

## **Mallard Pass\_ISH1\_11 July\_PT2**

Created on: 2023-07-11 12:13:16

Project Length: 01:16:34

File Name: Mallard Pass\_ISH1\_11 July\_PT2

File Length: 01:16:34

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:12 - 00:00:11:02

Thank you. It's time to resume item three.

00:00:13:24 - 00:00:23:11

D we are up to, which is the applicant's approach to the Rochdale envelope, including project parameters and design guidance.

00:00:28:14 - 00:00:43:12

And could start just by asking the applicant just to briefly explain the relationship between the project parameters and. The design guidance and how that leads in to the Rochdale envelope approach.

00:00:44:28 - 00:00:52:01

Thanks to Mr. Fox and the applicant and will introduce Mr. Rob Pyle design, who will be able to explain that.

00:00:54:01 - 00:01:33:05

Okay. Thank you. Morning, says Rob Paul on behalf of the applicant. Um, just to kind of set out the overview and think it's in light of the need for a degree of flexibility at this stage of the design process. We've taken an iterative design approach process to establish Rochdale envelope for the purposes of the assessments and the parameters, the maximum and minimum parameters where relevant we have set out in Appendix 5.1 of the environmental statement, which is 2016.

00:01:33:16 - 00:02:26:27

So they set out the dimensional maximum and minimum parameters of the different components of the development and the work plans, which is 2004, illustrates the maximum spatial extents of the proposed developments within which the parameters of the individual components would set the relationship with the design guidance. The design guidance has been developed in light of the process that we've gone through, and that starts to set out the look and feel of some of the components of the proposed development where it's at this stage not possible to define exactly where some of those things would be located or there are a matter of detail regarding colour or precise location located within the works plans.

00:02:26:29 - 00:02:32:23

So it's a further degree design detail that will be addressed at the detailed design stage.

00:02:34:25 - 00:02:45:06

Thank you. In terms of what is in, uh, Ian being one of the adopted and the emerging, um.

00:02:46:22 - 00:03:24:12

And the need for good design. Of course, good design embraces aesthetic design and functional design. Both are obviously important in just in terms of aesthetic design and the level of detail that's in the design guidance. How is the design, how is the design guidance emerged in order to meet that particular policy requirement? Because understand the situation with the Rochdale envelope and the

need for a flexible approach, and that's also mentioned in policy as well. But there comes a point where the level of detail within the scheme in terms of what we're looking at is examining authority and what the Secretary of State will be looking at.

00:03:24:20 - 00:03:51:02

And obviously we need to be sort of satisfied that a design is capable of being achieved, that at the end of the day meets the policy, meets the policy tests, and in, for example, 4.66 of think it's the drafting in one talks about for substations or for example for substations the design you know the importance of the design and the sensitive use of materials. So with all that in mind, how is the design guidance actually been framed in terms of, you know, endeavouring to meet those objectives?

00:03:58:07 - 00:03:58:22

A.

00:04:00:07 - 00:04:40:27

On behalf of the applicant, I think it's worth just taking a step back and just setting out the approach to good design, and that's something we've considered right from the outset of the project. So when we first established the vision for the project and then we started to consider the National Infrastructure Commission design principles and we aligned with those established a set of project principles which provided a guiding framework for how the design has evolved from the inception to where we are to date and think it's important to recognize that good design is not just an output, but actually the process by which you go through the design process.

00:04:40:29 - 00:05:15:00

So that is equally important as part of the delivering good design is actually the look and feel of the design as an output. And the design and access statement are 2018. Sets out the design narrative of how we've delivered good sign over the course of the project, and the design guidance sits at the very end of that process as to where we are now to help ensure that good design aesthetically on some parts of the projects is delivered through the detailed design process.

00:05:16:14 - 00:05:26:13

Okay. Thank you. I presume it's the intention that the local authorities, when they determine the detailed design, when the individual applications put in the design guidance, will be utilized at that at that point?

00:05:27:09 - 00:05:28:13

Yes, that is correct.

00:05:28:15 - 00:06:01:06

And I can't remember if that's in the actual requirement or not. We can see the detail that I think a point coming from that is that, as said earlier, I'd like to make sure that local authorities who are responsible for determining those applications have a look at that design guidance and make sure that they are comfortable with that, because obviously that will breed into what the final appearance of parts of the scheme will look like. For example, we're not limited to the the substation because it appears to me that those design, the design guidance and obviously the parameters are are important in that respect.

00:06:01:08 - 00:06:20:23

And it's important that we're sure that those that obviously the parameters are the parameters, but the design guidance is a bit more sort of like slightly more sort of general. But the level of detail in there absolutely sufficient for what is being is being looked at. Obviously you think you think it is, but I'd be interested to get other comments perhaps at deadline for on on on that from others to

00:06:23:02 - 00:07:01:08

happen just to confirm that requirement 62 does require that the details that are submitted pursuant to that requirement must accord with the design guidance and the parameters. Okay. Thank you. And with that in mind, this is very general point. There are points, some parts of it maybe this could be subject to a further written question where it's, in my opinion, sort of slightly ambiguous in some of the wording as to where that might lead. I just wonder if, you know, a tightening up is, is it could benefit in that regard. Again, I'd be interested to hear the views of others, in particular the local authorities and obviously action group I'm sure will be presumably consulted on those applications when they come in.

00:07:01:11 - 00:07:10:02

Don't know. That's a discussion for Thursday. But if I could leave that point there and on the.

00:07:13:20 - 00:07:23:21

Is there anything else you wanted to say about the Rochester envelope parameters and design guidance? Other than that's being said, I'm clear what what's happening with with that. So I don't think we need sort of further discussion on that necessarily.

00:07:25:16 - 00:07:57:16

And just to briefly say that, think it just in context, the question you just asked is about the role of the guidance versus the role of parameters. And the parameters are deliberately specific, whereas the guidance is guidance. So in in in a way, the language is going to be less specific than the parameters. So the parameters have to be met, as I understand it, don't they? They are. If something is 12m high, it can't be 12.1m high and has to be much consultation on the design guidance with the local authority as much engagement on.

00:07:59:14 - 00:08:00:18

On those so far.

00:08:03:01 - 00:08:12:16

Not on the specifics of the design guidelines. The design principles I do believe were part of the consultation. Stage two, consult a statutory consultation. Okay.

00:08:14:12 - 00:08:15:01

Okay.

00:08:16:22 - 00:08:19:19

Mr. Hughes, did you have a point you wanted to raise at this point?

00:08:20:15 - 00:09:06:22

John Hughes An interested party. Going back to this project, parameters and design guidance. What was actually shown on the screens previously just relates to the actual solar panel arrays and structures. The detail that is missing and what we cannot actually comment on is the actual substation because there is no design detail to it other than a two dimensional drawing and a reference to a height of a 13.6m. And the visual impact from Glen Crescent is tremendous and there is nothing that is being submitted so far at stage one or stage two that I've been able to actually comment on because there has been no design detail.

00:09:08:03 - 00:09:29:14

Thank you. Mr.. You think? Was tempted to do this anyway? Was tempted to actually bypass point for the time being and go on to F, which is the proposed substation. I think your comment has prompted me to definitely do that because it probably does flow on follow on from what we've just

been discussing. So just ask my questions in relation to the substation because think they they pick up 1 or 2 of the points that you you have raised. So in terms of.

00:09:29:16 - 00:09:33:05

Two are linked. So project parameters, design guidance if.

