

Heckington Fen_22 NOV_ISH4_PT2

Created on: 2023-11-22 13:42:31

Project Length: 01:14:52

File Name: Heckington Fen_22 NOV_ISH4_PT2

File Length: 01:14:52

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:08 - 00:00:10:03

And welcome back. And specific hearing for is now resumed.

00:00:12:03 - 00:00:20:04

We're now on agenda item five which is ecology, biodiversity, ornithology and the natural environment.

00:00:23:11 - 00:00:38:05

So understand we've got the ecology representative for the. The North Kesteven is appearing online. Is that right? I can't see the online participants yet.

00:00:40:08 - 00:00:40:23

Okay.

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

There's David.

00:00:47:06 - 00:00:48:19

Felton's Macomb.

00:00:49:00 - 00:00:51:07

Yes. David Button for North Kesteven Council.

00:00:52:02 - 00:00:57:21

Hello. Can hear you now. Thank you. Okay. Just like to ask you, um.

00:01:00:12 - 00:01:04:00

Well, it's gone again. First questions for you.

00:01:07:09 - 00:01:29:21

Okay. I'd just like to ask you, if you reviewed the response from the applicant to the your appendix one of North Kesteven District Council's local impact report regarding the survey approach. Um, and if you'd like to make any comments on that before, ask the applicant for their summary.

00:01:30:13 - 00:02:05:04

Yes. I can confirm that I've read the responses received, and I'm broadly satisfied with most most of the responses. In terms of being, I agree that good progress has been made. I think we're very, very nearly there in terms of agreeing what the strategies should be. I think the the, the outline length document is acceptable. Um, my only outstanding concern in relation to the is the visibility of the evidence base underpinning how the data has been entered into the metric.

00:02:05:07 - 00:02:31:21

I think there are some requirements set out in the user guide, specifically paragraphs 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 of the user manual that haven't been met in full. And I don't wish to imply that that that that the conclusions reached are wrong. But but in order to verify the calculations, I would like to see some more evidence.

00:02:34:02 - 00:03:14:27

Um, the next key is to think within the correspondence related to quail. Um, quail is a a schedule one bird species. It's also been assessed as endangered, and it's a bird of conservation concern as well. So in terms of standing advice, there's some quite clear recommendations in terms of survey expectations and requirements for mitigation. Um, I queried the level of survey effort on quail, um, that related to whether dawn surveys were appropriate and the broader survey efforts.

00:03:15:18 - 00:03:51:17

The applicant has clarified that they felt dawn surveys were acceptable and would concede that point. But there but there were still issues in terms of survey efforts. The Good Practice survey guidelines, which I've referred to previously, advise six surveys for quail. Um, the applicants report confirms that within the park for breeding bird surveys were done. So that's less than six visits. And also the guidance is quite clear that the survey period for quail is between mid-May and late July.

00:03:52:10 - 00:04:03:28

And within that period, two of the four surveys completed by that application applicant were conducted. So just two of these surveys were within the advisor survey period.

00:04:06:22 - 00:04:11:03

And think that the other matter that think was.

00:04:14:05 - 00:04:48:26

Um, that that was key within the previous one is related to arable flora. And my concern there really was just in relation to. The evidence based and rationale for the impact assessment itself and the level of survey effort applied to make that assessment. The applicant has advised that there may have been some misunderstandings there in terms of the method that was applied, and I would welcome further clarification of exactly what was done because I based my review on the survey.

00:04:50:00 - 00:05:13:00

The survey locations shown on figure two of Application document 195. And that figure would seem to imply that surveys for arable flora were undertaken at point point features rather than at field scale. So think if the applicant could clarify that point, then think that might resolve the issue in relation to arable flora.

00:05:16:10 - 00:05:20:26

And think that those were the main three points. I think that need further comment.

00:05:24:02 - 00:05:36:11

Okay. Thank you very much for that. That's useful. I'll pass it over to to the applicant to respond and to provide a general update on on ecology Matters, please.

00:05:38:07 - 00:06:11:24

Thank you very much, Mark Latham, for the applicant. You have to take on board those comments from from Aecom and happy to provide further information around the calculations, particularly around clarity around the condition assessments as mentioned in the user guide. And in terms of in terms of sort of a calendar, arable, arable, apple floor surveys. Yeah, we're happy to to provide extra clarity on on those two points, particularly around the methodologies used.

00:06:19:27 - 00:06:22:27

So that will that be in writing for deadline three?

00:06:24:09 - 00:06:26:22

Yeah. Happy too. Happy to provide those. Yeah.

00:06:43:22 - 00:06:46:29

Kyle. Come on. Biodiversity net gain shortly.

00:06:52:19 - 00:06:55:01

Just wanted to.

00:06:57:16 - 00:06:59:04

Ask about.

00:07:00:21 - 00:07:39:15

I don't know if this is for you, Mr. Lay them or somebody else, but North Kesteven District Council's local impact report, referring to the oak tree in Group 39 and the applicants response Rep 2078, stated that a further survey will be undertaken. And just wanted to an update on that. If and when a survey will be undertaken. Um, and how can it how can it be secured with measures for its protection? And did see this tree from a distance on site on Monday.

00:07:42:14 - 00:08:21:22

For the applicant. So we note the comments made in relation to a potential veteran tree within the audit limits and subject to landowner permission. We're planning further survey of the tree within Group 39. Um, due to the cable widths corridor at that location, the width of the cable route at that location. And there is some flexibility in design available to us to mitigate any potential impacts through micro siting of the cable route. At that point, should the tree be identified as a veteran tree, we would also update the assessment to ensure we're reflecting the tree's distinctiveness, capturing that adequately.

00:08:22:14 - 00:08:30:15

However, to date, we've not yet agreed the walkover survey, but think we're working towards securing access.

00:08:36:20 - 00:08:53:17

So I don't know if you can answer the timescales then. And. In terms of providing that further information, and if it's not provided during the examination or whether anything further is needed within the DCO to secure that.

00:08:54:05 - 00:09:26:10

Madam and the applicant, and just possibly to add, as Mr. Latham said, there's no issue with doing that survey. It's merely just access to land. As Mr. Tarr explained yesterday, we are working very hard to get agreement with all the landowners where we don't have yet to have agreement not only to reach agreement on cable rights, but also to access the land for undertaking further archaeology surveys.

00:09:26:12 - 00:09:59:21

And and this survey, we very much hope to have those agreements in place before the end of the examination. There is obviously a possibility that that might not happen. And again, we touched on it yesterday, the need for temporary powers, one of one of those temporary rights is the ability to use or one of those powers is the right to use that temporary right to get onto the land. So unfortunately, whilst we can't be specific as the deadline when we will get access, we hope it's very soon.

