:34.400 --> 00:27:37.200

thank you. I think probably just deal with

513

00:27:37.200 --> 00:27:41.200

this sort of relatively high level and bring in the experts as

514

00:27:40.200 --> 00:27:42.300

you think appropriate.

515

00:27:43.300 --> 00:27:46.900

and eo5 we have

516

00:27:46.900 --> 00:27:49.700

proposed additional

517

00:27:49.700 --> 00:27:53.000

mitigation and enhancement which

518

00:27:52.600 --> 00:27:56.100

includes the approach in

519

00:27:55.100 --> 00:27:58.100

respect to the Lee Brook, which I think is what

520

00:27:59.200 --> 00:28:01.100

was just referred to

521

00:28:02.300 --> 00:28:06.300

but there's also a change

522

00:28:05.300 --> 00:28:09.500

to the permissive path through ea5 and

523

00:28:08.500 --> 00:28:10.900

a

524

00:28:13.600 --> 00:28:16.200

the the memorial and the viewing place which we now show

525

00:28:16.200 --> 00:28:20.100

on the landscape Master plans. We

526

00:28:19.100 --> 00:28:22.400

have agreed with the councils on the

527

00:28:22.400 --> 00:28:27.700

A5 that there will be further changes minor

528

00:28:27.700 --> 00:28:30.100

changes which were discussed with them in on the

529

00:28:30.100 --> 00:28:35.100

31st of January and they will be reflected and updated master plan

530

00:28:34.100 --> 00:28:37.400

deadline seven in terms

531

00:28:37.400 --> 00:28:41.000

of the halfway house for ea5.

532

00:28:40.200 --> 00:28:44.700

I think this is again going back to excluding land

533

00:28:44.700 --> 00:28:46.400

in respect to the crash site.

534

00:28:47.200 --> 00:28:48.600

We think we've made an appropriate.

535

00:28:49.500 --> 00:28:52.800

Proposal and respect to the crash site in light

536

00:28:52.800 --> 00:28:55.800

of its Heritage significance in terms

537

00:28:55.800 --> 00:28:58.500

of the provision of a viewing point and interpretation board

538

00:28:58.500 --> 00:29:01.500

and so on and standing off

539

00:29:01.500 --> 00:29:05.800

from the archaeological remains and

540

00:29:04.800 --> 00:29:07.500

we think that's an

541

00:29:07.500 --> 00:29:10.700

appropriate balance to strike given the history given

542

00:29:10.700 --> 00:29:13.000

the loss of life and so on.

543

00:29:13.900 --> 00:29:15.100

So that's ea5.

544

00:29:17.300 --> 00:29:20.500

E 12 and 13 there is

545

00:29:20.500 --> 00:29:23.200

as you know, and I don't think you'll want to go over

546

00:29:23.200 --> 00:29:28.200

it again because we debated it at length last time there is significant. Yeah

547

00:29:26.200 --> 00:29:30.000

ecological proposals

548

00:29:29.600 --> 00:29:32.300

in respect of stone curly, which

549

00:29:32.300 --> 00:29:35.800

is I think is the predominant ecological interest in respective

550

00:29:35.800 --> 00:29:38.900

those Parcels. Those are

551

00:29:38.900 --> 00:29:41.200
agreed with

552

00:29:41.200 --> 00:29:43.200
natural England most importantly.

553

00:29:45.500 --> 00:29:48.500
We say entirely appropriate

554

00:29:48.500 --> 00:29:53.400
proposals that will lead to benefits for

555

00:29:52.400 --> 00:29:55.900
the stone curly population in the

556

00:29:55.900 --> 00:29:58.400
area through the protection over 40 year

557

00:29:58.400 --> 00:30:01.400
period of areas on which those birds can

558

00:30:01.400 --> 00:30:04.700
Nest which would not otherwise be provided in E12 and

559

00:30:04.700 --> 00:30:07.300
e13 in the normal cycle of things.

560

00:30:08.100 --> 00:30:12.100
The visual impacts that I think are in issue

561

00:30:11.100 --> 00:30:15.200
and still an issue relate to

562

00:30:15.200 --> 00:30:20.800
first of all the the setback from

563

00:30:18.800 --> 00:30:21.900
of E12

564

00:30:21.900 --> 00:30:24.100
from u6006.

565
00:30:26.300 --> 00:30:28.900
Just very briefly.

566
00:30:30.900 --> 00:30:34.300
We looked at the proposed

567
00:30:33.300 --> 00:30:36.200
setback that shown in the

568
00:30:36.200 --> 00:30:40.600
what's put as a halfway house in E12. We

569
00:30:40.600 --> 00:30:44.200
looked at that we gave you figures previously for

570
00:30:43.200 --> 00:30:46.400
each field and the

571
00:30:46.400 --> 00:30:50.400
total capacity. The reduction

572
00:30:49.400 --> 00:30:53.200
in in power

573
00:30:52.200 --> 00:30:55.700
that is proposed by

574
00:30:55.700 --> 00:30:58.700
SCC on E12

575
00:30:58.700 --> 00:31:01.700
is some 25 megawatts of renewable energy. That's

576
00:31:01.700 --> 00:31:04.200
what they say should be lost to accommodate the views

577
00:31:04.200 --> 00:31:07.100
from that path. We say we've

578

00:31:07.100 --> 00:31:10.900

got adequate mitigation as it stands. There will

579

00:31:10.900 --> 00:31:13.500

be views for use of that path. It

580

00:31:13.500 --> 00:31:17.100

is it's a unclassified Road. I

581

00:31:16.100 --> 00:31:19.300

think it's mainly used by pedestrians and and

582

00:31:19.300 --> 00:31:22.300

cyclists rather than being used by

583

00:31:22.300 --> 00:31:27.200

Motor Vehicles whether they can legally do so, but it

584

00:31:26.200 --> 00:31:29.100

is we've carried out

585

00:31:29.100 --> 00:31:30.100

usage surveys.

586

00:31:30.800 --> 00:31:34.200

Is used I think we recorded five pedestrians

587

00:31:33.200 --> 00:31:37.600

and a couple of cyclists on average in

588

00:31:36.600 --> 00:31:39.900

our usage survey. We say

589

00:31:39.900 --> 00:31:42.200

the loss of 25 megawatts of power

590

00:31:42.200 --> 00:31:45.800

to accommodate the views, which we're already addressing through

591

00:31:45.800 --> 00:31:48.200
mitigation on that route would be

592
00:31:48.200 --> 00:31:51.800
disproportionate to address those

593
00:31:51.800 --> 00:31:52.200
impacts.

594
00:31:53.400 --> 00:31:57.300
And in respect of e13 there's

595
00:31:57.300 --> 00:32:01.000
a small area of land. Sorry a

596
00:32:00.200 --> 00:32:04.300
relatively modest area of land which is identified for exclusion

597
00:32:03.300 --> 00:32:06.100
in e13. I think

598
00:32:06.100 --> 00:32:11.100
that relates to the grassland feature, but

599
00:32:09.100 --> 00:32:12.500
that in

600
00:32:12.500 --> 00:32:16.400
itself we say it's not justified in ecological terms

601
00:32:15.400 --> 00:32:18.200
or in any other terms. It would

602
00:32:18.200 --> 00:32:21.500
result in the loss of some point eight five

603
00:32:21.500 --> 00:32:24.200
megawatts of renewable energy generation. If we were

604
00:32:24.200 --> 00:32:27.200
to follow the green exclusion Zone shown on

605

00:32:27.200 --> 00:32:31.000
sec's plan. So overall

606

00:32:30.600 --> 00:32:34.300
their proposals they're

607

00:32:33.300 --> 00:32:36.900
inviting you to delete in

608

00:32:36.900 --> 00:32:38.700
their halfway house some

609

00:32:40.200 --> 00:32:43.300
30 38 megawatts of

610

00:32:43.300 --> 00:32:46.300
renewable energy generation to address really

611

00:32:46.300 --> 00:32:49.900
what are very localized landscape concerns very

612

00:32:49.900 --> 00:32:52.200
localized visual concerns and we say that would

613

00:32:52.200 --> 00:32:55.300
be a disproportionate inappropriate thing to do in all

614

00:32:55.300 --> 00:32:59.100
the circumstances. We have looked at

615

00:32:58.100 --> 00:33:01.300
e13. Sorry E12 and

616

00:33:01.300 --> 00:33:04.900
13 mitigation that from the u-6006. I

617

00:33:04.900 --> 00:33:07.600
don't know if Mr. Rooney do you want to add anything on the
mitigation

618

00:33:07.600 --> 00:33:09.900

that is proposed for the for the public right away?

619

00:33:10.800 --> 00:33:13.600

So generally for the applicants. Yes deadline five.

620

00:33:13.600 --> 00:33:16.800

We added an additional Hedgerow along

621

00:33:16.800 --> 00:33:18.300

the eastern boundary of E12.

622

00:33:19.500 --> 00:33:23.200

to further screen views traveling south along u6006

623

00:33:23.900 --> 00:33:26.300

That's our workshop on the 31st of

624

00:33:26.300 --> 00:33:27.400

January. We also discussed.

625

00:33:28.400 --> 00:33:31.500

the possibility of strengthening existing vegetation

626

00:33:32.500 --> 00:33:35.200

along the U6 between E12 and

627

00:33:35.200 --> 00:33:38.100

e13 through into planting and that will

628

00:33:38.100 --> 00:33:41.300

be resolved in detail that deadline seven.

629

00:33:49.400 --> 00:33:52.100

And thank you Mr. Rooney. I just

630

00:33:52.100 --> 00:33:55.700

and just to add obviously this parcel of

631

00:33:55.700 --> 00:34:00.100

development 12 and 13 and the ecological mitigation

632

00:33:59.100 --> 00:34:01.700

area that goes with it. So that's

633

00:34:02.800 --> 00:34:03.700

ek3

634

00:34:05.600 --> 00:34:08.400

it it's deletion from the scheme. We

635

00:34:08.400 --> 00:34:11.000

already gave the the high level figures I think

636

00:34:11.500 --> 00:34:14.800

for that which amount a

637

00:34:14.800 --> 00:34:18.700

total of 55 megawatts

638

00:34:17.700 --> 00:34:21.300

of renewable energy. Obviously the

639

00:34:22.700 --> 00:34:25.400

It would be likely that if those were to

640

00:34:25.400 --> 00:34:28.600

be removed then the eco3 environmental mitigation

641

00:34:28.600 --> 00:34:29.200

would also.