00:09:34:00 - 00:09:58:00

On the sub station. Just the first, a very sort of general question. Have a very quick answer. One of the parameters is that it will be 12m away from Uffington Lane. I've probably missed something in this, but he just be absolutely clear which part will be. Approximately will be 12m away from a fountain lane. Will that be the fence or the boundary of the site? Or what was the intention.

00:09:58:02 - 00:10:05:08

On behalf of the applicant? It will be the fence that is surrounding the prime, the onsite substation compound.

00:10:05:15 - 00:10:12:09

And will the fence be on the actual boundary of the borderland for that particular work? Yeah.

00:10:12:25 - 00:10:26:09

The intention, as shown in the illustrative elevations that we submitted in response to your first written questions, shows the fence around the perimeter of the substation compound.

00:10:29:15 - 00:10:54:09

Okay. And on. And if there is a is there any illustrator material that's available to put upon the. Screen while I'm asking the next question. There is then, by all means, by all means, put it up and I'll come back to you, Mrs. Holloway, on on levels for the substation. I think the response to a question like this, that question 1.04 and the. And.

00:10:56:14 - 00:10:59:08

I think the response said that the there'll be a level platform.

00:11:01:00 - 00:11:45:00

We said with no cut. That. My question is because I understand that that piece of land is sloping at the moment. I've been there and I'm pretty sure it is. There's a slope of, you know, some significance. And to get to the bottom of is how would that sloping land be taken into into account if there isn't no cut? And presumably it says a level platform will be made, but can only assume that the level platform will involve the the bringing in the import of materials to raise it. And you have this what sounds to me like a rather strange situation where you have a lap level platform above the angle of the the land, which had a sort of question about and obviously what would be the visual implications of that because of thought it would be the best way to do it the other way around.

00:11:45:02 - 00:12:20:02

Actually, you do have a cut and you go into the slope so that it would it would zoom. That may help to a certain degree with its visual appearance. So if you could just clarify that and I think it would be helpful as well to have an indicative cross-section plan of how the substation might appear. Obviously, it will be indicative. And is this all considered in the. It goes back to my point about the design action statement is has this actually been considered in there? Because I'm not sure it has at the moment. And it's an example of the level of detail that perhaps would be helpful at this stage, which isn't already in the in the application details.

00:12:22:12 - 00:12:56:23

So. On behalf of the applicant, I'll try and provide a summary to a number of questions in there and think we provided in our response to your question on this point, to just reiterate that the, the location of the substation shown on the illustrative masterplans is just for illustrative purposes only. The works plans allow for the substation, the two hectare substation, which is the footprint which is set out in the premises appendix to be located anywhere within the field.

00:12:56:25 - 00:13:38:02

19. It's not specific to the location shown on the initiative layouts and the detailed design. Um, when we come to the detailed design of the substation, which will be driven by the technology that is chosen and the suppliers of the electrical equipment, the configuration of the layout that is shown on screen may change as well. So there may be an opportunity in which to reconfigure that site or orientate that site, that substation layout to better fit with the suggestions, like you said, in terms of balancing cut and fill.

00:13:38:04 - 00:14:09:06

But that that's a matter for detailed design and we haven't done that at this stage. But what would clarify is that the landscape and visual impact assessment, which will be talked about in more detail tomorrow, believe has assessed worst case of that level platform with 13m high. So it's assessed the the parameter of that 13 metre high Rochdale envelope box for the two hectare site located anywhere within field 19.

00:14:11:12 - 00:14:29:24

Looking back to that. Excuse me. Think we will come back to that tomorrow because think they've got several questions that result from from what you've just you've just said. Thank you for that answer. We'll come back to those during landscape and visual because that's more about the assessment of things rather than talking about the actual scope of development. But that that is helpful. Thank you. And.

00:14:38:15 - 00:14:41:00

Will you be attending tomorrow for the landscape session?

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

Because

00:14:43:13 - 00:14:48:06

I will be here with my colleague. To the left of me is also the landscape expert. So he'll be here as well.

00:14:49:03 - 00:15:25:15

Okay. Think Will. I was going to ask about how is the assessment being done in terms of and how is the guidance being established in terms of the various components of the substation? Because the substation is going to be quite a major part of the the development. You know, substations sometimes are not the most attractive aesthetically. Some might be. I don't know. But but but I'd be interested to know more about how actually the landscape and visual assessment has assessed the proposed substation in particular, plus other things in terms of where parts will go, where components will go, and also the need to minimise visual effects and how that's all been taken into account.

00:15:25:20 - 00:15:34:04

Think we can consider that given the time today that tomorrow in the morning session on landscape and visual? Uh.

00:15:36:05 - 00:15:46:08

To my last question at this point before Miss Holloway, she's got a point to make is. Can you just give some more explanation about how we ask the question about this?

00:15:48:27 - 00:16:30:01

In writing how the the substation was said share the same site as the primary construction compound. And I'm still not quite sure how that will actually work. Obviously there's a sort of quite a large area of land, and I'm still not quite sure how you'll go from having a primary construction compound. And my understanding of primary construction compounds, although we've not got indicative drawings on in this case, which I think would be helpful. We haven't got one before is at the moment. Is that how that can be reconciled with having this, you know, the proposed substation and how that will actually work and how you move from having a primary construction compound to having the substation? I'm not absolutely clear how that will all be reconciled on what is the same thinking.

00:16:30:03 - 00:16:32:05

Right. And saying is the same the same piece of land.

00:16:34:14 - 00:17:10:26

On behalf of the applicant. I think what we're seeking to achieve through this point is best illustrated on the works plans where the works extents for the substation and also the primary construction compound overlap and utilize the entire extensive field 19, which is six hectares in size in its entirety. The onsite substation compound is a maximum of two hectares, the location of which will be determined and configuration will be determined at the detailed design stage.

00:17:10:28 - 00:17:53:00

What we're seeking to do at this moment in time is to allow flexibility for the contractor as and when they come forward to look at the sequencing and phasing of the construction of the onsite substation compounds and the timing of the area that is needed for the primary construction compounds. And if there is a possibility to make use of whether that's for the entire duration of the construction period or part of the construction period, that there's possibility of dual use to reduce or make it more efficient or reduce the need for important material.

00:17:53:02 - 00:18:07:00

We want to retain that flexibility at this point in time. So we're not saying that the two things have to be separate. We are saying that we're wanting the flexibility. Should they be able to offer a dual use, that we are able to deliver that dual use.

00:18:13:15 - 00:18:39:15

Okay. Thank you. One final question on this. How many parking spaces? Would be required for the dashboard. This is for the actual primary compound. As we're talking about this. I'm not sure the detail on how many parking spaces, but in terms of reading detail about the fact that people will be driving to the site, how many is there? A number of you can come back to this at deadline for? Perhaps if that's good, it'll be helpful to know how many parking spaces would be included in the primary construction comp.

00:18:39:21 - 00:18:40:19

I'll need to come back to six.

00:18:40:27 - 00:18:48:12

And I'd probably go on from that saying an indicative layout plan for the primary construction compound I think would be quite, um,

00:18:50:13 - 00:19:34:06

if one of those could be considered. And on behalf of the applicant. Mean you would have seen that both you mentioned earlier the the cross-section and the primary compound layout. Um, we said we felt we weren't able to do that for the questions and obviously we will consider it because we hear that you've said it again. Um, but just to emphasize at this point that anything we do produce could only ever be indicative just for the room. Um, also just wanted to make one, one other point. We move off to substation and thinking about whatever discussion we may have tomorrow, which is just to emphasize really that the, the question of the design of the substation itself, um, as a piece of kit, um, is that it is a piece of electrical infrastructure.