00:09:59:23 - 00:10:09:18

That is a process for getting access onto the land and that survey will be undertaken obviously at the earliest opportunity. Think we can. That's all we can say at the moment.

00:10:12:20 - 00:10:22:14

Okay. And you mentioned in terms of updating the diversity net gain. How does that fit into this?

00:10:26:20 - 00:11:01:13

But in terms of if we identify the tree as a veteran tree, and that would be an update to the metric, but it would be a very minor update and just reflected in the report. So once the surveys have been undertaken, that's that's quite a quick, quick update for us to make in terms of updating the calculation. It's just important to capture the veteran tree has a certain high level of distinctiveness and would be treated a little bit differently in the, in the, in the, in the metric, as opposed to just a rural tree that doesn't meet the criteria for for veteran status.

00:11:04:01 - 00:11:05:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:11:06:24 - 00:11:35:18

I could just add one point. Sorry. Just go ahead and just on your question as to what would happen in the event we weren't able to survey this before the end of examination. And we have included further pre-construction survey works within section seven of the outline. Kemp. And think that's a natural place for this pre commencement survey to go. To the extent we didn't get agreement to survey before we finished examination.

00:11:42:16 - 00:11:51:19

Okay. Thank you. Do the councils have anything to say in response to this about the potential veteran tree?

00:12:00:28 - 00:12:02:29

Parish District council. Nothing further.

00:12:04:21 - 00:12:05:21

Okay. Thank you.

00:12:13:19 - 00:12:20:12

Sorry. Boston Borough Council wish to raise any comments in relation to this to trees in your area.

00:12:23:14 - 00:12:56:15

Thank you, ma'am. Abby Marwood for Boston Borough Council. Um, yes. Just in terms of treason, Boston Borough Council. I suppose our view is the main impact. Will the main lasting impact for Boston, um, is the loss of the trees at the substation as a result of the cable connection? Um, it's something we've raised in our local impact report, and it's something that the applicant is in discussions with us with. Um, our sort of viewpoint is that offsetting them on the solar farm park, whilst it replaces the trees, is some distance away.

00:12:56:17 - 00:13:09:20

It's outside of the borough's area. So we'd be looking to secure some mitigation or replacement a bit closer to the substation, or at least within the borough area itself. Um, but these are sort of discussions that are ongoing with the applicant at the moment.

00:13:13:00 - 00:13:23:04

Okay. Thank you. Have you got anything specifically about the oak tree and further surveys on that? Are you happy with the applicants approach?

00:13:24:02 - 00:13:27:19

Um, nothing further from Boston in terms of the oak tree yet? Happy with the approach.

00:13:28:18 - 00:13:29:21

Okay. Thank you.

00:13:32:13 - 00:13:47:18

Yeah. So moving on to the Ms.. Marwood just mentioned regarding the loss of woodland next to the National Grid substations, said the discussions are ongoing. Can you provide any update on that place?

00:13:51:08 - 00:14:28:12

Certainly for the applicant. Yes. That's correct. Discussions are ongoing. Think just to take a step back and just to remind, we have obviously provided for that offset planting in the energy site and think our position is obviously the scheme needs to be judged as a whole and as a whole. We have provided that replacement or compensation planting. So that's our kind of first position. But we do recognize what Boston Borough Council are saying and their concerns. So we are having discussions with landowners as to whether there's the ability for connectivity between the energy site and substation in that respect.

00:14:29:03 - 00:14:40:12

So we we will pursue those conversations to the extent we can, I suppose, get agreement. Then we can capture that in an outline plan. But I think that's all we can say at this stage.

00:14:41:23 - 00:14:42:18

Okay? Okay.

00:14:43:29 - 00:14:57:13

I'm sorry. I'm just. Prompted to to remind that the Forestry Commission have also confirmed they're happy with the offset planting being a kind of offset measure, and it is sufficient in those terms.

00:15:00:20 - 00:15:02:09

Yeah. Saying that. Thank you.

00:15:19:16 - 00:15:26:17

While we're on trees, landscaping to the local authorities. Relevant planning authorities. Have anything else to add?

00:15:32:00 - 00:15:32:19

No thank you, mom.

00:15:34:16 - 00:15:35:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:15:57:01 - 00:16:06:09

Okay. Yeah, jumping around a bit, but the. The applicants answer to my first written question. Bio 1.1.

00:16:07:25 - 00:16:16:13

And that included a survey schedule for pre commencement surveys. And the applicant just clarify if that list is secured anywhere.

00:16:20:00 - 00:16:43:07

Yes them to the applicant. So pre pre commencement surveys have been secured through the Outline construction environment management plan. And that security requirement 13 for the camp. The Outline Construction Environment Management plan sets out the pre commencement surveys. A timetable of the pre commencement surveys

00:16:44:26 - 00:16:47:28

will be undertaken prior to development commencing.

00:16:50:26 - 00:16:51:25

Okay. Thank you.

00:17:04:26 - 00:17:07:08

Okay. Moving on to biodiversity net gain.

00:17:10:21 - 00:17:39:16

So yesterday at she specific hearing three talks about requirement eight and that part two says been amended to secure a minimum of 60% of net gain. I'm. And then also there's the part three has been added regarding trees and hedges which die or damage should be replaced.

00:17:41:02 - 00:17:41:20

I'm.

00:17:43:18 - 00:17:56:08

Let me say we talk about this 60% figure today. Um, so if the applicant could start on that and just provide that further detail to where the 60% comes from, please.

00:17:57:19 - 00:18:40:16

Not even for the applicant. So the applicant is comfortable with delivering the unit gains that are set out in the report. However, it's also important to note that the calculation is an iterative process and the calculation will be refined to reflect future changes both during the process and during that detailed design phase. Um, when you look at the first suite of solar echoes that are in the public domain at the moment, a variety of approaches to securing bag percentages have been taken, with some solar setting, very firm figures and others having a more flexible approach.

00:18:41:02 - 00:19:13:29

So what we've tried to do with the 60% is take a pragmatic approach that tries to find that middle ground in terms of approach and as such, seeks to secure a minimum net gain of 60% in habitat units. And so this approach ensures that there's enough flexibility for us to accommodate scheme design, whilst also demonstrating that there is a significant increase in biodiversity value being delivered by the proposed development that's being brought to the local area and in which planning work can be applied.

00:19:21:28 - 00:19:33:04

Okay. Yeah, that's that's understood. Just just wondered how you arrived at 60%. Is there any mathematical rules? That's just what you talk about the pragmatic approach.