642

00:34:30.200 --> 00:34:34.900

Have to be removed from the scheme. It wouldn't be justified. So

643

00:34:33.900 --> 00:34:36.300

we'd be

644

00:34:36.300 --> 00:34:39.200

looking at a fairly substantial scheme change and it

645

00:34:39.200 --> 00:34:43.600

would be dealing we say with really quite limited impacts. So

646

00:34:42.600 --> 00:34:45.700

not not a

647

00:34:45.700 --> 00:34:48.200

route that we think is it's Justified and one that

648

00:34:48.200 --> 00:34:51.100

would ask the local authorities to reflect on

649

00:34:51.100 --> 00:34:54.100

once they've seen the the latest proposals for mitigation.

650

00:34:56.800 --> 00:34:59.600

Thank you, Mr. Turney. So if the

651

00:34:59.600 --> 00:35:02.900

dco were to be framed along the lines, excuse

652

00:35:02.900 --> 00:35:05.300

me, suggested by the local authorities with

653

00:35:05.300 --> 00:35:09.400

all of the sites in the list. I went through excluded. What

654

00:35:08.400 --> 00:35:11.400

would the impact be on the viability of

655

00:35:11.400 --> 00:35:12.100

the scheme?

656

00:35:16.200 --> 00:35:19.600

If all it said notes, they're not just the ones that Mr. Bedford

657

00:35:19.600 --> 00:35:22.400

has discussed. Not just the halfway house the W all

658

00:35:22.400 --> 00:35:25.900

of all of the parcels suggested by the local authorities including

659

00:35:25.900 --> 00:35:28.200

Sonicare East Monica East

660

00:35:28.200 --> 00:35:31.100

and West well, it's a

661

00:35:31.100 --> 00:35:33.200

it's a loss of

662

00:35:35.400 --> 00:35:38.300

328 megawatts of renewable

663

00:35:38.300 --> 00:35:39.400

energy, so

664

00:35:42.600 --> 00:35:45.100

Between six and seven n tips of

665

00:35:45.100 --> 00:35:49.200

renewable energy with so the

666

00:35:48.200 --> 00:35:51.900

scheme itself obviously would deliver substantially

667

00:35:51.900 --> 00:35:54.600

less by way of renewable energy.

668

00:35:54.600 --> 00:35:56.100

Even if it could come forward.

669

00:35:56.900 --> 00:35:59.300

It would necessitate. I think it's fair to say a pretty

670

00:35:59.300 --> 00:36:01.200

fundamental revisiting of the scheme.

671

00:36:03.300 --> 00:36:04.200

it obviously

672

00:36:05.100 --> 00:36:08.700

the cable routes need to be reconsidered. We had the

673

00:36:08.700 --> 00:36:11.500

same thing with Sonica West B, because

674

00:36:11.500 --> 00:36:14.400

you had to take account to the fact that the cable routes still

675

00:36:14.400 --> 00:36:17.300

had to cross the land in question. Even if

676

00:36:17.300 --> 00:36:20.700

it's permanent. Use for solar arrays

677

00:36:20.700 --> 00:36:21.900

was no longer proposed.

678

00:36:22.800 --> 00:36:25.800

In terms of viability we'd have

679

00:36:25.800 --> 00:36:28.600

to consider the detail, but it doesn't seem likely

680

00:36:28.600 --> 00:36:31.900

that there'd be a viable scheme that included

681

00:36:31.900 --> 00:36:34.800

it would be a wholly different proposition.

682

00:36:34.800 --> 00:36:37.100

So it doesn't seem likely that

683

00:36:37.100 --> 00:36:40.300

a scheme would come forward if

684

00:36:41.600 --> 00:36:44.700

The sector of state were to Grant development consent,

685

00:36:44.700 --> 00:36:48.800

but exclude 60% of

686

00:36:48.800 --> 00:36:50.200
the power generation.

687

00:36:51.100 --> 00:36:55.400
Because of course the the costs

688

00:36:55.400 --> 00:36:58.400
of the cable route and so on would remain the

689

00:36:58.400 --> 00:36:58.400
same.

690

00:37:00.200 --> 00:37:04.500
And also there'd be a grid connection at Burwell 500 megawatts,

691

00:37:04.500 --> 00:37:08.100
which would be lying idle at

692

00:37:07.100 --> 00:37:11.900
least a 60% of it. And that's

693

00:37:10.900 --> 00:37:14.000
of course would fundamentally undermine

694

00:37:13.300 --> 00:37:16.400
what National Grid is trying to do which

695

00:37:16.400 --> 00:37:21.000
is to maximize the amount of Deployable Renewables onto

696

00:37:19.100 --> 00:37:23.000
the grid inappropriate locations.

697

00:37:22.000 --> 00:37:24.500
So

698

00:37:25.600 --> 00:37:28.200
the whole sense of the scheme, I think at that scale

699

00:37:28.200 --> 00:37:29.700
would be have to be Revisited.

700

00:37:32.200 --> 00:37:33.900
and in Practical terms

701

00:37:35.500 --> 00:37:38.600
If you were to make such a recommendation, obviously, they'd

702

00:37:38.600 --> 00:37:42.000
need to be a substantial redrawing of plans because for

703

00:37:41.300 --> 00:37:45.800
example, the master plan

704

00:37:45.800 --> 00:37:48.700
environmental master plan would have to be Revisited to identify

705

00:37:48.700 --> 00:37:51.100
which bits of mitigation would remain in which bits would

706

00:37:51.100 --> 00:37:54.800
be removed. The ecological mitigation

707

00:37:54.800 --> 00:37:57.400
areas are a good example. So there'd be

708

00:37:57.400 --> 00:38:00.200
a loss of of those for example, he gave

709

00:38:00.200 --> 00:38:03.600
fire ek3 which is the stone curly mitigation

710

00:38:03.600 --> 00:38:06.400
area that would that wouldn't be provided and

711

00:38:09.500 --> 00:38:12.700
There would no doubt the other changes for example planting because

712

00:38:12.700 --> 00:38:15.400

you wouldn't want to consent a scheme which provided

713

00:38:15.400 --> 00:38:19.000

for the provision of mitigation planting for a

714

00:38:18.100 --> 00:38:21.400

solar farm that wasn't there and that's

715

00:38:21.400 --> 00:38:23.800

what would be would be involved. So

716

00:38:25.600 --> 00:38:28.700

fundamental scheme viability it would depend on what was

717

00:38:28.700 --> 00:38:31.500

left but it doesn't seem

718

00:38:31.500 --> 00:38:34.400

likely that the proposition that's before the

719

00:38:34.400 --> 00:38:36.000

examining Authority would would come forward.

720

00:38:38.300 --> 00:38:38.700

Thank you.

721

00:38:40.200 --> 00:38:42.300

can clarify for me in relation to the

722

00:38:43.200 --> 00:38:44.600

consider the substation you

723

00:38:45.400 --> 00:38:48.500

mentioned strength beyond my area of commercial expertise here,

724

00:38:48.500 --> 00:38:48.700

but

725

00:38:50.400 --> 00:38:53.100

Can that connection only be used in relation to

726

00:38:53.100 --> 00:38:53.800

this scheme?

727

00:38:54.400 --> 00:38:57.300

Or would it could it potentially be used for

728

00:38:57.300 --> 00:39:00.700

other schemes that may take place?

729

00:39:00.700 --> 00:39:03.900

So the it's it's

730

00:39:03.900 --> 00:39:06.200

beyond me as well

731

00:39:06.200 --> 00:39:09.700

to some extent but my understanding is this that the grid

732

00:39:09.700 --> 00:39:12.400

connection offer is made at 500 megawatts.

733

00:39:12.400 --> 00:39:15.200

So that is what Sonicare can connect

734

00:39:15.200 --> 00:39:19.500

at. There is a process at

735

00:39:19.500 --> 00:39:22.300

National Grid. I think are increasingly going through which is to seek to

736

00:39:22.300 --> 00:39:26.200

revisit installed capacities to ensure

737

00:39:25.200 --> 00:39:28.900

that where they have agreed to

738

00:39:28.900 --> 00:39:32.100

take 500 megawatts. There is not Headroom because

739

00:39:32.100 --> 00:39:35.400

the lower capacities of in fact being installed and that that

740

00:39:35.400 --> 00:39:38.500

can release capacity. So there would be I think

741

00:39:38.500 --> 00:39:41.800

it's fair to say over the course of years. There

742

00:39:41.800 --> 00:39:44.400

would be the scope to revisit whether other schemes could

743

00:39:44.400 --> 00:39:47.700

connect at Burwell if the installed capacity

744

00:39:47.700 --> 00:39:50.800

of Seneca was a lot less than the 500 megawatts

745

00:39:50.800 --> 00:39:53.700

had been agreed but at

746

00:39:53.700 --> 00:39:54.000

the moment

747

00:39:54.700 --> 00:39:58.100

That is the proposal which makes use of unavailable connection

748

00:39:57.100 --> 00:40:00.300

and we say makes best use

749

00:40:00.300 --> 00:40:03.900

of that available connection through the combination of the solar

750

00:40:03.900 --> 00:40:06.700

and the best and it would

751

00:40:06.700 --> 00:40:09.300

be necessary for another scheme which presumably in

752

00:40:09.300 --> 00:40:12.300

this vicinity would be another solar scheme. And

753

00:40:12.300 --> 00:40:15.200

I think that's the point that just the legs authorities need to bear in

754

00:40:15.200 --> 00:40:18.800

mind that the creating Headroom at

755

00:40:18.800 --> 00:40:21.600

Burwell is he's very likely

756

00:40:21.600 --> 00:40:24.700

to result in more best and more solar proposals

757

00:40:24.700 --> 00:40:27.700

coming forward to take advantage of any good connections there.
This

758

00:40:27.700 --> 00:40:31.400

is not an area which is likely to lie fallow in

759

00:40:30.400 --> 00:40:33.300

terms of renewable energy generation given the

760

00:40:33.300 --> 00:40:36.500

crisis that we're in the scale of the need that's been

761

00:40:36.500 --> 00:40:37.100

identified.

762

00:40:39.900 --> 00:40:41.600

Thank you.

763

00:40:42.800 --> 00:40:45.500

Yes, I'll come to the local authorities

764

00:40:45.500 --> 00:40:48.200

again in a minute, but I would like to ask say no to

765

00:40:48.200 --> 00:40:48.700

Sonica if

766

00:40:49.500 --> 00:40:51.700

Mr. Steele, would you like to comment at this stage?