00:19:34:22 - 00:20:07:08

Um, and that there are very limited or no um, controls apart from the paint essentially, which we have put into the guidance that you, that can really, um, so what the substation looks like. Um, because it is essentially a electrical kit. What I would say is that obviously the, the mitigation comes from your siting of it. And Mr. Powell started to talk about the various factors that we've done in terms of this location close to the substation relationship to the site.

00:20:07:24 - 00:20:41:29

Um, and being surrounded by a strong network of vegetation. Um, and I think it's important to note that, you know, you've rightly raised the question of the onshore substation is something that is raising lots of projects, including in particular offshore wind. Um, and we're there. The question is more about again, the siting and the vegetation and mitigation around it rather than the, the design of the piece of kit itself. Um, now I appreciate and we'll get into detail of what's been assessed and the questions of layout and how that's been considered as important, but just wanted to set that stall out quite early in terms of.

00:20:43:00 - 00:21:14:21

I don't think there's really going to be a control on what the substation looks like at bit of kit as opposed to where it sits and how that relates to the mitigation around it. Okay. Understand that. But also paragraph 4.66 of eight drafty in one think does talk in particular or it provides a sort of a mentions substation in the context of design. And it does talk about the consideration of the design and sensitive use of materials, which maybe gives an idea of what the proposed thinking there is of the in in one rather. And we said sorry.

00:21:15:00 - 00:21:49:13

And then we have in the the reference design guidance 3.7, which talks about the requirement for the colors and the materials for the built components to be sensitive to the context. And. So it comes down to the question that always comes down with good design of the functional aesthetics versus the the the location in which it sits. Um, so just want to make the point that we've got to think as far as we can in terms of guidance for the kids. But appreciate, you want to talk about how we've assessed it and the layout and how it sits and surroundings.

00:21:49:19 - 00:21:53:29

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mrs. Holloway, did you have anything you wanted to add on?

00:21:54:01 - 00:22:27:06

Yes, Thank you. Two points, really. Just to draw attention in preparation for tomorrow, there is a photo montage app which actually gives an illustrative appearance of the substation taken from the main A6 one two, one. But that is not in accordance with where they're saying the substation will be in field 19. It's far closer to the railway line and therefore subsequently also closer to residents. Some residents on the A6 one two, one and Glen Crescent.

00:22:27:08 - 00:22:49:18

So think that sort of anomaly tomorrow needs to be sorted just by way of clarification for I believe it was 150 parking places that were being provisioned for in the primary construction compound.

However, there should be also consideration that they said that the workforce could go up to 400 at a peak. And how would that be accommodated? Thank you.

00:22:50:29 - 00:22:54:19

Thank you, Mr. Toby. Did you say photo montage? Yes.

00:22:54:21 - 00:23:08:05

Yeah. No lie. Sorry. Yes. Okay. It seems it may be out of date, that photo montage, but it is going to be a crucial piece of assessment for the landscape and visual as it's a very sensitive view.

00:23:08:09 - 00:23:21:10

Thank you. I'm sure you've already noted that. And that can be picked up and prepared for. So that can be discussed tomorrow. Okay. Thank you. Any further points on? The proposed substation

00:23:23:12 - 00:23:24:10

is the fossil.

00:23:26:19 - 00:23:32:23

Uh, do we have any information in terms of what the noise of this substation will generate?

00:23:33:00 - 00:23:35:05

Bearing in mind the closeness of.

00:23:35:07 - 00:23:37:07

The residents of Glenn Close and.

00:23:37:09 - 00:23:38:09

Other residents.

00:23:38:11 - 00:23:39:03

Along the main.

00:23:39:07 - 00:23:57:01

I've got questions about that on Wednesday or Thursday morning as part of environmental matters. So if we could just stick to the scope today. But I think it's probably a valid question because I've got a question or two on that, but think that'll be subject to the the environmental matters hearing there. Okay. If.

00:24:00:10 - 00:24:18:26

I'll come back to it. See on the arrays in the panels, but we can just go on to G, which is details of solar stations and other equipment and. Just for absolute clarity. I think I understand it now. I didn't quite understand it at first as to what is quite the

00:24:20:12 - 00:24:39:13

there's a solar station and there's a container. What is the difference between the the two? The term is interchanged a little bit. Think in the environmental statement project description chapter. It's not entirely clear on the reading of that as to what the differences are between the two. Could you just clarify that so everyone is aware of what the differences are?

00:24:40:25 - 00:25:32:20

Yes. Robert Paul on behalf of the applicant, the term solar station is used to refer to collection of electrical equipment ranging from inverters, transformers and switchgear. And they may also contain a storage container which will be co-located with the solar stations throughout the solar PV sites. The



term container is also sometimes used to refer to a transformer container or an inverter container because depending on the selection of technology which is chosen, you can either get individually outdoor housed units for an inverter switchgear in the transformer or there is the possibility of them being all housed within a single container.

00:25:32:22 - 00:25:47:02

So we've tried to use the word solar station to describe the collection of those pieces of electrical equipment, because depending on the chosen technology, it could be a container or a cabinet.

00:25:47:20 - 00:26:00:20

Okay. And so it's the the parameters is the solar station whereby parameters are provided, isn't it, rather than containers. I think I'm right in saying without the document. Yes, that is correct.

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

Within the parameters, we've set a maximum height of the elements within a solar station at 3.2m.

00:26:09:28 - 00:26:13:29

And why in the parameters is the no parameters for size?

00:26:16:02 - 00:26:40:25

Fit. There's a parameter for footprint, which is if we ask a question about this and that's quite large in terms of the actual width, length, depth or whatever, why is the no parameters included for solar station for that? And how does that then sort of go into the assessment of, again, the landscape for visual assessments in terms of how they were were assessed maybe moving on to tomorrow. But in terms of that first question, why would the no, why are there no parameters for that?

00:26:42:05 - 00:27:36:24

The the primary reason for setting the height parameter was to ensure that the solar stations were seen in the context of the solar PV arrays. So they have a lower maximum height parameter. So we'll sit within the solar arrays and distributed throughout the site so they wouldn't be necessarily seen as much greater heights than the arrays themselves, given that given that they sit within the arrays, we didn't feel it was necessary to set a width and length parameter at this stage, given the size and the flexibility that we're seeking, whether it's a within a container or within a individually outdoors outdoor house, the cabinet.

00:27:40:14 - 00:27:49:07

Okay, Will again think I'll ask for the questions about that in the landscape and visual assessment or session tomorrow.

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

Air.

00:27:52:27 - 00:28:12:20

And in terms of numbers of solar stations or containers, again, there's no maximum parameters in terms of the maximum numbers of those who think there's something dependent on the per megawatts produced. Why wasn't a number able to be put in? Is that simply because there's no maximum output?

00:28:13:26 - 00:28:36:22

That's correct. So there are there are a number of assumptions which we clarified in our response that relate to number of strings per inverter and the number of inverters per transformer and the the agricultural land assessment has assessed. Um, the amount of land lost to solar stations.

00:28:37:28 - 00:29:22:19

And in terms of the being actual the talk before about the actual capacity of the grid. So there is sort of a point of which there will be effectively, even though it's not in the application, it sounds as though the effectively there is likely to be a capacity which is on the actual capacity of the existing substation unless there were enhancements to that. Why can't there be a maximum number put in in terms of sort of moving onto landscape visual assessments and looking at the spread of those across the site? Because it would be in many ways quite helpful, I'm sure, for residents living nearby to actually know sort of generally sort of what the actual number is, different parameters on the parameters in terms of distance from residential properties on footpaths, but there's not parameter in terms of how many of these per particular space and appreciate it to.