00:19:35:07 - 00:20:14:28

Of applicant. Yeah I think we've looked at what we were. We're aiming to deliver within the calculation, looked at what sort of level of comfort we'd need in terms of incorporating any design changes and then also weight that in, in, in, in respect to the out there at the moment. And that 60% seems to be that sort of happy, happy sort of middle ground really in terms of, you know, providing it,

demonstrating that significant increase in bang whilst also allowing that weight to be applied to the 60%.

00:20:20:05 - 00:20:21:06

Okay. Thank you.

00:20:25:12 - 00:20:35:07

Now. Just thought to ask the relevant planning authorities if you'd like to make any comments regarding requirement eight and biodiversity net gain.

00:20:36:15 - 00:21:18:23

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council mum. Think I really made the point yesterday, which I'll carry across to today, that the level of benefit that's secured is the level of benefit that should definitely be going into to your planning balance moment. And it therefore leaves a kind of question mark over what one does with the remaining 40% that was promised in the application document. We are being told that today that the applicant is, I think my notes say, comfortable with delivering the gain set out in the report, in which case the question arises the other way around, why is that not then going to be secured? And if that is what is promised in the application, then that is what should be secured.

00:21:18:25 - 00:21:52:01

And if that is what the applicant is now telling us they are comfortable with achieving, then then why then why not? So there's a significant discrepancy between 60% and 100%, which is sort of a loose figure. But you know, there's a margin there between 60 and 101, which the applicant is saying they are comfortable with delivering but is not, in fact, promising to deliver. So there's a there's a discrepancy there which we think needs to be addressed and that materially affects the balance overall.

00:22:03:06 - 00:22:05:15

I think. And North Kesteven.

00:22:06:15 - 00:22:36:23

North District Council. Yes, ma'am. Our position aligns with that of Lincolnshire County Council's it. In short, in addition to what's already been stated, it's not clear to us why the margin between what is suggested over 100% increase and what is going to be secured at 60% is so wide. We understand that there might be some degree of flexibility that if, as the applicant states, they are comfortable with achieving what is being promised at over 100%.

00:22:37:03 - 00:22:55:12

But why the margin needs to be so wide at almost 40, if not higher than 40%? And if there is any justification for that 40%, perhaps a detailed, indicative, detailed plan could be provided to indicate why that margin would need to be so wide. In short, it's also our position that.

00:22:57:15 - 00:23:09:17

It's the increase that secure that needs to go into the planning balance. And as it stands, we feel that perhaps something higher than 60% could be achieved and secured through the requirement.

00:23:18:25 - 00:23:21:01

Okay. Thank you. With the applicant. Let's respond to that.

00:23:21:03 - 00:23:57:02

Pase Neil Bromwich for the applicant. Madam, we, um we are so confident that that we provide the will. Above 60%, but we've agreed within the requirement that it would be a minimum, and we are

comfortable that it is 60%, which is considered in the planning balance. So we're not looking for a planning balance which considers 60 plus 40, possibly 40 or somewhere between 60 and 40.

00:23:57:04 - 00:24:27:12

So I think the key point here is for the planning balance. The applicant is comfortable with 60%. And as explained by Mr. Latham, that is in order that the development can be delivered with some flexibility. And that's the only reason we are seeking a bigger of 60%, because the flexibility needs to be in the construction program so that we can be certain that we can deliver that amount.

00:24:27:22 - 00:24:50:09

We're happy for that to be put into the planning balance, but that is being secured through the and there are measures within that, which I'm sure Mr. Latham can explain in more detail around how how we will look to deliver the Barnett gain and and deliver an amount which is in excess of 60%.

00:24:53:28 - 00:25:36:17

Just for the applicant. Just picking up on on that point, we're looking to establish through the review and the assessment that's been submitted, an ecology working group, which brings in stakeholders from the wider, wider communities are looking at. We've already contacted the local wildlife trust and they're looking to to form a form, a list of potential invitees to come and sit on that steering group with us. We're proposing a monitoring strategy, and within those that monitoring strategy, there'll be a sequence of reports which will be submitted across the lifetime of the development to the local planning authorities.

00:25:36:19 - 00:26:10:14

And within that, the group will sit and and assess each of those reports across the lifetime of the development to make sure that the that we've we've put in that calculation is being delivered. If there's any deviation from that, if there's if there's potential for potential for the mitigation, further enhancements to be to be not being met through the monitoring surveys that we undertake, then that steering group will be able to decide ways forward to ensure that those those figures are met.

00:26:14:09 - 00:26:15:06

I think you.

00:26:22:00 - 00:26:27:25

With the relevant planning authorities like to make any further comments on biodiversity net gain.

00:26:31:23 - 00:26:33:29

Not. Okay. Thank you.

00:26:36:12 - 00:26:56:13

I just got a further question about requirement eight, the part three that was added. And replacing trees hedges within five years or damaged. And just once the relevant planning authorities views and is five years sufficient.

00:27:08:29 - 00:27:09:16

Thank you, ma'am.

00:27:09:22 - 00:27:40:18

Nick Feltham, North Kesteven District Council. Um, we do have some precedent of in town and country planning decisions using a seven year replacement clause. Um. We do have a tree strategy that the District Council has adopted. We will just need to review whether or not that timescale aligns with any figure that we that we have in our own tree strategy. But we do have precedent from planning decisions for a slightly higher replacement period.

00:27:40:20 - 00:27:44:06

But it needs to be we can revert back on that deadline. Three.

00:27:47:16 - 00:27:50:11

Okay. Thank you. Is there anything else on that?

00:27:51:03 - 00:27:51:21

Yeah. Thank you.

00:27:51:23 - 00:27:54:13

Mark Willis, Lincoln County Council. Yeah. Just to say, I think we.

00:27:54:15 - 00:27:55:09

We are generally.

00:27:55:11 - 00:28:15:29

Agreement the five year period. But we will be looking at the maintenance regime within the outline plan. So we will probably be looking at in some of the detail about the implementation of that management scheme. So for the purpose of the DCO in itself, yes. But I think some of the detail on the management plan is something that we can discuss.

00:28:18:21 - 00:28:19:19

Okay. Thank you.

00:28:23:19 - 00:28:36:09

Yes it is. If North Kesteven could just reply at deadline three without a bit of further information over seven years is justified, or if five years is enough. Okay.

00:28:47:21 - 00:29:13:06

And requirement 21 Community Orchard. Again, we discussed this issue specific hearing three yesterday. And it's just whether there's any further comments to make on that requirement and whether it meets meets the needs of the relevant planning authorities. And. That anything needs adding, or if they're happy with it as is.