767

00:40:52.700 --> 00:40:55.400

Madam very briefly. I'm just wondering I'm very

768

00:40:55.400 --> 00:40:58.900

convincingly the way in which my learning friend has put over those points concerning

769

00:40:58.900 --> 00:41:02.100

viability. We take a point

770

00:41:01.100 --> 00:41:04.500

on viability, which is this that

771

00:41:04.500 --> 00:41:07.500

is that something which is on

772

00:41:07.500 --> 00:41:10.600

instructions concerning assumptions, or is it something which has

773

00:41:10.600 --> 00:41:13.800

been based upon calculations if it's

774

00:41:13.800 --> 00:41:16.900

based upon calculations, we'd like to see those please because

775

00:41:16.900 --> 00:41:19.500

we want to check that and how that

776

00:41:19.500 --> 00:41:23.400

has been worked out because I can see that what it is is piling

777

00:41:22.400 --> 00:41:25.500

one assumption upon another assumption and

778

00:41:25.500 --> 00:41:28.800

change at this stage of the process. We say

779

00:41:28.800 --> 00:41:29.600

this madam

780

00:41:30.200 --> 00:41:33.000

that these matters if they are

781

00:41:33.700 --> 00:41:36.500

dealt with at this stage of the process are a fault

782

00:41:36.500 --> 00:41:37.300

either of the process.

783

00:41:38.600 --> 00:41:41.700

Which I don't say. It is necessarily at all or it's

784

00:41:41.700 --> 00:41:44.400

in a fault of going too far the outset.

785

00:41:45.400 --> 00:41:46.300

by the applicant

786

00:41:47.300 --> 00:41:48.300

it cannot be right.

787

00:41:49.500 --> 00:41:52.400

As it were and I say the words to voice on

788

00:41:52.400 --> 00:41:55.500

local people because this is an impact upon local people. They're just

789

00:41:55.500 --> 00:41:58.600

going to give you reference in a moment about the usage of bed and late Benham

790

00:41:58.600 --> 00:41:58.700

Lane.

791

00:41:59.900 --> 00:42:02.400

A mitigation which they seem to

792

00:42:02.400 --> 00:42:05.000

be important and then it said, oh, well, you can

793

00:42:05.300 --> 00:42:08.500

assume the whole thing is going to change including all our plans are going to change and we're

794

00:42:08.500 --> 00:42:09.300

gonna have to rearrange things.

795

00:42:10.200 --> 00:42:13.100

That and we say that is either a photo of

796

00:42:13.100 --> 00:42:16.500

the system which we don't say it is question

797

00:42:16.500 --> 00:42:19.500

of having to anticipate these points early on

798

00:42:19.500 --> 00:42:20.500

there's a whole point.

799

00:42:21.300 --> 00:42:24.400

Of this particular process the reference is this

800

00:42:24.400 --> 00:42:27.300

Madam in terms of the usage of that. It's in the

801

00:42:27.300 --> 00:42:30.100

frickenham parish council representations of

802

00:42:30.100 --> 00:42:34.300

rep 2 iPhone 1 3 9 at page

803

00:42:33.300 --> 00:42:34.300

10

804

00:42:35.300 --> 00:42:35.600

Thank you.

805

00:42:37.900 --> 00:42:40.200
Mr. Kennedy just

806
00:42:44.400 --> 00:42:48.500
can I just add to that it provides

807
00:42:47.500 --> 00:42:50.500
you just take that on board my additional

808
00:42:50.500 --> 00:42:54.000
question on board within that as well if you can which

809
00:42:53.100 --> 00:42:56.000
is your

810
00:42:56.800 --> 00:42:58.800
bearing in mind your response to

811
00:42:59.800 --> 00:43:03.900
Written question. 2.0.11

812
00:43:06.700 --> 00:43:08.000
the question was

813
00:43:09.800 --> 00:43:12.000
in order well that we said in order for

814
00:43:12.200 --> 00:43:15.800
this game to become acceptable in landscape terms

815
00:43:15.800 --> 00:43:18.800
the county council's consider it necessary to remove further
parcels.

816
00:43:18.800 --> 00:43:21.400
And those are itemized and the

817
00:43:21.400 --> 00:43:24.100
question was how would how if at all would remove full of

818
00:43:24.100 --> 00:43:27.200

all or part of the specified Parcels present a significant

819

00:43:27.200 --> 00:43:30.500

operational constraint on the proposed development?

820

00:43:30.500 --> 00:43:33.900

If so, please provide a robust justification for

821

00:43:33.900 --> 00:43:35.000

their retention.

822

00:43:36.400 --> 00:43:39.000

And I just been listening to what you've been

823

00:43:39.300 --> 00:43:42.300

saying in response to to that issue and I'm just trying to

824

00:43:42.300 --> 00:43:45.300

to work out. Are you saying something more?

825

00:43:46.100 --> 00:43:50.400

That is in your response to that question or

826

00:43:49.400 --> 00:43:53.200

might there be more to come

827

00:43:52.200 --> 00:43:56.100

on that issue of viability.

828

00:43:59.700 --> 00:44:02.700

Rich attorney for the applicant what we've

829

00:44:02.700 --> 00:44:04.800

provided in response to that question.

830

00:44:05.900 --> 00:44:07.200

as I recall it so is

831

00:44:08.400 --> 00:44:10.700

both a schedule of the

832

00:44:12.400 --> 00:44:15.500

expected install capacity for each of the parcels

833

00:44:16.400 --> 00:44:19.100

and a justification as to why we

834

00:44:19.100 --> 00:44:22.400

say that the effects are acceptable. So obviously it's

835

00:44:22.400 --> 00:44:26.600

the two two sides of the coin benefit versus harm.

836

00:44:25.600 --> 00:44:30.100

And so that's

837

00:44:30.100 --> 00:44:33.700

our answer. We say that the renewable energy benefits of each

838

00:44:33.700 --> 00:44:37.000

of these Parcels is sufficiently waited outweigh the

839

00:44:36.300 --> 00:44:39.700

harm both locally in

840

00:44:39.700 --> 00:44:42.500

each parcel, but also globally in

841

00:44:42.500 --> 00:44:44.500

terms of the scheme as a whole

842

00:44:47.700 --> 00:44:51.000

Am I making an additional point in referring answering

843

00:44:50.400 --> 00:44:54.500

Mrs. Taylor's question? Yes in

844

00:44:54.500 --> 00:44:55.300

this sense that

845

00:44:56.200 --> 00:44:58.100

the question that Mrs. Taylor posed was

846

00:44:59.500 --> 00:45:00.100

Would it?

847

00:45:01.200 --> 00:45:05.000

Would there be a viable scheme and the answer is perhaps

848

00:45:04.000 --> 00:45:05.400

not.

849

00:45:06.600 --> 00:45:09.300

And the reason and obviously the

850

00:45:09.300 --> 00:45:11.900

detail that would depend on precisely what it is was done.

851

00:45:12.700 --> 00:45:15.000

And I think

852

00:45:15.200 --> 00:45:18.300

that perhaps answers to some extent Mr. Steals question.

853

00:45:20.600 --> 00:45:23.400

If we were to delete these sections of

854

00:45:23.400 --> 00:45:26.500

the scheme still says well, you wouldn't need to delete the mitigation.

855

00:45:26.500 --> 00:45:30.000

But let's just test that if W A3

856

00:45:29.300 --> 00:45:31.200

to 12 were deleted.

857

00:45:31.900 --> 00:45:35.100

Why would we why would we plant Hedges

858

00:45:34.100 --> 00:45:38.500

across the land surrounding

859

00:45:37.500 --> 00:45:40.100
the Avenue of

860

00:45:40.100 --> 00:45:43.600
trees? Why would we enhance that

861

00:45:43.600 --> 00:45:46.400
Avenue of trees? The answer is we obviously wouldn't the scheme
would

862

00:45:46.400 --> 00:45:48.400
be nowhere near them. It would be it would be.

863

00:45:49.800 --> 00:45:52.700
I think literally miles away from from it aside from

864

00:45:52.700 --> 00:45:53.300
the cable route.

865

00:45:54.200 --> 00:45:57.600
So if those Parcels weren't developed those areas

866

00:45:57.600 --> 00:45:58.500
of mitigation would go.

867

00:45:59.100 --> 00:46:02.300
If E12 and e13 weren't developed then this need

868

00:46:02.300 --> 00:46:05.300
for the stone curly mitigation would substantially alter because
those were

869

00:46:05.300 --> 00:46:09.200
the parcels that were identified as having a potential Stone curly

870

00:46:08.200 --> 00:46:11.600
interest. So we wouldn't be providing huge

871

00:46:11.600 --> 00:46:12.800
Stone curly plots.

872

00:46:13.500 --> 00:46:14.900
in those circumstances

873

00:46:16.200 --> 00:46:17.600
So when you remove the parcels.

874

00:46:18.500 --> 00:46:21.800
If you go down that route, you have to redesign the scheme work

875

00:46:21.800 --> 00:46:24.200
out which mitigation areas you need and then fundamentally you

876

00:46:24.200 --> 00:46:27.600
need to work out what your land requirement is. That's the starting
point how

877

00:46:27.600 --> 00:46:32.500
many leases need to be renegotiated to

878

00:46:30.500 --> 00:46:33.800
agree appropriate

879

00:46:33.800 --> 00:46:36.500
terms for taking on what remains of the

880

00:46:36.500 --> 00:46:39.700
scheme and then you need to say. Well I've taken this length of

881

00:46:39.700 --> 00:46:43.600
400 kiloback kilovolt

882

00:46:42.600 --> 00:46:45.700
cable between the scheme

883

00:46:45.700 --> 00:46:47.400
and joining the various Parcels together.

884

00:46:49.500 --> 00:46:52.900
Would I nonetheless proceed

885

00:46:52.900 --> 00:46:53.400

with what I've got?

886

00:46:54.700 --> 00:46:57.400

Would there be Shades of Gray between

887

00:46:57.400 --> 00:47:00.200

that so Seneca West Side B is a

888

00:47:00.200 --> 00:47:03.200

really good example of this we recognize that because of

889

00:47:03.200 --> 00:47:07.300

the engineering serious difficulties

890

00:47:06.300 --> 00:47:10.300

in engineering around the below

891

00:47:09.300 --> 00:47:13.000

ground archeology that we

892

00:47:12.100 --> 00:47:15.600

would not be able to develop a substantial proportion

893

00:47:15.600 --> 00:47:18.800

of that site. But the result was that developing that

894

00:47:18.800 --> 00:47:21.200

side tool no longer becomes an

895

00:47:21.200 --> 00:47:25.000

attractive commercial opportunity because

896

00:47:24.100 --> 00:47:27.700

you would have an isolated small site of

897

00:47:27.700 --> 00:47:30.400

solar panels that wouldn't

898

00:47:30.400 --> 00:47:30.800

be worth.

899

00:47:31.800 --> 00:47:34.500

Acquiring the landfall wouldn't be worth taking that

900

00:47:34.500 --> 00:47:37.600

parcel of land just to deliver a relatively small

901

00:47:37.600 --> 00:47:39.000

Financial benefit.