00:29:22:21 - 00:29:33:25

There are indicative plans, as has been already said, they're merely indicative but don't quite understand why they can't have been a a maximum number put in. Just to give people an idea of how many they're looking at across the site.

00:29:35:18 - 00:30:13:04

Go up and think. It goes back to the points we were discussing this morning and won't reiterate some points that my colleague Mr. Gillett was making in terms of over planting and the installed capacity that we're seeking. But depending on that and the technology that is chosen to be selected and delivered at the site may impact the number of solar stations that we require. And we don't feel it's necessary to put up a limit on those at this stage, subject to detailed design.

00:30:13:06 - 00:30:36:18

But I think as you've as you've picked up the noise assessment and we have considered where they are located and assessed the impacts of those solar stations in close proximity to residential dwellings or public rights of way. And you come on, touch upon it again tomorrow about the landscape and visual impacts of those solar stations within the PV arrays.

00:30:38:19 - 00:31:07:20

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. To that, Mr. Fox. It was just to note that something we didn't touch on so much this morning is obviously the the work of the. That's right. It was the whole converting the DC to AC and the inverters transformers, which are a key part of achieving that for the solar farm to work as a whole and taking that into account and the overlapping discussions we had earlier and

00:31:09:18 - 00:31:24:28

the different panels that might be brought forward. It's all it's all interrelated to the decisions that are made about whether the types of panels, technological advances and the need to do the DC to AC. Okay. Conversion. Okay. Thank you. And.

00:31:26:17 - 00:31:31:17

Mrs. Holloway, Mrs. Holloway, having missed her hand up before from Mrs. Smith. So apologize. Uh.

00:31:33:10 - 00:31:36:26

It was a virtual hand. But, Mrs. Holloway, you go first, and then I'll ask if Mrs. Smith wants to speak.

00:31:37:02 - 00:32:07:09

Mrs. Holloway, Past Action group. Think just a question for the applicant in understanding why they did have some of these parameters in the peer document in terms of the maximum number of containers. But yet when it came to the application, this information has been removed. So, you know, appreciate there are different design alternatives, but there will always be a worst case scenario. And obviously there was data at the peer stage. Surely that data could have been re reviewed and included within the application.

00:32:07:15 - 00:32:08:00

Thank you.

00:32:09:23 - 00:32:12:12

Okay. Thank you. If you'd like to respond to that, please.

00:32:14:09 - 00:32:49:28

The rover on behalf of the applicant. The the information that was based presented in the pair was based on the initiative masterplans the initiative layouts, which are just one interpretation of how the parameters could be implemented on the sites. And that information was based on that initiative masterplan layouts. But and that's that. Just to be clear, the illustrative masterplan layout hasn't been the basis of the assessment. It's the parameters following the Rochdale envelope that has been the basis of the assessment presented within the environmental statement.

00:32:52:24 - 00:33:16:06

Okay. And I think we can talk more about the actual visual landscape impact tomorrow as required. Uh, can I just ask online, Mrs. Smith? Sorry I missed you earlier on. Think you had your hand up and. Sorry. It's just difficult trying to keep track of everyone's hands online and in the room. Or at least I found that difficult. But, Mrs. Smith, is there anything you would like to say? You might have wanted to say something about the substation, I suspect, rather than this. But don't. No.

00:33:16:29 - 00:33:40:04

No. You, um. Sorry, sir. Thank you. Um, Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. I just wanted to clarify, um, paragraph 4.7.2 of the transport assessment states, there's 150 car parking spaces on the main, the primary compound for parking.

00:33:40:23 - 00:33:56:18

Thank you. Think Mr. Holloway raised that point as well. So. Yeah. Thank you both for for reminding me of that. Okay. Thank you. At Item H is the proposed cable routes, including the crossing of the East Coast Main Line railway,

00:33:58:08 - 00:34:32:17

the impacts of which and people's comments on which will probably form or form more helpfully under the relevant sections of of noise etcetera. And also I suspect at the compulsory acquisition hearing. But just wanted to ask the reason for this item really was just asked for the applicant to update on what the current situation is on the options for the crossing of the East Coast mainline, including obviously in relation to that discussions with Network Rail.

00:34:32:28 - 00:35:10:28

So I'm not so much asking you for comments on the implications of that that will come, but just so we can be clear on what the current situation is from the applicant, Mr. Fox The applicant. So we've had really positive discussions with Network Rail, um, provisionally agreed and the basic asset protection agreement with them is agreed. Our proposal is to do put cables on a train through the arch structure. Um, and they've informally indicated that they are happy with that, but we obviously need to get that formally confirmed to, to, to know that that is confirmed.

00:35:11:23 - 00:35:46:16

And just also just wanted to emphasize that, um, you know, we recognise that residents are concerned about the impacts of the cable going through the village and we want to resolve as much, as much as they do, um, to get an agreed position with, with network, with network rail and as we said in our written responses, think until we've got the confidence for Network Rail that they have kind of signed

off on our engineering design, we need to keep that optionality open. Um, but once we, once we have that, then, you know, we would be putting forward drafting to do deal with that point.

00:35:46:29 - 00:36:17:16

Um, I should say that the discussions have been positive. So we are hopeful that we would be able to do that, um, quite a bit before the end of examination. Okay. That's going to be my next question. Was it's helpful to have that update, but actually what is the timetable for it? Because obviously there's, there's one of my questions it was was to is that why why is all this being resolved now when presumably it was known quite some time ago that it needed to be a crossing? And why now? We're examination stage.

00:36:17:18 - 00:36:31:24

We have these three options and all of a sudden there seems to be quite a lot of of action taking place and sounds reasonably obviously optimistic in terms of at least having a one crossing point. But why has that been left to now rather than in the build up to the application

00:36:33:14 - 00:37:06:26

path that you can? It hasn't been left till now and it's the process of engaging with network Rail. Um, can sometimes be a slow process, but they are now now engaging and they have more people in their team who have been engaging with the applicant. So it's not for want of trying. And um, you know, people have raised concerns about the fact that the in their reps they about the cabling being on the ground and being something that came later on in the stage one two process.

00:37:06:28 - 00:37:49:14

And that was partly because we've not been able to make as much progress we'd hoped for with Network Rail, and so we had to provide for the optionality. Okay. Well, Network Rail unfortunately can't comment on that because not. Well, I would ask them and you said well before the end of the examination or words to that extent, think what's the time, what's the current timetable? Because when I read your previous response, I think it gave the indication that it wouldn't be before the end of the examination timetable, or perhaps that was from Network Rail, I don't know. But there was a it resulted in the question from us as to what is the timetable, what is the realistic timetable and what are the actual impediments to actually committing to a final decision so that by the end of the examination, those three options are removed down to down to one in the in the documents.

00:37:49:16 - 00:38:26:15

If that is something that is possible. Because think your answer before in writing said that you still need the three options in there. Yes. So the application I think just just to say that in terms of progress, the the basic agreement has been exchanged 2 or 3 times between the parties now. So that's why I say fairly confident that it will be able to be to be agreed. Um, I think though an important point to make that the reason that we haven't put any kind of controls on this as of yet is because we need to keep all options open, not just on the basis that it might be a situation where the amount of cabling that is needed for somebody to go in more than one place, we don't want to do that.