00:29:15:27 - 00:29:20:24

Should we say North Steven District Council? Ma'am, we're happy with how it is in its current form.

00:29:22:29 - 00:29:25:03

Okay. Thank you. And Lincolnshire?

00:29:27:14 - 00:29:30:04

It's definitely holding each county council equally happy. Thank you.

00:29:37:09 - 00:29:54:16

Okay. In terms of agenda item five, I don't have any further questions. If there's anything else on this sort of broad topic of ecology, natural environment. Anything on birds anyone wishes to add or. Now's your chance.

00:29:56:15 - 00:29:57:07

Oh, Newsom.

00:30:00:17 - 00:30:01:02

Yeah.

00:30:03:27 - 00:30:05:26

Does the applicant wish to raise anything?

00:30:10:12 - 00:30:11:29

No. Okay.

00:30:14:13 - 00:30:17:02

So. Item six water environment.

00:30:25:11 - 00:31:01:17

Again. To receive responses at deadline two from the Environment Agency, which is to 103. In respect of that, I've got no further questions to ask on this matter. But if the applicant wants to summarize what the current position is in terms of drainage, flood risk, water environment, um, and the mitigation and monitoring, if there's anything that you wish to raise that you think I should know about, now's your chance for the applicant.

00:31:04:28 - 00:31:40:19

Josh Taylor for the applicant. In short, mum. No, don't think so. There's for brief updates that it might just be worth me recapping on. We do have Stuart Harwood from JB consulting online should you need to ask any more detailed questions on flood risk. But if just quickly update on the four most recent areas. So as you might have seen, requirement 11, which is the surface and water drainage requirement, we updated a deadline to to essentially secure the outline drainage strategy within that requirement, meaning that the final scheme must be in accordance with the outline drainage strategy.

00:31:41:29 - 00:32:00:16

The second point is that we updated the floor levels for the control rooms. So the substation control buildings, that is to be at or above 2.5, 2.25m. And that's secured in the outline design principles which are secure under requirement six. And that was following a request from the Environment Agency.

00:32:02:04 - 00:32:33:06

At that point. The protective provisions, as we touched on yesterday, are agreed with the Environment Agency, the and Anglian Water. So in the context of flood and hydrology, that's that's dealt with and agreed in schedule 13 of the DCO. And finally Anglian Water, I think it was a deadline to confirmed that the project does not need a to provide a water resources assessment in the given that the scheme has designed in the need.

00:32:33:08 - 00:32:50:07

Sorry, sorry it designs in that there's no need for potable water, so we do not need to provide a water resources assessment. And Anglian Water have confirmed that. So the for brief updates. And as I said to the extent more detail is required we do have on the line.

00:32:54:29 - 00:33:03:11

No, don't don't have any further questions on those points. Just wondered if the IDB wanted to raise anything.

00:33:04:24 - 00:33:36:22

Hi, it's Andrew Scott. You should be a couple of bits and bobs generally. Really, because this is probably the last chance we'll get to comment on anything. Firstly an apology. We didn't get a chance to respond to your written questions. One on the think. It was the 17th of October because we had it

turned up two days later, and we've didn't get a chance to respond to any of those. So if you're happy, I'll respond to those. In writing for deadline three, if that's okay.

00:33:37:29 - 00:33:40:16

Yeah, that's okay for deadline three. I mean.

00:33:40:25 - 00:34:18:13

Generally from the written questions, there's a couple of issues on the actual legislation. They've quoted some blacks loose legislation for bylaws really should be the Land Drainage Act 1991, as amended, which should cover both the the two references to black solution. In that and regard to 1.4. Um, we're satisfied regarding directional drilling and the technology they're going to be using to cross watercourses between the site and the substation.

00:34:19:00 - 00:34:19:15

Um.

00:34:22:07 - 00:34:52:24

Point two um crossings of watercourses again that will be covered under protective provisions anyway. Um smaller field ditches. Can the applicant explain how these will be monitored? Um I haven't seen anything on response to that. I apologise if if not, if I've missed something. Um, as far as we're concerned, we monitor all watercourses within the district, and we can. I'm sure we can come to a common sense and pragmatic approach towards those particular issues.

00:34:53:10 - 00:35:26:02

And similarly, the the number for the mitigation and monitoring measures again will be appointed negotiation under the provisions. Um regarding what was discussed this morning regarding landscaping and hedges and the like. Um, just a reminder, please, that, um, we don't want anything within at least ten metres of a Bald Mountain watercourse. If you starting to put hedges in for screening so that the board can actually access its watercourses without obstruction.

00:35:26:16 - 00:35:41:12

But again, that's a pragmatic approach. We obviously don't want hedges bang straight on the top of watercourse Bank tops. Otherwise we can't get 15 tonne machines through. So um, so yeah, just just a general one on that. Otherwise no further comment from me.

00:35:44:08 - 00:35:50:27

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Scott. Um, just come back to the applicant, see if you've got anything further. What it's just said.

00:35:52:21 - 00:36:17:19

Judge Taylor for the applicant. Yes. Think that they're all capable of resolution? The only concern we have is the ten meter setback that Mr. Scott referred to during discussions. I believe with the nine meters setback has been agreed and that's been embedded within the design. So we can proceed on that basis. And hopefully that's the point we can agree or take offline to discuss.

00:36:19:07 - 00:36:29:11

Andrew Scott. Yeah. Andrew Scott for the black slaves again. Yeah. We did discuss with Laura and various others previously, especially if we're

00:36:30:27 - 00:37:07:18

potentially looking at security fencing around the outside of of of the, of the solar panel installations themselves. Um, we generally would like any planting to be put ten meters away because we need to allow for lateral growth as well as vertical growth, because obviously we don't if they put it nine

meters potentially, if, if there's going to be lateral growth, that is going to impact on the maneuvering of our machines when we come in to do our work on an annual basis. Um, so preferably an additional meter would be preferable.

00:37:08:09 - 00:37:35:14

We can obviously come to a more detailed discussions outside of this forum, but in an ideal world, we'd like them at ten meters just to allow for that additional meter of of growth, especially where they're going to be placing security fencing as well, either watercourse side or on the other side. We just need to make sure that we've got full maneuverability to be able to access the workhorses. And that's what the nine meter bylaw is for.

00:37:37:22 - 00:37:40:14

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

00:37:41:18 - 00:37:58:26

Taylor for the applicant. Yeah. The point is understood. I think, as I understand it, it's a kind of nine metre protection setback. And Mr. Scott's concern is around planting to make sure it kind of doesn't broach that nine meters. So I don't think we're talking at cross purposes. And it is something we can pick up offline.