902

00:47:40.200 --> 00:47:40.400

So

903

00:47:41.400 --> 00:47:45.000

you have to go back and think about the scheme altogether

904

00:47:44.700 --> 00:47:47.300

and the point that we make is

905

00:47:47.300 --> 00:47:47.500

that

906

00:47:48.400 --> 00:47:51.300

In doing that you may come to the conclusion that actually

907

00:47:51.300 --> 00:47:54.500

if we can't develop 60% of

908

00:47:54.500 --> 00:47:57.400

the scheme, then we might not develop at

909

00:47:57.400 --> 00:48:01.000

all. There might not be someone who wishes to take forward a

910

00:48:00.400 --> 00:48:04.500

soda Farm in this Arrangement at 40%

911

00:48:03.500 --> 00:48:06.500

of what was intended. Okay. So

912

00:48:06.500 --> 00:48:09.000

that's the overall point.

913

00:48:09.800 --> 00:48:11.100

Yeah, that's not.

914

00:48:12.700 --> 00:48:14.400

Yeah, so I'm just reminded that.

915

00:48:17.500 --> 00:48:19.500

the we have raised

916

00:48:20.400 --> 00:48:23.500

that the question that the pointed

917

00:48:23.500 --> 00:48:26.300

in our written summary at that we submitted to

918

00:48:26.300 --> 00:48:29.900

deadline for we did we did address the point about scheme viability.

919

00:48:30.900 --> 00:48:33.800

Okay, thank you. Thanks Tony. Right?

920

00:48:33.800 --> 00:48:36.500

I have one quick logistical question of

921

00:48:36.500 --> 00:48:41.800

you. And then I want to go to Mr. Bedford and then I'll go back to you right

922

00:48:39.800 --> 00:48:43.000

and Mr.

923

00:48:42.000 --> 00:48:43.500

Hashi.

924

00:48:46.900 --> 00:48:47.800

Mr.

925

00:48:50.100 --> 00:48:50.600

Goes

926

00:48:51.700 --> 00:48:54.100

hey, I I've seen Mr. Keen number of

927

00:48:54.100 --> 00:48:57.300

times. He's used to calling me my first name, so that's okay. It's alright.

928

00:48:59.700 --> 00:49:03.800

Thank you very much, Mr. Turney.

929

00:49:02.800 --> 00:49:05.300

Just the figures that you gave

930

00:49:05.300 --> 00:49:06.000

earlier, I think.

931

00:49:07.500 --> 00:49:10.000

I've got the table that you

932

00:49:10.500 --> 00:49:13.500

that you provided in in the written submissions the

933

00:49:13.500 --> 00:49:16.200

written responses that as I understand it is in relation to

934

00:49:16.200 --> 00:49:19.600

the the totality of the of what's

935

00:49:19.600 --> 00:49:22.400

desire to be removed by the local

936

00:49:22.400 --> 00:49:25.400

authorities in terms of what we are.

937

00:49:26.700 --> 00:49:29.300

Calling the halfway house. I think you gave one

938

00:49:29.300 --> 00:49:33.200
two, or three figures for for various Parcels

939
00:49:32.200 --> 00:49:34.200
of that. Yes.

940
00:49:35.100 --> 00:49:38.300
Are they set out anywhere else? No, they're not

941
00:49:38.300 --> 00:49:42.600
because I asked for those to be checked last night. So

942
00:49:43.400 --> 00:49:46.000
we can we'll put in our written summary, but those were for the

943
00:49:47.400 --> 00:49:50.600
SEC submission deadline

944
00:49:51.800 --> 00:49:55.500
Some deadline it answered examining

945
00:49:54.500 --> 00:49:58.100
Authority questions. Number two, they provided

946
00:49:57.100 --> 00:50:01.300
plans which were shaded green.

947
00:50:01.300 --> 00:50:04.500
It was

948
00:50:04.500 --> 00:50:09.000
on an overlay a satellite overlay. I think we took

949
00:50:08.100 --> 00:50:11.700
that shading and have estimated how many

950
00:50:11.700 --> 00:50:15.100
panels are lost from that and the green

951
00:50:14.100 --> 00:50:19.200
shading in E12 loses 25.73

952

00:50:17.200 --> 00:50:19.800
megawatts.

953

00:50:20.500 --> 00:50:24.100
Meaning the E12 is 15.8 megawatts

954

00:50:23.100 --> 00:50:26.700
instead of 41.5 megawatts and

955

00:50:26.700 --> 00:50:30.400
the green shading and e13 loses 2.85

956

00:50:29.400 --> 00:50:32.200
megawatts. Meaning that it is

957

00:50:32.200 --> 00:50:35.700
e13 parcel is 11.9 megawatts

958

00:50:35.700 --> 00:50:39.100
rather than being 14.7 megawatts. So I

959

00:50:38.100 --> 00:50:41.400
just I know I'll put those in my wrist and that's helpful.

960

00:50:41.400 --> 00:50:44.200
And what I'm interested in is the totality of the

961

00:50:44.200 --> 00:50:47.700
figures in relation to it. Well in relation to the totality of

962

00:50:47.700 --> 00:50:50.100
the halfway house if you see what I mean, yes,

963

00:50:50.100 --> 00:50:50.800
so I think the other

964

00:50:51.800 --> 00:50:54.000
the other elements of the halfway house was

965

00:50:54.900 --> 00:50:58.000

I don't think we've looked at in terms of providing a

966

00:50:57.300 --> 00:51:00.700

precise figure. This is about leaving more land in

967

00:51:00.700 --> 00:51:03.400

eo5. I can't recall whether

968

00:51:03.400 --> 00:51:07.100

that's is actually on a plan as well. Okay, well,

969

00:51:06.100 --> 00:51:09.400

I will if I could include those and ask

970

00:51:09.400 --> 00:51:12.200

the person who gave me an answer last night to give an answer for that. Thank you

971

00:51:12.200 --> 00:51:17.400

very much. And then Mr. Bedford Mrs. Taylor

972

00:51:17.400 --> 00:51:22.400

prefers to remarks or when she

973

00:51:21.400 --> 00:51:23.300

was speaking.

974

00:51:24.900 --> 00:51:27.600

She used the phrase if if the dco were

975

00:51:27.600 --> 00:51:28.300

to be framed.

976

00:51:30.400 --> 00:51:31.400

so as to accommodate

977

00:51:32.300 --> 00:51:34.700

the local authorities position

978

00:51:36.500 --> 00:51:39.800

either I suppose in the eventuality of

979

00:51:39.800 --> 00:51:42.300

social removal of

980

00:51:42.300 --> 00:51:47.700

those desired Parcels or some part

981

00:51:47.700 --> 00:51:48.400

of them.

982

00:51:50.500 --> 00:51:53.500

That seems very pertinent question. Doesn't it? How how

983

00:51:53.500 --> 00:51:56.400

would the GC0 be framed to

984

00:51:56.400 --> 00:52:00.100

accommodate that that particular issue what

985

00:51:59.100 --> 00:52:02.700

thank you. You're right.

986

00:52:02.700 --> 00:52:05.200

It's an issue that you will need to

987

00:52:05.200 --> 00:52:08.500

consider. We don't actually see it as

988

00:52:08.500 --> 00:52:11.800

a significant issue.

989

00:52:12.700 --> 00:52:15.300

and what we were

990

00:52:15.300 --> 00:52:19.200

in visiting doing as part

991

00:52:18.200 --> 00:52:19.500

of our

992

00:52:20.800 --> 00:52:23.800
deadline seven post hearing

993

00:52:23.800 --> 00:52:25.800
submissions, but which

994

00:52:27.700 --> 00:52:28.600
we will certainly do.

995

00:52:29.400 --> 00:52:33.000
Now you've raised the point is we were envisaging that

996

00:52:32.200 --> 00:52:35.400
we would be putting forward to you

997

00:52:35.400 --> 00:52:38.900
wording of I think

998

00:52:38.900 --> 00:52:41.500
it particularly affects schedule one and the

999

00:52:41.500 --> 00:52:44.700
description of the development what the

1000

00:52:44.700 --> 00:52:46.100
implications would be.

1001

00:52:49.400 --> 00:52:52.300
If we focus for example.

1002

00:52:53.200 --> 00:52:55.400
on E12 and E30

1003

00:52:56.800 --> 00:52:59.500
and clearly at the moment. I'm only giving you

1004

00:52:59.500 --> 00:53:03.300
an illustration and we will provide you with specific drafting

1005

00:53:02.300 --> 00:53:05.500

when we come to it if you take for

1006

00:53:05.500 --> 00:53:06.600

example work one.

1007

00:53:09.600 --> 00:53:12.900

We envisage that you would simply include in

1008

00:53:12.900 --> 00:53:15.100

the description of word work one.

1009

00:53:17.600 --> 00:53:20.400

reference to land Parcels which obviously

1010

00:53:20.400 --> 00:53:23.300

are shown on the land plans and what

1011

00:53:23.300 --> 00:53:24.200

one would say

1012

00:53:25.400 --> 00:53:29.200

Is work one is effectively as described save

1013

00:53:28.200 --> 00:53:29.500

that.

1014

00:53:31.100 --> 00:53:35.200

No, such Works shall be undertaken within

1015

00:53:34.200 --> 00:53:37.000

parcel and then it will

1016

00:53:37.100 --> 00:53:40.300

be whichever parcel one is dealing with.

1017

00:53:41.400 --> 00:53:41.600

because

1018

00:53:42.700 --> 00:53:45.100

we take the point that obviously there

1019
00:53:45.100 --> 00:53:47.400
are cable runs. There are certain Works, which

1020
00:53:48.600 --> 00:53:49.100
as it were

1021
00:53:50.300 --> 00:53:52.500
the scheme would need to carry out.

1022
00:53:53.500 --> 00:53:57.000
If it were to be able to deliver a solar

1023
00:53:56.000 --> 00:53:57.200
farm.

1024
00:53:58.400 --> 00:54:02.300
But so far as the above ground location of

1025
00:54:01.300 --> 00:54:04.900
particular solar panels.

1026
00:54:06.500 --> 00:54:10.500
Those can be removed from the

1027
00:54:09.500 --> 00:54:11.300
works.

1028
00:54:12.400 --> 00:54:15.900
Without that impacting on the

1029
00:54:15.900 --> 00:54:18.100
functionality of the total. I'll come

1030
00:54:18.100 --> 00:54:21.600
back to the percentage point about the energy loss. There's a

1031
00:54:21.600 --> 00:54:21.900
separate point.

1032
00:54:23.500 --> 00:54:26.600

But so I say what we would envisage is that

1033

00:54:26.600 --> 00:54:29.500

in schedule one when one takes a particular work

1034

00:54:29.500 --> 00:54:32.800

one would then identify that that

1035

00:54:32.800 --> 00:54:34.800

work can be undertaken save that?