00:38:26:17 - 00:38:29:04

We want to have one cable, um,

00:38:30:19 - 00:39:17:09

cable connection route. Um, and, but until we know from Network Rail that they are happy with the technical design, including for all the cabling we might need, um, we need to keep all options open. Um, and what I would also say is that as much as we think. We are going to be able to make good progress. When? Well, by the end of examination. It's kind of a two stage process there. We need them to be happy with the solution and signed up to the basic APA. But there is also the position that, as you may be aware of the amount of different paperwork the network rail requires may mean that

even if we make progress in one aspect, the overall deal, particularly in the context that they require consent under the pipes, may not be finished in time before the end of examination.

00:39:17:11 - 00:39:47:10

So what I would say is that I don't think we will get to a point where we will ever reduce the 3 to 1 and say in our application materials and what we seek to get consent for that we will only do this option, what we will do once we've got confidence that it can be one of the two is provide for drafting, which requires us to only be able to use our powers in respect of one and to notify the and others to when when that is been.

00:39:48:09 - 00:40:33:24

Confirmed. So the position will be that we will have there will be a control to say that we can only use one routes, but we won't amend the documentation to only be able to use my routes. If you have names that might mean that, but essentially the control imposed there will be the three routes would still in. So in terms of what we have to assess and what the Secretary state would have to assess would be the implications of those of all three routes, but only one would be used. But we we don't think think the hope is that we will, as I said, be able to put drafting, which essentially says in very short order, you can either go down or there is the other go via network rail, but you can't do both.

00:40:34:03 - 00:40:43:12

But at the moment you must only do one of those two. But at the moment there is a possibility that we may need to do one of the two network rail options or and

00:40:45:01 - 00:41:15:02

so in terms of assessments, I'm not quite sure how much it actually moves the things along in terms of what needs to be assessed, both in terms of and environmental. But is it possible for actually a timetable provided and what your sort of ongoing discussions will are planning to be between now and the end of examination with Network Rail in order to try and get this forward as far as possible before it's from my point of view, I don't think it's particularly helpful to have options to be considered. Certainly sort of, you know, it increases the complexity, etcetera.

00:41:15:10 - 00:41:48:12

And but it would be, you know, think all endeavors should be made to try and get to an option if it's at all, if it's at all possible. And it would be quite helpful to have a timetable to see what the what the progress of negotiations proposed to be, etcetera with network Rail. And it might be helpful, you know, for them to have that as well. Yes. So we will do that deadline for on Friday. In the hearing, we have person who's been doing the direct negotiations with them here for that agenda item. But we will do that for the time for just obviously with the caveat that any timetable that involved two parties is not entirely in our control, but we will do what we can.

00:41:48:22 - 00:41:51:03

Okay. Okay. Think that can be picked up

00:41:53:07 - 00:42:10:24

on Friday in terms of further obviously implications. Of it. I don't want to talk about the effects of of that. On residents in Amsterdam is anything that anyone wants just by the point of clarification anyone wants to make or is that is that clear what the position is? Okay.

00:42:12:14 - 00:42:14:09

Right. Thank you, Mr. Fox. Yeah.

00:42:19:03 - 00:42:50:21

The next item. And no, it's still got panels to deal with. The next item is fencing and cameras. Uh, we've got half an hour to lunch, so I think we'll probably just be able to get through what we need to get through. Um, on fencing the parameters, state fencing consisting of wooden posts and metal wire mesh, which will be up to two meters in height. And think there's been representations about whether or not this will provide for appropriate security and whether or not the scheme can be properly insured, etcetera.

00:42:50:23 - 00:43:20:28

I'm sure you've read those representations. Uh. Can you just provide a sort of response? No, there's been some response provided already in your written comments on on the written representations. But can you just summarize what that response is? And, and is there any particular evidence from other. Recent solar farms. And it might be argued that there are not existing solar farms of the scale of this one, where it has been appropriate to use the fencing that is proposed rather than fencing, that might be more.

00:43:21:27 - 00:43:27:06

Security sort of conscious, but might not be as aesthetically pleasing, perhaps.

00:43:35:06 - 00:44:10:13

I'm Robert Paul. On behalf of the applicant. I think I'd probably just like to point out, when you travel through the countryside, you do see solar farms all throughout the countryside, throughout the UK, and it's a common occurrence that this type of fencing is used as security measures commonly on solar farms throughout the UK and they're monitored through CCTV and the applicant feels that that is a suitable security Pence mechanism for the proposed development.

00:44:13:00 - 00:44:23:01

Okay. Is there any comment? Forget. Think it was no multiple action group raised this. Do you want miss the hallway, John, to come back to what's been said with your comments on that, please.

00:44:23:11 - 00:44:54:09

Mrs. Holloway for Mallard Past Action Group. I think we raised it because we're part of the Solar Campaign Alliance, which is a culmination of a whole number of groups, nearly 90 action groups. And therefore, we get a lot of feedback about what's going on elsewhere around the country. And increasingly, we're finding that solar crime is going up because the valuable items are very accessible. It's not very difficult to get through the fencing, get in and out quickly before anyone actually comes out to a rural area to repair it.

00:44:54:12 - 00:45:42:18

And that's increasingly Dakotas and. Insurance companies. Now, some insurance companies are starting to specify that you need a certain level of security fencing, otherwise they won't insure it. Now, from the action group's point of view, the last thing we would want is security fencing from a visual perspective. However, we want to ensure that the worst case scenario is put into this assessment because there has been a case and can give details in a written submission afterwards where this has been handled retrospectively after an application was approved and then subsequently they've had to go back in and put security fencing in and there was no assessment of the impacts of that because it was retrospective after planning.

00:45:42:25 - 00:46:04:05

So we just want to be sure, I'm sure the applicant doesn't want to put in security fencing because it will cost a fortune. I'm sure it's the last thing they want to do, but they can they categorically confirm that, you know, in no no event, no eventuality, by the time they need to come to insure that they will have a problem with insurance.

00:46:04:07 - 00:46:12:18

And the other scheme that you referred to. By all means, do provide details of that. Do you know what the reasons why they presumably the intent originally intended fencing was not able to.

00:46:12:20 - 00:46:42:16

It's just it's not stock fencing, it's just two metres high. And the problem is that people can't get out to these rural areas quick enough so people can operate. You know, there's rural crime games and they know exactly and they go back repeatedly sometimes as well because they just cannot be people can't get to the area quick enough. And when you've got a site of this size potentially within CIPs coming up, this will become a bigger problem because to guard a site of 2000 acres, it's going to be a challenge.

00:46:43:18 - 00:46:44:15

Okay. Thank you.

00:46:46:04 - 00:46:50:12

If you want to respond to that. But again, sort of situation, which.

00:46:52:17 - 00:47:27:28

That it's in something that's in the parameters. It's something that can be agreed by the by the local planning authorities in the in the requirement. But is there any risk that the actual what is proposed now might need to be changed at all for based on what's been said for, for example, for insurance purposes? Because at that stage by the time that it might be quite difficult and possibly quite difficult for the council to resist something like that, if that's the only thing holding up, don't know. It might be wrong, don't know. But sometimes, you know, it can be actually quite difficult to resist certain changes to schemes later on where that is absolutely necessary because circumstances have have changed.

00:47:28:00 - 00:47:38:18

Know there are things in this application that could allow, you know, minor changes etcetera, and I'm sure you'll come back on that. But in terms of Mrs. Holloway's point, is there any risk at all?