00:38:00:27 - 00:38:02:01

Appreciate. Appreciated. Thank you.

00:38:03:07 - 00:38:12:13

Okay. Thank you very much. The relevant planning authorities have anything to add on in terms of water environment type issues?

00:38:17:27 - 00:38:19:26

No. Okay, great. Move on.

00:38:22:02 - 00:38:23:09

Item seven.

00:38:26:24 - 00:38:29:16

She's the Habitats Regulations assessment.

00:38:31:28 - 00:38:46:15

We do have a. Updated version of the Shadow Habitats Regulations assessment to inform appropriate assessment. Received a deadline two, which is Rep 2022.

00:38:48:12 - 00:38:58:28

Um, so I'll, I'll just initially ask the applicant just to explain what the amendments are. So to the place.

00:39:01:06 - 00:39:32:19

And Mark Latham for the applicant. So we've we've updated the report to Rep 02.2 to bring its format into alignment with advice note ten. So we've provided additional tables in appendices to the report outlining which European sites were scoped into the HRA for conservation objectives of each site and the threats and pressures to each of the sites integrity. And we've also provided a summary of likely significant effects.

00:39:33:06 - 00:40:09:11

We've also updated the cumulative assessment section in the shadow HRA, as that's been updated to reflect the revised site list and further detail. Setting out instances where silt control would be required

during during construction have been added, and we've signposted to the Construction Environment Management Plan on behalf of the findings of the shadow HRA remain the same as the last submission and rules out any impacts from pathways during construction and also only pathways during operation.

00:40:09:28 - 00:40:20:06

Natural England concurs with the assessment and the reasoning we've we've provided, and this consensus will be documented in the Statement of Common Ground.

00:40:25:25 - 00:40:57:18

Yeah. Natural England. Yeah I've seen the the latest statement of common grounds. So understand that they accept the conclusions. The shadow habitats Regulations assessments. I've got no further questions on the matter. Um, just to make parties aware that we've just received this morning a response from Natural England to to my written questions, a late response. And that will be published shortly, hopefully today.

00:40:58:06 - 00:41:31:09

So don't expect a response today. Um, it does it does include just just that confirmation that they're happy with the conclusions of the again, but there's also some matters relating to soil management plan, um, which was discussed yesterday. So I'm not going to go over that again. But I would like the applicants provide a written response at deadline three um, to to what Natural England are saying in the in their current submission.

00:41:33:14 - 00:41:34:03

And.

00:41:35:21 - 00:42:09:19

Also in respect of the conclusions of the Shadow Habitats Regulations assessments, because it doesn't rule out likely significant effects and moves on to appropriate assessments, and do need to produce a report on the impact of European sites. And so that will be published in accordance with the examination timetable on the 23rd of January. And then there'll be an opportunity for the for the applicant to respond to that if they wish.

00:42:10:02 - 00:42:24:08

After that. And so that that's all on habitats regulations. But it's whether the relevant planning authorities or anybody else like to raise anything going into this matter.

00:42:27:25 - 00:42:29:15

Nope. Okay. Thank you.

00:42:49:19 - 00:42:55:02

Okay general automate which is everything else basically. And.

00:42:59:20 - 00:43:17:02

First of these matters can be ruled out of further questioning. I'm pretty much got what I need on on these, and if there's anything outstanding, it will go into the second set of written questions.

00:43:18:27 - 00:43:19:18

Um.

00:43:23:06 - 00:43:24:16

Those.

00:43:26:15 - 00:43:36:18

Yeah. Applicants answer to. My first written question and 1.6.

00:43:38:22 - 00:44:15:27

That's right. 2077 that's regarding waste. And I just wanted to share it with Lincolnshire County Council in their capacity waste authority. Um, because it says that at least 60% of waste decommissioning will be diverted from landfill and that waste handling facilities within Lincolnshire are expected to have available capacity to accommodate waste at decommissioning, including when considering other schemes across the county. And I just want to check whether Lincolnshire agree with that statement or if you've got anything to add regarding waste.

00:44:20:23 - 00:44:25:12

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. Mum, I don't think we've got anything to say about this.

00:44:29:18 - 00:44:48:00

Yeah. We've taken the view that we don't have a crystal ball, and we don't know what the facilities will be available at the time, so it's very difficult to know whether that's an adequate percentage or not. And it is very difficult, conversely, for the applicant to know what what's achievable or not. And we don't think we can take that any further.

00:44:50:02 - 00:44:51:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:45:03:13 - 00:45:18:07

I find again, this is something that was briefly mentioned yesterday. Um. Regards the battery, energy storage and fire risk. And there's a change to requirements seven.

00:45:20:00 - 00:45:33:11

That the and that's just a minor change that it should be approved by Lincolnshire County Council in consultation with the district council and fire service. It was mentioned yesterday about protective provisions.

00:45:35:09 - 00:45:46:08

Um for the fire service may be added, and I've also seen reference somewhere to a section 106 agreement potentially. I wonder if you could provide any information on that place. Lincolnshire.

00:45:46:28 - 00:46:18:05

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire county council. Um, the the the protective provisions would be in lieu of the 106. So we wouldn't also need A106. It was just about having a mechanism for essentially fee recovery by the fire authority for their costs in visiting, assessing and monitoring the fire safety energy storage safety management plan required by requirement seven. So it's it's more about having a mechanism for money to change hands.

00:46:18:07 - 00:46:43:23

So 106 is often a tool for that. But we're happy for it to be in a protective provision. That's what's happening elsewhere, particularly at Gate Burt. And that's what's going to be agreed there. So we're happy with that as a as a mechanism. So the protective provisions and requirement seven would work together to achieve, um, an appropriate energy storage safety management plan and oversight and monitoring of that going forward.

00:46:45:18 - 00:46:57:05

And obviously just discussions are ongoing about the wording of protective provisions, and that's quite embryonic in terms of the discussions. But we're hopeful.

00:47:00:12 - 00:47:01:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:47:03:21 - 00:47:10:10

Who did it that couldn't have anything to add on those two matters. Just raise the waste and then fire service.

00:47:12:19 - 00:47:41:14

Neil Bromwich from the for the applicant just dealing with the the battery storage point and the applicant has no concerns about meeting fire authorities, costs for inspecting the site and monitoring the battery storage and the principle is agreed, uh, whether that the correct place for that is protective provisions is something that we're just considering. I appreciate that it's novel. Um.

00:47:43:12 - 00:48:16:06

Up to want to go into lots of detail about what protective provisions do, but they protect assets. The fire authority won't have any assets. Therefore, it may be better that that arrangement for the for the transfer of monies is dealt with in one of the control plans. We're going to take that away. And what I don't mean not to do is burden the base of the order with something which does something which is different to what the order tended to do. So we do need to work through that carefully and make sure that that's the right place for it to go.