1036

00:54:36.500 --> 00:54:39.300

Those work shall not take place within an identified

1037

00:54:39.300 --> 00:54:42.300

parcel of land. So we don't we don't see a

1038

00:54:42.300 --> 00:54:46.100

problem with that. Obviously, you'll need to look at the drafting once

1039

00:54:45.100 --> 00:54:48.700

we have formulated it. All

1040

00:54:48.700 --> 00:54:51.200

right, but can I can I just make some

1041

00:54:51.200 --> 00:54:55.900

slightly wider points in relation to the same topic because we

1042

00:54:54.900 --> 00:54:58.000

obviously heard what Mr. Turney

1043

00:54:57.900 --> 00:55:01.700

has been saying what we

1044

00:55:01.700 --> 00:55:05.600

have given you already in our

1045

00:55:07.500 --> 00:55:11.000

comments in rep 6 0

1046

00:55:10.400 --> 00:55:15.400

7 6 that's when we commented on the

1047

00:55:13.400 --> 00:55:16.600

applicant's response

1048

00:55:16.600 --> 00:55:18.400

to the executive's.

1049

00:55:19.500 --> 00:55:22.400

Part of the applicant's response had been to set

1050

00:55:22.400 --> 00:55:25.900

out the figures of energy installed capacity

1051

00:55:25.900 --> 00:55:28.300

of the individual Parcels field by

1052

00:55:28.300 --> 00:55:28.600

field.

1053

00:55:30.100 --> 00:55:33.400

And so using the applicant's figures rather than

1054

00:55:33.400 --> 00:55:37.300

attempting at anything of our own we identified

1055

00:55:36.300 --> 00:55:39.100

to you what the implications would be.

1056

00:55:40.200 --> 00:55:43.600

of the losses on the three Parcels that

1057

00:55:43.600 --> 00:55:45.500

Suffolk County Council has referred to

1058

00:55:46.600 --> 00:55:49.500

And this is if those Parcels were removed

1059

00:55:49.500 --> 00:55:50.200
all together.

1060
00:55:51.900 --> 00:55:55.700
And that produces a reduction

1061
00:55:54.700 --> 00:55:58.000
in capacity such that

1062
00:55:57.200 --> 00:56:00.400
of the installed capacity

1063
00:56:00.400 --> 00:56:04.600
of 630 megawatts 84% would

1064
00:56:04.600 --> 00:56:07.500
remain if all three Parcels were

1065
00:56:07.500 --> 00:56:09.300
removed in their entirety.

1066
00:56:11.100 --> 00:56:13.600
So far as the individual Parcels are concerned.

1067
00:56:14.500 --> 00:56:17.400
E30 would equate

1068
00:56:17.400 --> 00:56:21.200
to a loss of only we think about 2.3% of

1069
00:56:20.200 --> 00:56:22.400
installed capacity.

1070
00:56:23.300 --> 00:56:26.600
E12 or eo5

1071
00:56:27.700 --> 00:56:29.100
Which are of similar size?

1072
00:56:30.200 --> 00:56:33.400
Would be a loss of it's approximately 7% in

1073

00:56:33.400 --> 00:56:34.000
each case.

1074

00:56:35.200 --> 00:56:38.400
So as if you have the two seven percents and the 2.3% you get

1075

00:56:38.400 --> 00:56:42.600
to the the difference between that and the 84% what

1076

00:56:41.600 --> 00:56:43.600
we haven't done.

1077

00:56:44.400 --> 00:56:47.300
And I appreciate what Mr. Tony

1078

00:56:47.300 --> 00:56:50.300
has given us some new figures this morning.

1079

00:56:51.200 --> 00:56:55.100
Is what the impact would be on the installed capacity?

1080

00:56:56.200 --> 00:56:58.200
of the halfway house scenarios

1081

00:56:59.400 --> 00:57:01.200
but necessarily by definition

1082

00:57:02.400 --> 00:57:05.600
because the halfway house leaves more panels in situ.

1083

00:57:06.600 --> 00:57:08.100
The percentages will be smaller.

1084

00:57:09.700 --> 00:57:12.900
In terms of what is lost in all of those cases of

1085

00:57:12.900 --> 00:57:15.200
sorry, we can do that at exercise when we've

1086

00:57:15.200 --> 00:57:18.200
got the arithmetic that's you know, that is

1087
00:57:18.200 --> 00:57:23.100
an issue. So thank you for that connection, Mr.

1088
00:57:22.100 --> 00:57:25.100
Tony. Some stage will want to

1089
00:57:25.100 --> 00:57:26.800
know I think we must be better to move on.

1090
00:57:27.500 --> 00:57:32.300
The Mr. Habit

1091
00:57:30.300 --> 00:57:33.100
it was

1092
00:57:33.100 --> 00:57:35.400
this a point in relation to what I've been.

1093
00:57:36.800 --> 00:57:39.600
Going on about yes, it's a point about the question that

1094
00:57:39.600 --> 00:57:42.200
was asked by Mrs. Taylor in relation to removal of

1095
00:57:42.200 --> 00:57:43.500
the parcels and viability.

1096
00:57:44.300 --> 00:57:47.500
And what you what I'm going to hand back to Mrs. Taylor? Yeah case

1097
00:57:47.500 --> 00:57:50.000
and yes, yep. Thank you.

1098
00:57:50.200 --> 00:57:56.300
If I may just respond to what what you've heard on this mom. The

1099
00:57:53.300 --> 00:57:56.600
first

1100

00:57:56.600 --> 00:57:59.200

thing is that your question said in in the event where

1101

00:57:59.200 --> 00:58:00.000

where

1102

00:58:01.900 --> 00:58:05.200

The conclusion was reached that these Parcels

1103

00:58:04.200 --> 00:58:07.600

were to be excluded. What would be the work in

1104

00:58:07.600 --> 00:58:10.300

terms of the result of the viability and I'm afraid with respect to Mr.

1105

00:58:10.300 --> 00:58:14.200

Turney. I don't think he's answered that question. And what

1106

00:58:13.200 --> 00:58:16.200

you've been told is that there's a

1107

00:58:16.200 --> 00:58:19.800

loss of 328 megawatts of renewable energy less

1108

00:58:19.800 --> 00:58:23.800

of it would come forward. It would be a fundamental revisiting 60%

1109

00:58:22.800 --> 00:58:25.200

of the power generation will be

1110

00:58:25.200 --> 00:58:28.700

lost. Now all of that relates to questions

1111

00:58:28.700 --> 00:58:31.500

of capacity and what

1112

00:58:31.500 --> 00:58:34.200

you're then asked to do is take a leap from

1113

00:58:34.200 --> 00:58:37.500

there get in the mind of Sonica and say

1114

00:58:37.500 --> 00:58:40.000

well if they're going to lose that much they probably don't want to

1115

00:58:40.200 --> 00:58:43.300

do it that's not in the evidence before you

1116

00:58:44.500 --> 00:58:45.000

second

1117

00:58:46.200 --> 00:58:49.200

Whenever Mr. Turney was he was was trying to

1118

00:58:49.200 --> 00:58:52.700

refer in terms of this viability question. His phrases

1119

00:58:52.700 --> 00:58:55.600

were we would need to consider it? We might

1120

00:58:55.600 --> 00:58:58.400

not be able to deliver it. It doesn't seem likely it

1121

00:58:58.400 --> 00:58:59.800

will come forward again.

1122

00:59:00.700 --> 00:59:03.600

There is no evidence Beyond you being

1123

00:59:03.600 --> 00:59:05.200

asked to take a leap.

1124

00:59:05.700 --> 00:59:09.500

From the position that these Parcels will be lost capacity

1125

00:59:08.500 --> 00:59:11.800

would be gone and therefore why would

1126

00:59:11.800 --> 00:59:14.700

they do it? That's not what you're here to examine as

1127

00:59:14.700 --> 00:59:15.400

an authority.

1128

00:59:16.400 --> 00:59:19.400

And then you're obviously given the next hurdle which is well, there's

1129

00:59:19.400 --> 00:59:22.700

all these practical issues in relation to various

1130

00:59:22.700 --> 00:59:25.700

matters in particular. We wouldn't

1131

00:59:25.700 --> 00:59:28.500

provide this mitigation. We wouldn't do this piece

1132

00:59:28.500 --> 00:59:31.000

of planting and so on and that I'm afraid is a

1133

00:59:31.400 --> 00:59:35.100

yet another mistake on my Leonard friend of conflating

1134

00:59:34.100 --> 00:59:37.800

the issue of mitigation versus enhancement.

1135

00:59:37.800 --> 00:59:41.300

If you are not causing damage or

1136

00:59:40.300 --> 00:59:43.200

causing harm to this landscape or

1137

00:59:43.200 --> 00:59:46.700

area, the mitigation would not be required. And

1138

00:59:46.700 --> 00:59:50.200

if you're going to have to remove these Parcels, what

1139

00:59:49.200 --> 00:59:52.500

would be the need for you to be undertaking all

1140

00:59:52.500 --> 00:59:55.300

this mitigation? So in other words, how are you able to

1141

00:59:55.300 --> 00:59:58.600

argue consistently that the mitigation

1142

00:59:58.600 --> 01:00:01.200

will not be there because we will not need

1143

01:00:01.200 --> 01:00:03.100

to put forward all these parcels.

1144

01:00:03.900 --> 01:00:06.200

If in circumstances where you haven't

1145

01:00:06.200 --> 01:00:09.200

done the homework to figure out precisely what would be

1146

01:00:09.200 --> 01:00:12.600

left? What would you need to do in terms of that particular

1147

01:00:12.600 --> 01:00:15.800

reconfiguration of the scheme?

1148

01:00:15.800 --> 01:00:17.700

So again, it just doesn't follow

1149

01:00:18.700 --> 01:00:21.000

and then the last point was in relation to

1150

01:00:22.800 --> 01:00:25.200

a suggestion my understanding of what he

1151

01:00:25.200 --> 01:00:26.300

said, which is that well.

1152

01:00:27.100 --> 01:00:28.200

if we are able to

1153

01:00:29.600 --> 01:00:31.100
plug into Burwell

1154
01:00:32.400 --> 01:00:35.700
somehow they will be a level of upgrading by virtue

1155
01:00:35.700 --> 01:00:38.700
of what Seneca does that will then give an opportunity

1156
01:00:38.700 --> 01:00:41.600
to others to be able to plug into Burwell?

1157
01:00:41.600 --> 01:00:44.300
Well, I'm here on behalf of East Cambridge District Council

1158
01:00:44.300 --> 01:00:47.200
and they know quite a bit about Burwell and they

1159
01:00:47.200 --> 01:00:50.200
know quite a bit about plugging into it via the solar

1160
01:00:50.200 --> 01:00:53.900
Farms that they have put forward and I'm afraid

1161
01:00:53.900 --> 01:00:56.300
again. That's another example of my learner friend

1162
01:00:56.300 --> 01:00:59.500
just talking about an aspiration of what might likely happen

1163
01:00:59.500 --> 01:01:02.900
rather than any evidence. So in

1164
01:01:02.900 --> 01:01:04.500
in short mom

1165
01:01:05.400 --> 01:01:08.200
the answer to your question if this is all

1166
01:01:08.200 --> 01:01:11.400
being excluded what's the result of viability the answer to

1167

01:01:11.400 --> 01:01:14.800

that is we don't know because they haven't done the work and there's

1168

01:01:14.800 --> 01:01:17.500

no evidence before you to have some confidence

1169

01:01:17.500 --> 01:01:20.600

of what that looks like not incapacity terms.