00:47:41:14 - 00:48:14:21

I mean, I was just going to emphasize the requirement. Eight means that any fencing has to be approved by the RPAs. Um, at this stage, no, we don't. We don't see the need for that. But I would also just emphasize Mr. Paul's point that, um, Canadian solar wind and make up the SPV have extensive experience in developing solar projects. So we are well used to knowing how things to work, um, as a multinational business will be well used to the understanding and the risks that are arising from security.

00:48:15:00 - 00:48:32:08

Um, so we've put forward a proposal on the basis of what we think is appropriate. Okay. Mr. Holloway, by deadline for you want us to provide that example, but set out your knowledge of the reasons why that was changed might be quite harmful. So why it went from one to the other and the actual reasons, reasons for that. Mr. Orvis.

00:48:33:21 - 00:48:48:01

Tell me what was excuse me, past Action group. If you look on the websites of some insurers, solar farms, they already refer to having greater level of security fencing than deer fencing.

00:48:50:11 - 00:49:07:19

Okay. Unfortunately, I'm bound by not looking at other websites for evidence on the application, so I'm reliant upon parties to send me any evidence that they think sort of supportive of their case. But I do see lots of solar farms when I travel around the country these days. Okay, so.

00:49:10:09 - 00:49:10:26

On.

00:49:11:12 - 00:49:18:07

And in terms of the fencing for the substation, that's going to be different. That's going to be palisade fencing up to three meters in height. That's a.

00:49:23:20 - 00:49:25:07

Yes, that's a separate parameter.

00:49:25:12 - 00:49:28:11

That's a separate parameter. And of the.

00:49:29:27 - 00:49:40:22

Space on the CCTV cameras and proposed lighting and lighting columns. The actual spacing. What's the actual spacing of those? Likely to be.

00:49:42:12 - 00:49:56:06

I don't think that's a particular parameter. But what's the actual. I can't remember. Actually. The number of those is proposed is probably not. Don't know. But what happens when you're walking along one of the footpaths, What's the expectation of what one would see when this when this

00:49:58:00 - 00:50:04:03

but when it's been developed as to how many, how many light columns and how many camera columns we've see.

00:50:04:23 - 00:50:53:28

Robert Paul, on behalf of the applicant, think the number and the spacing will be down to a matter of detailed design depending on the selection of the technology, the CCTV technology and what the range and distance is between each of the cameras needed to see it alongside the internal area of the fencing. Think in terms of your experience as you move along the footpath and my colleague Mr. Crew, can expand on this if need be, that once the mitigation vegetation is established, that the visibility through the public rights of way towards the security fencing and CCTV cameras will be substantially screened from users of the public right of way.

00:50:54:08 - 00:51:15:26

And if there isn't a sort of spacing in the parameters though, how can then the landscape of visual assessment make its assessment? If there's no actual knowledge of what the spacing of these would be, notwithstanding your point about screening. But there's also points being raised about how long it sorry, how long it would take screening to actually properly establish, but there's no actual parameters. How can they how can they be properly assessed?

00:51:17:12 - 00:51:23:10

Parameters on spacing don't mean actual height. We've got those. But in terms of the actual frequency of of how they will appear.

00:51:23:18 - 00:51:34:05

I will defer to my colleague, Mr. Crouch. And I do wonder whether that's a matter, a detailed matter for the landscape and visual impacts assessment in the round in terms of how the



00:51:35:22 - 00:51:46:20

has assessed the parameters of the scheme. So do you want to briefly touch upon that now or would you do you want to hold on to that for tomorrow's session? I'm happy to.

00:51:46:22 - 00:51:55:12

Do it tomorrow with time marching on, but I think it's a point that would like to be picked up. So that can be, you know, and consider it again, consideration as to whether or not there needs to be further

00:51:56:27 - 00:52:07:15

matters put in the guidance or whether or not parameters can be changed. At this stage, I don't know. But whether or not there actually can be changes to to make things more sort of certain in terms of what what's going to be looked at.

00:52:07:17 - 00:52:09:06

We'll make sure we pick up tomorrow.

00:52:11:15 - 00:52:12:03

Yes.

00:52:13:00 - 00:52:16:27

It is. In terms of the screening. Mean, we've got two.

00:52:16:29 - 00:52:23:18

Seasons, we've got summer and we've got winter. And has consideration been given to what the effect of.

00:52:23:20 - 00:52:24:13

The screening will be.

00:52:24:15 - 00:52:25:06

In winter when.

00:52:25:08 - 00:52:25:23

There's no.

00:52:25:25 - 00:52:30:08

Leaves on hedges, tree or some trees, etcetera, it will be surely.

00:52:30:10 - 00:52:34:16

Far more visible from footpaths and things like that and roads.

00:52:35:04 - 00:52:41:23

Probably a matter for tomorrow, but it's probably a simple answer to it as well. So if you want to come back quickly just to cover that point now because think know the answer.

00:52:42:12 - 00:52:57:25

Yes. Good afternoon. So Ben Crete, landscape architect for the Multipath scheme. The simple answer is yes. That's been considered as part of the assessment. So the assessment is based on winter conditions, the worst case, to put it that way, visual. That will be optimum.

00:52:57:27 - 00:52:59:06

Visibility of the proposal.

00:53:02:03 - 00:53:05:10

Okay. Thank you. And internal access.

00:53:05:12 - 00:53:06:07

Routes.

00:53:08:13 - 00:53:09:00

Uh.

00:53:11:26 - 00:53:51:16

There's an indication of where these might be, but I don't think at the moment there's an indication or details of the full extent of the access routes. Which I think certainly drafty and free. Think it's paragraph three, ten. Two, two and three. Ten two four. Indicates that indicate the application should include the full extent of the access routes and an assessment of their effects. And think by access routes. That's meant to also include internal access routes as well as access routes to the scheme. But that's a question that I have as to what your interpretation of that is, because obviously in this case we've not got details of the actual locations of those access routes or only indicative details.

00:53:55:16 - 00:54:21:25

Robert Paul on behalf of the applicant. The access routes have been assessed within the environmental statement in terms of their impact on agricultural land. The the layout of them is not fixed and we have put in place some design guidance that will help to influence their location at the detailed design stage.

00:54:24:15 - 00:54:25:05

Okay.

00:54:25:10 - 00:54:27:20

There's a deadline for you could just address the

00:54:29:18 - 00:54:39:12

the the three point draft. The in three point which is paragraph 3.1, two, two and 3.1, two four, where it says that the application should include the full extent of the access routes.

00:54:41:15 - 00:55:06:06

My reading of it is that it should includes the internal access routes as well, but it'd be helpful to get your response and that. We can do would just say initially that 310 two four follows after two three, which talks about access routes being constructed to public road network as well as on site. So yes, we'll make we'll make written submissions. Thank you. I think Mr. Kentish had

00:55:07:24 - 00:55:09:27

his hand up before Mr. Kent. Yes.

00:55:10:05 - 00:55:45:12

Thank you. David Kentish. Bryce from Wilson Parish Council. Just an observation that there seems to be, um, when it comes to the words detailed design, absolutely nothing coming forward. And I would have thought at this stage in the proceedings that the majority of these things where the questions are being asked to show on the plans and on the submission, where lighting is going to be, where substations are going to be, where pathways are going to be, basically where anything's going to be, um, should have been resolved by now.

00:55:45:14 - 00:55:57:24

And that's a concern for me because think it allows for too many unknowns to suddenly come out of the woodwork at a later stage. And I find that quite unsettling.

00:56:00:13 - 00:56:01:15

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kent.

00:56:02:06 - 00:56:03:18

Would it be happy to give an.