00:48:23:06 - 00:48:24:06

Okay. Thank you.

00:48:26:16 - 00:48:31:14

I'm Madam Branch, the applicant. No comments on the waste point raised.

00:48:32:25 - 00:48:33:14

Thank you.

00:48:35:22 - 00:48:46:00

Not because we were happy to take a form of that agreement. You know that discussion offline. We're not we're not fussy, I think. But we'll take that. We'll take that away.

00:48:48:17 - 00:48:49:06

Thank you.

00:48:54:16 - 00:49:06:12

Right. I've nothing further to add on any other points relating to environmental matters, but if there's anything that anyone, either in the room or online, wishes to raise.

00:49:08:13 - 00:49:11:03

You know, the relevant planning authorities. If there's anything.

00:49:12:16 - 00:49:26:17

But sorry. Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. Yes, we've got a small point on your written question. 1.6. At if we can, in relation to the sensitivity of links assessed in the year.

00:49:30:09 - 00:50:01:11

Well, there was a question raised by the Zé about. Well, just that the sensitivity of links, particularly link for Cowbridge Road's five biker drive and six vicarage drove, and they are assessed in the as

having a negligible sensitivity because they're put into the bottom rung of the of the criteria for sensitivity of receptors in table 14.2.

00:50:02:15 - 00:50:41:08

We don't agree with that assessment. We think they fall into one of the top two categories, either high or medium, and it's probably some professional judgment in that. But those roads don't have the destination and they don't have segregated footways for pedestrians. So there's an argument that they would fall into the high category because they are in road without a footway, and they could be used by pedestrians. Failing that, there's a sort of element of judgment that they could be medium, because they could sensibly be described as akin to roads with a narrow footway that may be used for pedestrians.

00:50:41:10 - 00:51:00:03

Certainly, the fact that they don't kind of neatly fall into one of those categories shouldn't mean that they get immediately bumped down to negligible. They are narrow roads without segregated footways that you get used by pedestrians so that that negligible category doesn't accurately capture their characteristics.

00:51:02:16 - 00:51:03:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:51:04:02 - 00:51:42:09

So. Yeah. So so our ask on that is for that to be to be looked at and fed into and fit into a further assessment. It may ultimately be that it doesn't go anywhere and doesn't lead to, you know, doesn't mean anything but but nevertheless, the assessment ought to be correct. And and the inputs into that needs, it needs to be properly reflective of the significance criteria that the applicant set themselves. And at the moment, we don't think it is. So that just needs to be to be considered. And and probably for the applicant to come back in writing about that, how that feeds through once the significant sensitivity is properly fed into that assessment.

00:51:46:11 - 00:52:01:17

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. Last the applicant to respond. I'm. They wish to say something now or just respond at deadline three. But will there be an update to chapter? I'm 14.

00:52:01:27 - 00:52:34:02

Thank you madam. Neil Bromwich for the applicant. I think. We'll probably explain fully at deadline three, but I was going to just ask Katie Stocker. Pegasus, who is representing the applicant on transport is is online. And sorry, this is the second point. You may recall yesterday that we were discussing some of the plans, and that would be helpful if you had an explanation of some of the colors of the plan.

00:52:34:04 - 00:52:44:06

So the stock is here. Maybe she might want to respond to that first point, but she is also here to to to deal with the plans should you still wish her to do that.

00:52:47:07 - 00:53:09:08

Yeah. On both points. Yeah. I'd completely forgotten about anything from yesterday, so thank you for that. Um, yeah. Firstly, if you could just just just respond to what Ms.. Hall's said about the sensitivity of the lanes and, and then just go through what the shading means on the, on the highway plans. Thank you. Absolutely.

00:53:09:19 - 00:53:11:18

Katie Stoke, on behalf of the applicant.

00:53:11:27 - 00:53:47:07

Um, so in relation to the sensitivity of Cowbridge roads, um, the, um, the assessment criteria for the guidelines on transport and traffic has changed since the original submission of the chapter. It's not as prescriptive now in terms of whether or not roads without footways are or are not included as a sensitive receptor. However, we don't disagree with what Lincolnshire have suggested in terms of the sensitivity of that route, and we can provide some further information on what the outcomes would be if we were to assess it as either a medium or high sensitivity.

00:53:47:15 - 00:54:18:03

Um, the the conclusions think have already been established in some sense. Lincolnshire's response to your first questions did kind of do that assessment. And the ultimate conclusion is that whilst if the sensitivity is high, the impact would still be temporary and there would be a neutral impact on that route. But we'll do the same assessment and we can present that in writing. In writing for you. Um, that's also a point that we're trying to establish in the statement of common Ground as well.

00:54:18:05 - 00:54:21:13

So hopefully by that time that will be established in there for you.

00:54:22:29 - 00:54:54:12

Um, in relation to the schedules and the streets and access plans. Um, so Mr. Taylor was talking yesterday about the change to schedules five and schedule seven. Um, so we've done some further work to establish where the access locations within the order limits, where there are existing field access points, and they may be improved either temporarily or permanently. And then where those locations where they might need to be new access junctions, again, either temporarily or permanently.

00:54:54:21 - 00:55:29:21

Um, so to inform that we did some sweat path assessment exercises, um, for the largest vehicle being a low loader. Um, so that's what we've used at the moment. Um, it is also confirmed that the cable route access points will need to be, um, available permanently and once operational. So that's with the exception of which is the access point at Royalty Lane. And so as a result of doing that exercise, we've revisited articles nine and 12 and then the corresponding schedules five and seven.

00:55:30:06 - 00:56:06:27

And so Mr. Taylor touched on it yesterday that the article nine, which relates to the power to alter the streets where we've got access points shown on the streets and access plan there will inevitably need to be changes to the streets as a result of the accesses going in, either temporarily or permanently. And that's where the changes to the plan has come about. So we've tried to tidy it up, in essence. So the permanent and temporary access locations are highlighted in hatch and the circles and think it's a hexagon shape is the whether their existing or proposed access points.

00:56:06:29 - 00:56:22:05

So nothing has changed in terms of the principle of the plan itself. The access points are still in the same place. We've just tried to clarify how they relate to the different schedules, having now included them in both schedules five and seven. Um.

00:56:26:07 - 00:56:47:09

I think that's primarily it, other than will say as well that MacRae, which was on the original streets and access plan, has been removed so that access is no longer needed or no longer proposed to be used as part of the proposals. So that's where the cursor is at the moment. Um, and obviously to account for those changes, the key has been changed on the plan to reflect the changes to the colors and the hatching.