1170

01:01:21.500 --> 01:01:24.300

But in actual viability terms of what that looks like

1171

01:01:24.300 --> 01:01:25.100

as a scheme.

1172

01:01:30.300 --> 01:01:31.400

misfort

1173

01:01:32.600 --> 01:01:35.400

Mr. Corrected used to want to comment still.

1174

01:01:37.400 --> 01:01:40.400

Beauty Barrack for West africanseI Madam my

1175

01:01:40.400 --> 01:01:43.100

government not exactly on this point. So I don't know

1176

01:01:43.100 --> 01:01:46.100

if you want to go back to the applicant instead or still want to

1177

01:01:46.100 --> 01:01:46.600

hear. Okay?

1178

01:01:49.300 --> 01:01:52.300

Yes, thank you Richard attorney

1179

01:01:52.300 --> 01:01:53.000

for the applicant.

1180

01:01:53.600 --> 01:01:56.300

So I'm gonna take it in this way first for Mr.

1181

01:01:56.300 --> 01:01:59.300

Bedford saying it's all very straightforward. And I think it's going

1182

01:01:59.300 --> 01:02:02.600

to pick up what with respect Mr. Mohammed just hasn't understood

1183

01:02:02.600 --> 01:02:05.400

what I've said. I'm sure it's my fault, but he hasn't understood what said.

1184

01:02:07.200 --> 01:02:10.600

So if we're to delete large proportions

1185

01:02:10.600 --> 01:02:13.400

of this scheme, we have to go back to the drawing board.

1186

01:02:13.400 --> 01:02:16.600

We have to think about whole series of different propositions.

1187

01:02:16.600 --> 01:02:19.800

For example, where what mitigation

1188

01:02:19.800 --> 01:02:22.400

is required where that mitigation would

1189

01:02:22.400 --> 01:02:22.500

be.

1190

01:02:23.400 --> 01:02:26.300

My example was a hedge in the

1191

01:02:26.300 --> 01:02:29.900

vicinity of shipping and parking Gardens would no longer be required. So

1192

01:02:29.900 --> 01:02:33.300

the land that would no longer be required eco3 no

1193

01:02:32.300 --> 01:02:35.200

longer required the land for that would no longer

1194

01:02:35.200 --> 01:02:35.700

be required.

1195

01:02:37.900 --> 01:02:40.400

Mr. Bedford's proposition is where you

1196

01:02:40.400 --> 01:02:43.600

just say, you can't build solar panels. No, that's not good enough because

1197

01:02:43.600 --> 01:02:46.500

you also have to exclude all of the mitigation. Otherwise

1198

01:02:46.500 --> 01:02:50.200

the order will require us to deliver mitigation

1199

01:02:49.200 --> 01:02:51.300

for panels that are not there.

1200

01:02:52.300 --> 01:02:56.400

So we'd be laying out Stone Curlew plots to mitigate

1201

01:02:55.400 --> 01:02:58.500

impacts on Stone Curlew that

1202

01:02:58.500 --> 01:03:01.500

did not occur. And obviously you couldn't sensibly do

1203

01:03:01.500 --> 01:03:04.500

that lawfully do that. But also and this

1204

01:03:04.500 --> 01:03:06.100

is the aspect that I think Mr. Bedford just

1205

01:03:06.700 --> 01:03:09.100

is not proposing to engage with but if he's going to

1206

01:03:09.100 --> 01:03:12.200

put in a submission on this he needs to land acquisition.

1207

01:03:15.100 --> 01:03:18.300

We can't have to identify which land passes should be excluded and in doing

1208

01:03:18.300 --> 01:03:21.800

so Mr. Bedford will no doubt identify how

1209

01:03:21.800 --> 01:03:24.500

the cable will cross Parcels E12 and

1210

01:03:24.500 --> 01:03:27.200

e13 and how that will be provided for in

1211

01:03:27.200 --> 01:03:27.600

the order.

1212

01:03:28.500 --> 01:03:31.700

Because we will need to include a cable route across those Parcels.

1213

01:03:31.700 --> 01:03:33.200

Even if there are no solar panels there.

1214

01:03:34.300 --> 01:03:37.500

Clearly we would not be able to justify and it would be could not

1215

01:03:37.500 --> 01:03:40.800

be justified in compulsory acquisition terms the outright

1216

01:03:40.800 --> 01:03:43.400

acquisition of E12 and e13 for

1217

01:03:43.400 --> 01:03:45.000

the purposes of running a cable across it.

1218

01:03:46.200 --> 01:03:49.300

So Mr. Bedford will have to suggest how the compulsory acquisition

1219

01:03:49.300 --> 01:03:52.300
schedules should be amended and in doing

1220
01:03:52.300 --> 01:03:55.300
so we'll all have to identify which plans will need to be mended
which

1221
01:03:55.300 --> 01:03:58.400
will include consideration of the cable route that is

1222
01:03:58.400 --> 01:04:02.100
required across those Parcels if they're not to be developed for
solar

1223
01:04:01.100 --> 01:04:05.300
we'll have to look at the substation locations. We'll

1224
01:04:04.300 --> 01:04:07.600
have to look at the connections between the solar farm

1225
01:04:07.600 --> 01:04:08.100
and the best.

1226
01:04:09.300 --> 01:04:13.100
Will have to look at the access points.

1227
01:04:13.700 --> 01:04:16.600
We'll have to because for example, I'm sure

1228
01:04:16.600 --> 01:04:19.500
the County Council would be very resistant to the idea that we were
authorized

1229
01:04:19.500 --> 01:04:22.200
to access a parcel of land which we didn't need to develop.

1230
01:04:23.400 --> 01:04:26.700
They'll be have to be a complete revisiting and

1231
01:04:26.700 --> 01:04:27.000
that.

1232

01:04:27.900 --> 01:04:31.100

Answers Mr. Mohamed's point. I we

1233

01:04:30.100 --> 01:04:33.200

don't know we don't know if somehow you can

1234

01:04:33.200 --> 01:04:35.500

put together a scheme that makes any sense.

1235

01:04:36.500 --> 01:04:38.000

by deleting these parcels

1236

01:04:38.800 --> 01:04:41.400

because you have to do that redesign work and

1237

01:04:41.400 --> 01:04:44.600

then you need to work out whether that scheme is one which is economically viable.

1238

01:04:45.800 --> 01:04:48.500

So you have to go through that process of delete

1239

01:04:48.500 --> 01:04:51.500

all these aspects agree with the authority that

1240

01:04:51.500 --> 01:04:55.100

for example, no stone curly mitigation is required. It's

1241

01:04:54.100 --> 01:04:57.300

just an easy example because you can see it on the plan. It's

1242

01:04:57.300 --> 01:05:00.500

a block of land. We won't be required agree with

1243

01:05:00.500 --> 01:05:03.200

them that they're content that that nonetheless Stone curly impacts with

1244

01:05:03.200 --> 01:05:03.700

mitigated.

1245

01:05:04.600 --> 01:05:07.500

And come back with your proposal for excluding that plot and

1246

01:05:07.500 --> 01:05:09.100

putting a cable in a particular location.

1247

01:05:10.500 --> 01:05:13.200

That's the process you have to go through and Mr. Mohammed with

1248

01:05:13.200 --> 01:05:15.400

respect is just he's got the wrong end of the stick we

1249

01:05:16.300 --> 01:05:19.400

It's us who are being asked to take a leap. Not

1250

01:05:19.400 --> 01:05:21.300

anyone else in the room. We're being asked to say.

1251

01:05:22.100 --> 01:05:25.800

In some hypothetical scheme redesign which excluded

1252

01:05:25.800 --> 01:05:28.500

Mr. Bedford's parcel X Mr. Mohamed's parcel

1253

01:05:28.500 --> 01:05:28.700

y

1254

01:05:29.600 --> 01:05:33.100

Would we nonetheless have a scheme that stacked up commercially and

1255

01:05:32.100 --> 01:05:33.500

the answer is?

1256

01:05:34.900 --> 01:05:35.700

quite possibly not

1257

01:05:38.300 --> 01:05:42.100

but until you have done that thorough going redesign

1258

01:05:41.100 --> 01:05:44.700

drawn the plots again considered whether

1259

01:05:44.700 --> 01:05:47.500

the exclusion of a particular plot means that you would never develop another

1260

01:05:47.500 --> 01:05:47.900

plot.

1261

01:05:48.700 --> 01:05:51.800

Revisit all those points considered whether you could put more solar

1262

01:05:51.800 --> 01:05:54.700

in different locations. For example, could you use areas

1263

01:05:54.700 --> 01:05:56.800

identified as mitigation for solar?

1264

01:05:57.400 --> 01:06:00.400

I don't know you would redesign your scheme. And that's the

1265

01:06:00.400 --> 01:06:03.400

scale of impact. We're looking at in terms of the parcels that

1266

01:06:03.400 --> 01:06:04.600

are being looked at. That's the scale.

1267

01:06:05.400 --> 01:06:08.300

The final point, I'd never sorry

1268

01:06:08.300 --> 01:06:11.700

one more point on Mr. Mohammad the point about Burwell. I'll

1269

01:06:11.700 --> 01:06:14.200

just be absolutely clear because again, I don't think it understood what I said.

1270

01:06:15.800 --> 01:06:18.800

We have a right to connect to Burwell at 500 megawatts.

1271

01:06:19.500 --> 01:06:22.800

That means that 500 megawatts of capacity

1272

01:06:22.800 --> 01:06:25.500

at Burwell is allocated to Seneca and not available

1273

01:06:25.500 --> 01:06:26.300

for another project.

1274

01:06:27.400 --> 01:06:31.000

In the event that we connected as a lower capacity that capacity

1275

01:06:30.300 --> 01:06:33.600

would be unused until such

1276

01:06:33.600 --> 01:06:36.200

time as National Grid took steps to

1277

01:06:36.200 --> 01:06:39.300

recover that capacity from us at which

1278

01:06:39.300 --> 01:06:42.000

point I said, that would no doubt go to

1279

01:06:42.300 --> 01:06:45.700

other schemes most likely Zola or best schemes

1280

01:06:45.700 --> 01:06:49.000

given the location. So that's the point 500

1281

01:06:48.400 --> 01:06:51.600

megawatt available capacity. It's allocated to

1282

01:06:51.600 --> 01:06:54.300

Seneca. It will remain allocated to Sonic until we connect

1283

01:06:54.300 --> 01:06:57.900

if we connect it to lower installed capacity. Then

1284

01:06:57.900 --> 01:07:00.300

there is a process for

1285

01:07:00.300 --> 01:07:04.200

recovering that Headroom from us and then

1286

01:07:03.200 --> 01:07:06.600

it could perhaps become available for other renewable

1287

01:07:06.600 --> 01:07:10.000

energy. In the meantime. It will be not used not maximized

1288

01:07:09.200 --> 01:07:12.600

not used for renewable energy. The grid capacity

1289

01:07:12.600 --> 01:07:13.600

will be sitting idle.