00:56:03:20 - 00:56:04:10

Explanation.

00:56:04:15 - 00:56:07:05

Of that? Just for reassurance? So, Gareth Phillips, the applicant.

00:56:07:20 - 00:56:08:15

Essentially.

00:56:09:03 - 00:56:40:04

When we're thinking about a, it's helpful to think of it in basic terms like an outline planning permission. So essentially, if you were building 200 new homes, you'd apply for outline planning permission and the detail of each of those homes and sign guidance, things like that would be secured by a condition on the planning permission. The principle is much the same here. So essentially there are a number of design parameters that are assessed so that we can present the worst case scenario, and that's what we're required to assess from an environmental impact assessment perspective.

00:56:40:09 - 00:57:11:02

What then follows? Assuming the Secretary of State grants the development consent order for this project with the requirements, Lord knows why they were ever called requirements. They're like conditions on the planning permission when it comes to those. Once we've got the DCO, it's then for the developer to then discharge each of those requirements. Just like they would a condition on an outline, planning permission and the party or the body that's responsible for approving those is the local planning authority. So just like with the planning permission, details are submitted.

00:57:11:04 - 00:57:45:05

With those details, we as developer would have to demonstrate how those details comply with the design principles that are secured in the DCO, but also how they've been assessed in the environmental statement that we've done. So then for the local planning authority to check that and be satisfied that that we have done that. If they're concerned, they can raise questions. If they feel that there's an aspect of design that needs to be changed that doesn't work, then they can raise that at that time too. But essentially it's a two stage consent process, just like an outline planning permission.

00:57:46:02 - 00:57:47:24

Thank you. Okay.

00:57:48:21 - 00:58:23:23

Thank you for that. My my question still remains. Um, and understand your your explanation of the planning. If there was an application for a housing development, there'd be a perimeter for that housing development show where all the houses are. It would show the route roads are to those houses. It would show where the lighting is so that the planning application can go to the planning inspector or whatever to to be approved. Um. And in my very simple mind, I can't see the difference between something like that and something like what you're proposing.

00:58:24:09 - 00:58:24:24

Thank you.

00:58:24:26 - 00:58:26:04

Think on.

00:58:26:06 - 00:58:39:20

That one. It depends on what matters are reserved. But think from my point of view and think. Understand what both parties are saying. So don't want to continue the discussion on from examining a varieties point of view and think from the Secretary of State's point of view who will make the final decision. Is that.

00:58:41:12 - 00:59:17:14

We have to be sure that the actual details being provided. The scheme is capable of being designed in a detailed fashion so that it can meet the relevant policy requirements. Which is the reason why I've asked some of the questions today just to ensure that, you know, for the substations, a good example. Is it capable of being designed in such a way that was going to meet the policy requirements? Obviously, the substation was to be I'm saying hypothetically again here, 80m high, then there might be a clear sort of issue issue there, but I don't know if that's helpful or not in response to my response to that.

00:59:17:16 - 01:00:03:15

But I understand the points that are being being made. Can we just move on to item J looking at the time and this is construction phasing and construction hours, particularly construction phasing, I wanted to ask about because. Ours can be considered thinking, perhaps noise, which we'll do tomorrow or Wednesday. But in terms of phasing, phasing details are required by requirement three. Uh. And again, that question was asked about this, which I'd like further clarification on, is how is it intended that the phasing of the scheme will take place? And is it possible that the phasing will result in an actual construction process that is distinctly split? So you could actually have a notwithstanding that there's a two year indicative time frame.

01:00:03:17 - 01:00:35:18

I think for construction you can have a situation where there's actually part of the scheme is constructed, there is then a gap of 1 or 2 years or whatever, and then the remainder of the scheme could be constructed. And if so, obviously how has that been been assessed? So just like some more clarification and detail of what the phasing implications are or is it on the other side in case of these fields will be constructed at the same time as these fields and then two months later these fields are constructed and all that will take place within the indicative two year time frame.

01:00:39:08 - 01:00:47:26

Bob, on behalf of the applicant, the environmental statement has assessed a continuous 24 month construction period.

01:00:54:00 - 01:01:10:12

So. So the scheme will be developed in 1 in 1 overall construction process. There won't be any opportunity for, for example, parts of it being constructed at an early stage and then the rest being left for five years or whatever down the line.

01:01:11:26 - 01:01:30:11

Robert Paul On behalf of my first to the comments Mr. Fox made earlier about the timing of the delivery of bringing on the server capacity as quickly as possible, and it's our client's intention to build out the scheme as quickly as possible to contribute renewable energy to the grid.

01:01:35:12 - 01:02:06:06

And is that something that needs to be maybe something to take away and consider? Is that something which needs to be sort of tied down more in a don't know, a management plan or something just to make sure there's not the situation. Putting aside that there are controls on the requirements are new, different environmental effects, etcetera. But in terms of the local community and residents, it may or may not be advantageous, probably not for it to be constructed in two separate, completely two distinct separate phases, which is what is possible. And I've almost picked up 1 or 2 of the answers. That's something that hasn't been ruled out.

01:02:08:10 - 01:02:43:18

And Mr. Fox, the applicant I mean, think we'll take this away. My my initial reaction is to think that there are there is some wording that we could provide within their requirement to make sure that the phasing plan confirmed that the environmental effects of the phasing plan that's put forward are consistent with what? Suggesting that? Yes. Okay. Okay. If you can, that would be helpful because it's something I'm not absolutely clear about. And the same question probably applies to decommissioning as well. If, for example, I know this is not actually one of the agenda items here, but if they going back to the discussion before, if, for example.

01:02:45:21 - 01:03:11:15

Panels were changed if they are going to be changed to higher rating power. Higher power rating panels, which meant that further down the line. Not all the fields are required. And actually, is there a possibility that some of it might be decommissioned before the rest of it because some of it might not need to be actually in operation? So there's almost like a question about is there a potentially partial decommissioning of the site that might happen in the future.

01:03:13:13 - 01:03:42:16

If that can be taken away. Don't need an answer on that. Mean would reference to the requirement 18 does use the language of any part of the authorized development requirement. 18 is a decommissioning. Yes. Right. Yes. That's helpful. Yeah. So that does refer to any part and the requirements there. And I'm anticipating that you will have discussed that on Thursday. Yeah. Um, but that is kind of provided for within the crime and then, you know, will relate to the parts in question. Okay. Um, thank you.

01:03:45:12 - 01:03:48:15

And what time will the full phase and details.

01:03:50:03 - 01:03:50:21

Be known.

01:03:54:06 - 01:03:59:17

I talked about that at the time that we would submit our requirement for any discharge application.

01:04:03:13 - 01:04:45:26

And is there any intention that those would be publicized? I don't know at the moment what arrangements, if any, there are for any potential community liaison group or the like. But it's a sort of thing where it is helpful, like usually on these projects because they're quite significant construction projects for the community to have an indication of actually what will be done at what stage another local authority has to approve these details, but they can be quite important for forward planning of events or whatever it might be. So it'd be helpful to get some indication of actually how such matters would be publicized in terms of what is going to be done on at what stage, as well as the actual approval process, which of course will be for the council to approve the final phase and details.

01:04:47:01 - 01:05:05:00

And Mr. Fox, on behalf of the applicant, say the outline Kemp has already provide for the provision of community liaison officer, including creation of social media pages and regular process progress updates. And at the moment, 5.1..