00:56:52:09 - 00:56:53:17

Okay. Thank you.

00:56:55:17 - 00:57:03:02

Yeah. Don't have anything further to add on that. But if I could have somebody from Lincolnshire County Council respond.

00:57:07:16 - 00:57:08:17

And Stephanie Holding.

00:57:08:19 - 00:57:16:16

Which accounts counsel and will pick up the detail with the applicant going forward. But in terms of what's been presented, we don't have anything further to say today.

00:57:18:09 - 00:57:19:07

Okay. Thank you.

00:57:48:27 - 00:57:49:16

Okay.

00:57:57:18 - 00:57:59:27

Terms of agenda. Item nine.

00:58:04:29 - 00:58:08:15

Don't have many questions to ask. It's just.

00:58:10:06 - 00:58:10:21

Well.

00:58:12:12 - 00:58:36:27

The applicant's update and a response from the relevant planning authorities. Um. This is whether whether we plough on and finish the hearing, basically. Or if we have lunch and come back just for that item and to close and tie up loose ends. I'm open to suggestions.

00:58:42:12 - 00:58:43:26

Applicants have to keep going on.

00:58:45:29 - 00:58:46:29

Okay. Keep going.

00:58:47:01 - 00:58:47:16

Yes.

00:58:48:06 - 00:58:50:04

Yeah, that's absolutely fine.

00:58:53:26 - 00:59:38:17

So deadline to the applicant submitted an update to the cumulative assessment, which is 2050, and there were no updates to the interrelationship report with other national infrastructure projects at deadline too. So we're still on the deadline. One version. And so just like the applicant, to just clarify, um, what the updates were to the cumulative assessment and whether there are any other changes

expected, um, in any future versions of the interrelationship report, particularly considering that there are other examinations of now progress.

00:59:38:21 - 00:59:48:19

Cottam is progressing and West Burton is now in examination and you can have an update from you please.

00:59:50:27 - 01:00:36:08

Isabelle Hollands from Pegasus, on behalf of the applicant. So the within the cumulative report there were some submitted at deadline to. We obviously reviewed the long list in the short list as per the discussions that we had at age three, and updated it to include the sites that were agreed that should be included and update the status of the sites that were already on that list as they progressed through from pre into hearing, etcetera. So that was up to date. At that point there were, through agreement with the councils, the addition of uh one more local authority site, which was added into the cumulative shortlist.

01:00:37:08 - 01:01:07:27

So which I have here. Excuse me. And so that was added which was number 17 on the short list, which was land to the east and west of Markham Lane. That was a screening direction that was added. Um, the other local authority sites that were which are in the cumulative that are not in the interrelationship report were already in the short list. They had just altered in the status as they moved through that process.

01:01:07:29 - 01:01:45:29

So, for example, Little Fen was originally in, but now it has become a submitted application. So it had changed its status within the existing short list. Um, there were a few sites that were removed from the long list. So from the short list within the cumulative assessment. Um, and those were just find my piece of paper. Excuse me. So the ones that were removed were down to it was the wind farm, which is number on the long list.

01:01:47:27 - 01:02:07:27

Get reference for you. Number seven on the long list, which was outer dancing offshore wind farm that was on previously and has now been removed, mainly well down to the refinement of their order limits as they progress before the order limits of the potential cable route ran quite close to our order limits. It's now.

01:02:10:07 - 01:02:10:26

Uh.

01:02:11:08 - 01:02:34:01

54km away. It's the coast from the coast, and the closest point of the order limits is now 10.58km away. So the decision was made to remove that from the cumulative, because there would be no cumulative impact from the cable route. The other site that was removed was, um.

01:02:36:14 - 01:02:37:06

Uh.

01:02:38:08 - 01:02:42:26

There were further so just running through as I turn the pages. Um.

01:02:51:24 - 01:02:52:09

This.

01:02:54:26 - 01:03:38:03

And so the further ones that were removed were land at Thorpe and that previously was a screening. That land has now been encapsulated within the order limits of the site for Beacon Fen, so it's been removed in order to ensure that it's not double counting effectively. That, or the expectation is that that screening for town and country won't progress until the after the decision has been made on whether or not they intend to progress with Beacon Fen all the way through the process, and then further to removed, which was land north of Whitecross Lane, which was a 32 megawatt development in North Kesteven that's now fully operational.

01:03:38:05 - 01:04:02:14

So and that was confirmed with discussions with the applicant. Hence there would no longer be a cumulative impact. It forms part of the baseline. And the same is true for land south of Gorse Lane, which again is a North Kesteven application 20 megawatt site and again has been confirmed by the applicant and the applicant operator of that site to now be fully operational. So it would form part of the baseline rather than being part of the cumulative assessment.

01:04:06:09 - 01:04:48:14

Am moving on to think your question was whether or not they intended to be any updates to the interrelationship report. We are intending to revisit it again, obviously for deadline three and review those sites that are included within there. The intention is probably that there will be some updates to it. Um, and mainly to pick up now we've obviously produced the cumulative report. There's a wanted to try and just align one minute element of the methodology within the two reports, which was in the interrelationship report, are submitted where the inset sites had stated that they were going to have no no take at all on best and most versatile.

01:04:48:17 - 01:05:20:16

They've stated zero. We'd use that as zero. Within the cumulative report, we've taken a slightly harder line where we'd assumed if they were saying none, there may still be the risk of some being taken because they're at such early stages of their design, and we were assigning a 1% loss of best and most versatile. We intend to move that methodology. That's slightly harder methodology that we've used within the for cumulative assessment into the interrelationship report. So that will have an impact on that. The headline cumulative figure that's stated within the interrelationship report.

01:05:23:22 - 01:05:24:07

Thank you.

01:05:27:11 - 01:05:28:11

Okay. Thank you.

01:05:38:13 - 01:05:54:29

If the relevant planning authorities. Are you satisfied with the cumulative assessment as it is now, or is it is up to date as it can be? Um, are there any other known projects emerging that you think should be included?

01:05:58:13 - 01:06:08:09

By Stephanie Hall, Lancashire County Council, and we're happy that it's up to date at today's date, and we welcome the applicant's commitment to keeping it up to date going forward. Thank you.

01:06:11:00 - 01:06:18:08

At Nick Feltham, North Kesteven District Council. Yes, as has been highlighted, the council has very recently issued a

01:06:20:07 - 01:06:50:17

screening decision in relation to the Mayor Ram Lane Sleaford town and country planning proposal. We identify this is around about 11km southwest of the centre of the energy park site, so that has been subject to screen a screening decision. And so insofar as that is the latest proposal for a solar scheme within North Kesteven district that is relevant and.