1290

01:07:14.500 --> 01:07:17.300

And afterwards it will no doubt be used for renewable energy.

1291

01:07:18.700 --> 01:07:21.000

That's the point about that. The final point is.

1292

01:07:22.100 --> 01:07:22.600

we

1293

01:07:23.600 --> 01:07:26.400

I don't want to get into an argument about how people present their cases,

1294

01:07:26.400 --> 01:07:26.800

but

1295

01:07:28.600 --> 01:07:31.000

The approach that Mr. Bedford takes and we saw

1296

01:07:31.300 --> 01:07:34.400

it in his written submissions to percentages is really not

1297

01:07:34.400 --> 01:07:37.500

the question that the national policy statement or

1298

01:07:37.500 --> 01:07:39.800
general government policies asking you to consider

1299
01:07:40.700 --> 01:07:43.200
We need to maximize renewable energy output.

1300
01:07:44.100 --> 01:07:47.200
You've got local authorities sitting across the other side of the room who are

1301
01:07:47.200 --> 01:07:51.900
asking you to delete the delivery of 328

1302
01:07:50.900 --> 01:07:53.400
megawatts of clean power. That's

1303
01:07:53.400 --> 01:07:56.400
what they're asking you to do whether that would be 10% of

1304
01:07:56.400 --> 01:07:58.300
the scheme or 60% of the scheme.

1305
01:07:59.100 --> 01:08:02.500
It's 328 megawatts of clean power. That's what

1306
01:08:02.500 --> 01:08:05.500
we can deliver on the land that they want

1307
01:08:05.500 --> 01:08:08.600
to exclude from the scheme because of localized landscape

1308
01:08:08.600 --> 01:08:12.200
visual impacts and some other concerns and

1309
01:08:11.200 --> 01:08:14.300
we say that's inappropriate. That's our headline

1310
01:08:14.300 --> 01:08:14.500
point.

1311
01:08:18.500 --> 01:08:19.600

Thank you, Mr. Tony.

1312

01:08:20.500 --> 01:08:23.400

Just very quick final comments, please

1313

01:08:23.400 --> 01:08:26.200

before we wrap this agenda item up. So

1314

01:08:26.200 --> 01:08:28.700

Mr. Steel very quickly madam.

1315

01:08:30.600 --> 01:08:31.700

I do not accept.

1316

01:08:32.700 --> 01:08:33.600

What has been said?

1317

01:08:35.800 --> 01:08:38.600

There are many many options available to

1318

01:08:38.600 --> 01:08:40.600

Sonic including selling.

1319

01:08:41.100 --> 01:08:41.700

It on.

1320

01:08:43.300 --> 01:08:46.400

the whole point of this exercise one hopes

1321

01:08:47.100 --> 01:08:48.900

is to get the right scheme.

1322

01:08:49.900 --> 01:08:52.900

Not to get this scheme at all costs where

1323

01:08:52.900 --> 01:08:55.300

no mitigation when you find that there

1324

01:08:55.300 --> 01:08:58.900

are real problems with it, which have been identified for

1325

01:08:58.900 --> 01:09:01.700

a long time by the local authorities as

1326

01:09:01.700 --> 01:09:02.600

well as ourselves.

1327

01:09:03.700 --> 01:09:07.000

And what we're faced with is in All or Nothing. Am I

1328

01:09:06.200 --> 01:09:09.100

goodness me? You don't the whole of Britain is going

1329

01:09:09.100 --> 01:09:12.200

to collapse is almost what is being said if we don't get schemes like this through

1330

01:09:12.200 --> 01:09:14.600

which are the wrong schemes imagine.

1331

01:09:15.900 --> 01:09:19.200

I don't accept there is evidence. I totally

1332

01:09:18.200 --> 01:09:20.900

agree with what Mr. Muhammad has said.

1333

01:09:21.900 --> 01:09:25.300

That there is no evidence that is not viable and furthermore,

1334

01:09:24.300 --> 01:09:27.200

whatever the situation if it's not

1335

01:09:27.200 --> 01:09:30.900

viable it's because they've designed the wrong scheme. It's

1336

01:09:30.900 --> 01:09:33.300

not because it is our fault.

1337

01:09:34.200 --> 01:09:37.300

Collectively in terms of the opposition that we're putting

1338

01:09:37.300 --> 01:09:40.200

forward points where they've got to have the

1339

01:09:40.200 --> 01:09:43.700

right scheme in place. Even if it's a smaller scheme as

1340

01:09:43.700 --> 01:09:47.000

has been found elsewhere, even if it's fewer megawatts,

1341

01:09:46.700 --> 01:09:50.000

there's no requirement to roll

1342

01:09:49.100 --> 01:09:52.800

over maximize the number of megawatts which

1343

01:09:52.800 --> 01:09:53.600

cause harm

1344

01:09:55.800 --> 01:09:57.000

Thank you, Mr. Steel.

1345

01:09:59.200 --> 01:10:02.400

There's just another question. I want to ask Mr. Tony myself, and then

1346

01:10:02.400 --> 01:10:05.300

I'll turn to the local authorities for final

1347

01:10:05.300 --> 01:10:08.400

comments, Mr. Turney is just another something

1348

01:10:08.400 --> 01:10:11.200

that's occurred to me, which I would like the applicant to take

1349

01:10:11.200 --> 01:10:14.900

away and consider and come back with a reply

1350

01:10:14.900 --> 01:10:18.500

at deadline seven, please when the change the

1351

01:10:17.500 --> 01:10:21.600

second change request came in removing

1352

01:10:20.600 --> 01:10:23.100

Sonica West B.

1353

01:10:23.700 --> 01:10:26.600

From the project I've recall that the

1354

01:10:26.600 --> 01:10:29.300

supporting information for that said that in order

1355

01:10:29.300 --> 01:10:33.500

to compensate for the loss of generation from Seneca

1356

01:10:32.500 --> 01:10:34.000

SB.

1357

01:10:35.400 --> 01:10:39.400

Putting it in non-technical terms more powerful

1358

01:10:38.400 --> 01:10:40.600

panels would be used.

1359

01:10:42.200 --> 01:10:44.600

On other land Parcels in order to compensate.

1360

01:10:45.800 --> 01:10:48.500

So could the applicant please take

1361

01:10:48.500 --> 01:10:51.100

that away in terms of what we've been

1362

01:10:51.100 --> 01:10:52.100

talking about now.

1363

01:10:53.000 --> 01:10:53.300

and

1364

01:10:55.600 --> 01:10:59.500

submit some sort of explanation as

1365

01:10:59.500 --> 01:11:00.100
to whether

1366

01:11:01.600 --> 01:11:04.200
some compensation could be made for the

1367

01:11:04.200 --> 01:11:07.500
loss of power generation. If all the sites have

1368

01:11:07.500 --> 01:11:10.600
been talking about today were removed to what extent that

1369

01:11:10.600 --> 01:11:13.500
loss of power could be compensated for

1370

01:11:13.500 --> 01:11:15.900
on remaining parcels.

1371

01:11:17.100 --> 01:11:20.700
That thank you and Richard only for the applicant. Yes. I am

1372

01:11:20.700 --> 01:11:23.500
we last for that to be done. Can I

1373

01:11:23.500 --> 01:11:24.700
just clarify the question is it?

1374

01:11:25.800 --> 01:11:29.400
whether there is technological compensation that

1375

01:11:29.400 --> 01:11:32.100
could be done because the point that I alluded to is you

1376

01:11:32.100 --> 01:11:35.200
might for instance if you say

1377

01:11:38.300 --> 01:11:41.600
To use a hypothetical make it very clear before everyone leaps

1378

01:11:41.600 --> 01:11:42.900

in to use a hypothetical.

1379

01:11:43.500 --> 01:11:46.400

If he if he 12 and 13 were found to be unacceptable

1380

01:11:47.400 --> 01:11:50.500

But EG and therefore eco3 was not required for ecological

1381

01:11:50.500 --> 01:11:51.100

mitigation.

1382

01:11:52.300 --> 01:11:55.400

But that's I was acceptable in landscape and visual

1383

01:11:55.400 --> 01:11:55.700

terms.

1384

01:11:56.600 --> 01:11:59.500

Then that would be compensation for the loss because

1385

01:11:59.500 --> 01:12:02.000

you wouldn't need it for ecological mitigation. But I

1386

01:12:02.400 --> 01:12:05.300

think it sounds as though your point

1387

01:12:05.300 --> 01:12:08.400

is more limited to is there something about the

1388

01:12:08.400 --> 01:12:11.200

design of the panels the capacity of

1389

01:12:11.200 --> 01:12:14.700

the scheme the installed scheme that can make

1390

01:12:14.700 --> 01:12:17.300

up for lost ground if if we lose

1391

01:12:17.300 --> 01:12:20.100

Parcels, that's it. Yes. That's the rather than

1392

01:12:20.100 --> 01:12:23.300

thinking. How could you squeeze more Parcels on somewhere else?
Yes. It's

1393

01:12:23.300 --> 01:12:25.500

a point about the technology. Okay. Thank you.

1394

01:12:28.500 --> 01:12:31.100

Mr. Bedford or Mr. Peratt Miss perak

1395

01:12:32.500 --> 01:12:35.600

Ritchie back for West africansel Adam we've

1396

01:12:35.600 --> 01:12:38.300

moved on quite away from when I did identical in

1397

01:12:38.300 --> 01:12:42.300

which was a long time ago. Now it feels on halfway house proposals.
I

1398

01:12:41.300 --> 01:12:44.800

just wanted to make it clear obviously from our perspective. We

1399

01:12:44.800 --> 01:12:47.300

you know, even with the halfway house proposal for E

1400

01:12:47.300 --> 01:12:50.400

12 and e13. It wouldn't be sufficient because they would

1401

01:12:50.400 --> 01:12:53.600

still be a residual impacts on a stone

1402

01:12:53.600 --> 01:12:55.600

girl that that reside there see

1403

01:12:56.800 --> 01:12:59.600

Yes, we want necessarily supporting that halfway

1404

01:12:59.600 --> 01:13:02.000

house from that perspective. I've got Miss Fisher here.