01:06:52:01 - 01:07:34:17

The the point that we make think in our response to the first questions is that we make a particular comment about cumulative effects with with Beacon Fen Energy Park, which we've discussed to a degree. Um, the point there that there's insufficient information at the moment about in particular a ALK. Agricultural land gradings at Beacon Fen to be able to make for the applicant to be able to make a cumulative assessment, albeit identify that in principle, landscape and BMV matters are likely to be those of most relevance in consideration of the Heckingbottom Fen proposals, given the geographies of the two schemes.

01:07:46:12 - 01:07:47:04

Thank you.

01:07:51:11 - 01:07:57:12

So anyone else present have any comments that they wish to make on their cumulative assessment?

01:07:57:24 - 01:08:27:28

I have one, madam. That's okay. Yeah. Isabelle Hollands from Pegasus. For the applicant. It was really just to seek guidance from yourself. On note, obviously from the rule six letter, the program of when you were expecting the final update, which is deadline five of the interrelationship report. And if we were at an opportunity to agree whilst we were all in the room, maybe a last date when any new cumulative sites that might come through might be able to be issued to us. So we've got an opportunity to have had due time to have been able to produce that report.

01:08:28:00 - 01:08:38:08

I wondered if there could be agreement that we went for deadline three to be the update on when cumulative sites came forward. Was really seeking yours and the council's view on that.

01:08:40:14 - 01:08:42:20

I'm just asked for the council's view on that.

01:08:53:05 - 01:08:54:19

We just need a moment, I think.

01:09:03:07 - 01:09:20:17

Championship Stadium district. That might be one that we need to take away and just think about if that's okay. We just need to to consider the relevant deadlines and how long we think might be needed, and probably look at those that are coming through. And to give an idea as to what our position would be on that.

01:09:21:15 - 01:09:29:28

Yeah, because we did line through being a cut off point. That's in December and for deadline five it's not till February. Um.

01:09:31:26 - 01:09:33:02

Things could change.

01:09:34:23 - 01:09:48:13

Um, but I can see how you want a cut off point to be able to produce. Produce that report. Yeah, I have some further thought on that. Um. If you could liaise with with with the applicant.

01:09:51:11 - 01:09:56:22

On that point. But if a deadline. Three. Thank you ma'am.

01:09:57:18 - 01:10:33:00

Just to add to that. I think we're comfortable obviously for the deadline five with the need to continually review the sites that are already in the document. Up until that point, it was more of a concern that a site that, because the councils may be under nondisclosure or etcetera, could come out of nowhere that we just hadn't had an opportunity to look at and therefore the information may be lacking? Not through any anybody's fault, but just that we nobody had the opportunity to be able to assess that that in detail for deadline five, if we didn't sort of agree a possible final day when we might be able to get that information.

01:10:33:02 - 01:10:33:27

Thank you. Okay.

01:10:33:29 - 01:10:34:29

Yeah. Understood.

01:10:36:23 - 01:10:43:16

I'm just asked Boston Borough Council if you've got anything to raise on cumulative assessment matters.

01:10:44:18 - 01:10:58:21

Thank you, ma'am. Yeah. Abby Marwood for Boston Borough Council. Just to confirm, we're comfortable with the list as it currently stands. And happy to enter into those discussions around final deadlines and dates. Any other projects that might come up, but no further comments other than that?

01:11:00:17 - 01:11:01:19

Thank you very much.

01:11:16:28 - 01:11:17:13

Yeah.

01:11:17:22 - 01:11:23:15

Nothing further to add on agenda item nine unless anybody else does.

01:11:25:08 - 01:11:33:06

Net agenda item ten is Statements of Common Ground. And we had an update yesterday.

01:11:34:29 - 01:11:39:24

But if there's anything else that the applicant would like to raise on this.

01:11:42:08 - 01:11:43:21

Nor Norway for the applicant.

01:11:44:01 - 01:11:44:27

No exact.

01:11:44:29 - 01:11:45:19

Same update as.

01:11:45:21 - 01:11:48:20

Yesterday. Can remember it again if it's helpful.

01:11:49:26 - 01:11:55:14

If so, the Statement of Common Grounds remain in discussion with all parties listed in the rule eight letter.

01:11:55:16 - 01:11:56:01

And.

01:11:56:03 - 01:11:56:24

Summarizing the statement of.

01:11:56:26 - 01:12:30:29

Commonality submitted at the deadline to the Statement of Common Ground is progressing in line with the other amendments, with the Development Consent Order and the outline plans. And there might be some matters in relation to the best, most versatile land that are unlikely to be agreed between the parties. By the close of the examination, Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board will be agreed once the commercial side agreement is finalized. Once the land agreement is concluded with the Environment Agency, the Statement of Common Ground can be finalized as well. National grid gas and National Grid electricity transmission can be finalized once the commercial side agreements are agreed.

01:12:31:21 - 01:13:01:27

National Grid Viking Link is requires the protective provisions to be agreed and a likely side agreement as well, so slightly different from the previous National Grid and State Natural England statement of Common Ground remains under discussion. As you noted this morning, there's further amendments there potentially to the outline soil management plan. But the district's licensed contract is progressing. So that's to achieve the letter of no impediment. Network rail remains under discussion.

01:13:02:20 - 01:13:11:28

May be capable of resolution of commercial agreement. Can be reached and try to Knoll will be progressed once the legal agreement is concluded, seeing as well.

01:13:14:08 - 01:13:15:21

Okay. Thank you very much.

01:13:18:02 - 01:13:23:18

To the relevant planning authorities, however, have anything to raise in relation to statements. Common ground.

01:13:25:29 - 01:13:26:14

No.

01:13:28:12 - 01:13:39:06

Okay. I've had no other matters notified to me on this agenda. And if there are any other matters which anyone wishes to raise.

01:13:43:19 - 01:13:45:07

This is your last chance.

01:13:48:05 - 01:13:48:20

Nope.

01:13:49:00 - 01:14:21:14

Nobody online. Okay, great. Um, so there are a number of actions arising again. And as suggested. They'll be published as soon as possible. Um, on on the website, along with the recordings and the transcript. Um, written summaries of oral submissions made. Stays should be submitted for deadline three. And that's the 5th of December. And just to say thank you for your helpful contributions.

01:14:21:16 - 01:14:43:25

I'm both in person and online and there are no other hearings from now on, so all submissions from now on will be in writing in accordance with the examination timetable. The time is now 1251, and this fourth issue specific hearing for Harkins and Fenn Solar Park is now closed. Thank you.