1405

01:13:02.200 --> 01:13:05.300

If you want to hear more by I don't think we need to get into it for

1406

01:13:05.300 --> 01:13:06.400

present purposes.

1407

01:13:08.200 --> 01:13:11.500

That's just the only point I want to make as to why we needed to go further. Thank

1408

01:13:11.500 --> 01:13:12.900

you, Mr. Bedford.

1409

01:13:14.800 --> 01:13:17.200

Thank you, Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council.

1410

01:13:19.800 --> 01:13:20.000

but

1411

01:13:21.500 --> 01:13:25.800

first of all in terms of dealing with

1412

01:13:25.800 --> 01:13:27.600

the scale of loss.

1413

01:13:28.800 --> 01:13:32.000

You will recall that the applicant has

1414

01:13:31.500 --> 01:13:32.900

focused heavily.

1415

01:13:34.500 --> 01:13:37.500

On the test of whether

1416

01:13:37.500 --> 01:13:41.100

a loss of functionality is significant or not

1417

01:13:40.100 --> 01:13:44.700

and being the reference in the en and

1418

01:13:43.700 --> 01:13:47.800
in that context considering

1419

01:13:46.800 --> 01:13:49.300
the loss in

1420

01:13:49.300 --> 01:13:50.700
percentage terms.

1421

01:13:51.500 --> 01:13:55.100
Seems to us to be an entirely sensible

1422

01:13:54.100 --> 01:13:58.200
yardstick to measure the

1423

01:13:57.200 --> 01:14:00.500
degree of significance of removing X

1424

01:14:00.500 --> 01:14:03.100
or Y parcel. So that's a general

1425

01:14:03.100 --> 01:14:03.400
point.

1426

01:14:04.400 --> 01:14:07.900
Secondly, you're presented

1427

01:14:07.900 --> 01:14:10.700
in a sense with a Theta comply

1428

01:14:10.700 --> 01:14:13.300
through the applicants approach to this

1429

01:14:13.300 --> 01:14:17.300
scheme, which is not withstanding that

1430

01:14:16.300 --> 01:14:19.800
the local impact reports at

1431

01:14:19.800 --> 01:14:23.000

the start of the process have identified

1432

01:14:22.900 --> 01:14:25.100
areas of concern to the local

1433

01:14:25.100 --> 01:14:25.700
authorities.

1434

01:14:26.700 --> 01:14:29.400
Which have been outlined consistently through the

1435

01:14:29.400 --> 01:14:32.400
various representations. So the applicant has always

1436

01:14:32.400 --> 01:14:33.000
known.

1437

01:14:33.900 --> 01:14:36.700
That there's a degree of risk to the applicant

1438

01:14:36.700 --> 01:14:39.300
that the examining Authority.

1439

01:14:40.200 --> 01:14:43.200
May elect to agree with the

1440

01:14:43.200 --> 01:14:46.400
local authorities about the adverse impacts

1441

01:14:46.400 --> 01:14:49.700
of particular hearts of the applicant's proposals.

1442

01:14:50.700 --> 01:14:53.400
The applicant actually has chosen

1443

01:14:53.400 --> 01:14:56.300
not to prepare any form of

1444

01:14:56.300 --> 01:14:57.500
fallback position.

1445

01:14:58.500 --> 01:15:01.100

as to what the applicants position would be

1446

01:15:02.100 --> 01:15:05.500

if the examining Authority did form those views in

1447

01:15:05.500 --> 01:15:08.500

light of the local authorities representations.

1448

01:15:09.900 --> 01:15:13.200

Then the applicant says are well. We're

1449

01:15:12.200 --> 01:15:15.000

now very late in the examination. It would be

1450

01:15:15.500 --> 01:15:16.900

jolly difficult to prepare documents.

1451

01:15:17.800 --> 01:15:20.400

That showed how you would change the scheme to

1452

01:15:20.400 --> 01:15:21.700

reflect those concerns.

1453

01:15:22.800 --> 01:15:25.500

and the local authorities now bear

1454

01:15:25.500 --> 01:15:26.200

the onus

1455

01:15:26.800 --> 01:15:29.400

of doing all that work. Well with respect that's

1456

01:15:29.400 --> 01:15:29.700

wrong.

1457

01:15:31.200 --> 01:15:34.600

The applicant proposal is put before you

1458

01:15:34.600 --> 01:15:36.700

the applicant seeks the consent.

1459

01:15:38.700 --> 01:15:41.100

Whilst obviously views will differ on the

1460

01:15:41.100 --> 01:15:43.200

impacts of the applicants proposals.

1461

01:15:44.200 --> 01:15:47.700

It's it's essentially it's the applicant's luck out

1462

01:15:47.700 --> 01:15:50.500

if they have not contemplated a

1463

01:15:50.500 --> 01:15:51.100

full-back position.

1464

01:15:52.100 --> 01:15:55.700

And they then present to you as it were the Juggernaut is

1465

01:15:55.700 --> 01:15:56.900

heading in a particular direction.

1466

01:15:58.300 --> 01:16:00.300

and even if you come to the conclusion

1467

01:16:01.200 --> 01:16:05.100

that aspects of what the Juggernaut is doing are unacceptable.

1468

01:16:06.200 --> 01:16:10.300

Sorry, you can't change the Juggernaut.

1469

01:16:09.300 --> 01:16:12.400

You've only got the option of

1470

01:16:12.400 --> 01:16:16.100

rejecting the whole proposal. We don't accept that. We think

1471

01:16:15.100 --> 01:16:17.100

that the applicant.

1472

01:16:18.400 --> 01:16:18.800

could

1473

01:16:20.100 --> 01:16:23.800

And we will do what we can to assist in this could perfectly

1474

01:16:23.800 --> 01:16:26.900

well change the application to remove parcels

1475

01:16:26.900 --> 01:16:29.500

and you can obviously make

1476

01:16:29.500 --> 01:16:32.600

recommendations accordingly. And if you wished as

1477

01:16:32.600 --> 01:16:36.000

it were to encourage the applicant to do so, I know

1478

01:16:35.100 --> 01:16:39.200

that Monday is the the deadline for

1479

01:16:38.200 --> 01:16:42.300

your comment on the draft dco

1480

01:16:41.300 --> 01:16:44.300

you could certainly use that

1481

01:16:44.300 --> 01:16:47.900

opportunity if you wish to do so to give the applicant a 199

1482

01:16:47.900 --> 01:16:50.600

direction as to how the

1483

01:16:50.600 --> 01:16:53.300

applicant might think about further changes

1484

01:16:53.300 --> 01:16:56.700

to the scheme. So we think these things are practically possible

1485

01:16:56.700 --> 01:16:59.300

and if the applicant hasn't thought those through here the

1486

01:16:59.300 --> 01:17:02.300

two one in the sense, that's their Misfortune given that they've been

1487

01:17:02.300 --> 01:17:05.200

flagged up for so long by the local authorities. Thank you.

1488

01:17:05.200 --> 01:17:08.300

I'm going to draw this to a close now and we

1489

01:17:08.300 --> 01:17:12.100

could talk about this. Oh, Mr. Turney, we really

1490

01:17:11.100 --> 01:17:14.500

do need to break. I know I know Madam but

1491

01:17:15.500 --> 01:17:18.200

Mr. Bedford seems to always want to have the final say and I think I should

1492

01:17:18.200 --> 01:17:21.800

have the final say on generally on these issues. So at

1493

01:17:21.800 --> 01:17:24.100

some point he's got to draw his stumps. I think he's had

1494

01:17:24.100 --> 01:17:28.000

four goes on this. I think I should probably have the the final

1495

01:17:27.300 --> 01:17:30.200

say if I may but just very briefly.

1496

01:17:31.400 --> 01:17:34.200

That there still seems to be a bit of confusion as what I've said. I answered

1497

01:17:34.200 --> 01:17:37.600

your question about in which was would there be a viable scheme and

1498

01:17:37.600 --> 01:17:38.500

I said there may not be

1499

01:17:39.300 --> 01:17:42.100

I was not suggesting at that point that the scheme should

1500

01:17:42.100 --> 01:17:42.900

be refused.

1501

01:17:43.800 --> 01:17:46.200

Or that we would withdraw the application if you

1502

01:17:46.200 --> 01:17:50.000

were to say well we will only recommend the grant

1503

01:17:49.400 --> 01:17:52.500

development incentive. It excludes all of these Parcels. That's

1504

01:17:52.500 --> 01:17:52.900

not what I said.

1505

01:17:53.800 --> 01:17:56.300

But it may be that the scheme would not come forward and that's

1506

01:17:56.300 --> 01:17:59.500

is the reality of the position because we'd have to think about it very carefully.

1507

01:17:59.500 --> 01:18:02.000

There's then the question is to what would need to be

1508

01:18:02.300 --> 01:18:06.000

done the technical question of what would need to be done. And the

1509

01:18:05.200 --> 01:18:08.600

Soul point that I make is it is more substantial at

1510

01:18:08.600 --> 01:18:11.200

task than Mr. Bedford suggests. It requires us

1511

01:18:11.200 --> 01:18:14.900

to redesign things. It's not impossible. But obviously

1512

01:18:14.900 --> 01:18:17.500

we need to be given notice some stage

1513

01:18:17.500 --> 01:18:20.300

in the process. I suspect most likely after the secretary of

1514

01:18:20.300 --> 01:18:23.500

state has received your report. If you made such a recommendation, we would

1515

01:18:23.500 --> 01:18:26.800

need to be given an opportunity to submit revised plans because it

1516

01:18:26.800 --> 01:18:29.900

would have to be revised plans. Otherwise, we'd be having powers

1517

01:18:29.900 --> 01:18:31.100

to acquire land that we didn't need.

1518

01:18:32.400 --> 01:18:36.300

But thank you. I am going to close this now. Thanks to

1519

01:18:35.300 --> 01:18:37.300

Keen. Yeah you

1520

01:18:39.200 --> 01:18:42.600

thank you very much. It's Taylor. It's 25 past one now. I

1521

01:18:42.600 --> 01:18:43.700

think that concludes the

1522

01:18:44.600 --> 01:18:47.400

Your your item on this

1523

01:18:47.400 --> 01:18:50.300

agenda. Does it not? Yes, so will a journal

1524

01:18:50.300 --> 01:18:53.800

will come back and commence with the item

1525

01:18:53.800 --> 01:18:56.300
on traffic and transport which will

1526

01:18:56.300 --> 01:18:59.800
be led by Mr. Rigby and we

1527

01:18:59.800 --> 01:19:00.500
will do that.

1528

01:19:01.500 --> 01:19:03.800
at some past two

1529

01:19:05.400 --> 01:19:08.800
So the earrings adjourned now until 10 past two.

1530

01:19:08.800 --> 01:19:09.500
Thank you very much.