01:05:06:24 - 01:05:10:14

So talks about of the outline Kemp talks about

01:05:12:09 - 01:05:53:28

the community mechanisms would be the the mechanisms would post any information on deliveries or new faces of work. I think we can look to um, update the to provide some kind of provision for once the phasing is approved for the RPAs. There is that kind of agent starts from there. So no issue with that. Okay. Thank you. And how will the actual extent of locations of the different phases be? Determined. So what will be the process when applicant sits down and decides these bits are going to be done first? These bits might be done at the same time, can just give a little bit of indication of what the actual process would be for that part of the applicant.

01:05:54:12 - 01:06:31:27

So, well, I'll name two of the key constraints. One is archaeology and know you've got questions on that tomorrow. But we've talked in our mitigation documents and heritage around the need for the design of the scheme to account for archaeology that's found through the following investigations and also the geotechnical investigations that will need to be done first to understand that. And so that that will give the contractor the kind of full data that it needs to then work out how it's best to to phase the scheme.

01:06:32:28 - 01:06:36:09

And requirement three would would move on from that.

01:06:41:21 - 01:06:44:02

Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Holloway.

01:06:46:03 - 01:06:59:22

Just make one more addition, Mr. Fox. Just make your last point and then. Yes. Sorry. Apologies. The initial point wanted to make with just that. The other aspect of it is the measures in the soil management plan management plan, which talks about making sure that we don't construct when

01:07:01:07 - 01:07:32:06

this all becomes too wet. So obviously, once we're kind of ready to go and thinking about the phasing, we need to think about weather forecasts and accounting for the fact that obviously the weather changes. So the phasing might change. And and just on that point is the potential for the inability to develop certain parts of the site, construct certain parts of the site or the inability to do it at certain times because of soil conditions being too wet, for example, Has that been taken account in the overall two year construction program? Yes.

01:07:33:07 - 01:07:33:22

Okay.

01:07:38:13 - 01:07:39:05

This is Holloway.

01:07:41:02 - 01:08:11:08

Mrs. Holloway from our past action group. The applicant has identified the point I was going to raise. The only thing I would say is there is no doubt a lot of pre-work that can be done knowing the

different grades of the soil and type of soil that exists across the site, that could be an upfront plan, indicative plan as to kind of what field areas would be done, when and what kind of phasing sort of thought that could be provided quite early on. Preciate obviously, then the weather conditions would have to be overlaid at the time.

01:08:11:10 - 01:08:16:15

But the soil type will determine when it's likely to be able to be worked. Thank you.

01:08:18:20 - 01:08:53:17

So there are actually as well as construction factors to be taken into account. In terms of the construction program, there obviously are environmental considerations to be taken into account, and that's something that the councils, when they determine the actual phasing plan, would need the information on to come to a decision on that as well, Presumably, yes. Think what I would say is that none of the requirements need to be seen in isolation, of course, and that they will all be brought forward together. So. So we'll manage the detailed soil management plan will be informed by um will inform the phasing as will and vice versa.

01:08:53:19 - 01:09:16:05

And similarly we get the scheme investigation for archaeology. That work is done. Um, you know, the WSI will require certain activities to be done in reaction to the archaeology that's found, which then informs the phasing. So think yes, but don't think any amendments are needed because essentially we've got to review all the requirements together rather than seeing them in isolation.

01:09:22:21 - 01:09:23:06

Okay.

01:09:23:08 - 01:09:38:21

Just going back to I think construction hours can be raised probably most appropriately under noise and not saying noise is the only consideration of construction hours. But just thinking about the timing, let's go back to E, which is the first of all arrays of panels, etcetera.

01:09:46:07 - 01:09:48:23

The only question wants to ask at this stage on.

01:09:49:19 - 01:09:50:14

This.

01:09:51:03 - 01:10:30:22

Obviously, there are two options, and I understand that. We understand that in terms of the. I think it's proposed that 530,000 panels approximately proposed in total to achieve the installed or the indicative installed capacity. And in our response to our question 1.07, which is about power power ratings. Don't know if that's the right phrase to use or not, but I think you know what mean for each individual panel is based upon 660W per panel, which is near the upper end of the range, which I think the range was given in your answer of between 400 and 10W in the 670W as to what is available on the market at the moment.

01:10:31:09 - 01:11:02:16

Uh. And presuming that the higher the power rating that would be used, the less land. Would be required. Although again, read the answer you provided to the written questions on. It's more likely to be wider field margins. ET cetera than fields being whole fields being removed, for example. But is there any incentive? What incentive or any is there to choose the highest power rating possible at the at the time when a decision is made on that? Bearing in mind that.

01:11:03:22 - 01:11:20:15

It seems that there is a possibility of the less panels that are put on the site, no matter if it's individual fields, less amounts of fields being developed or fields being taken out, would have would reduce the the overall effects or potentially reduce the overall effects.

01:11:22:14 - 01:11:26:29

How does that sort of decision work on actually deciding what what panel rating to utilize?

01:11:30:26 - 01:11:35:03

It's quite simple. Yeah. I mean, think think it's the point of. It's not just.

01:11:37:08 - 01:12:07:00

That's not just the question of the your question, essentially, because it also goes to the type of panel that you're using and taking account of the constraints. So it's not it's not that question isn't in isolation. You take account of the technology, um, of the panels as they develop. So we've got the two technologies of single access trackers and fix our facing and, and the constraints of your geotech and your archaeology. Um, and ultimately it's going to be a matter of cost as well.

01:12:08:18 - 01:12:09:22

And presumably.

01:12:11:12 - 01:12:12:08

Based upon the answer.

01:12:12:10 - 01:12:26:09

That the question answer to 1.0 17 that the 660 watt panel has that being used to actually determine how many panels would be required in order to achieve the 350 megawatt installed capacity?

01:12:31:07 - 01:12:42:18

Rob Paul on behalf of the applicant. Yes. 350. The basis of the assessment is 350MW and the 530,303 think.

01:12:45:15 - 01:12:46:27

Hundred and 60W.

01:12:56:26 - 01:13:02:20

Okay. Thank you. Are there any further? Points on Mr..

01:13:05:11 - 01:13:06:12

Who wishes to speak.

01:13:07:23 - 01:13:08:08

On behalf of.

01:13:08:10 - 01:13:08:25

Madam.

01:13:08:29 - 01:13:09:24

Mallard past Action.

01:13:09:26 - 01:13:10:11

Group.



01:13:10:17 - 01:13:11:02

Um.

01:13:11:14 - 01:13:14:10

It's both a question and perhaps an observation as well.

01:13:14:15 - 01:13:15:06

With respect to.

01:13:15:08 - 01:13:18:26

The output of the panels. I think there's a.

01:13:18:28 - 01:13:20:00

Difference between the.

01:13:20:02 - 01:13:23:09

Size of the panels for the different outputs. So larger outputs.

01:13:23:11 - 01:13:24:01

Are typically.

01:13:24:03 - 01:13:33:06

Larger, although there are some differences, as has been explained around the technology, around the power density of the panels, But it's not a sweeping assumption to say that a higher power

01:13:34:21 - 01:13:37:04

panel takes the same space. So.

01:13:40:10 - 01:13:42:09

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Orvis.

01:13:43:14 - 01:13:44:06

Tenure with similar.

01:13:44:09 - 01:13:45:04

Price action group.

01:13:45:06 - 01:13:45:24

If I may just.

01:13:45:26 - 01:13:50:22

Pick up on your point. Regarding the £530,000.

01:13:51:08 - 01:13:53:09

What is not clear to me is.

01:13:53:11 - 01:13:59:24

If the 530,000 panels includes the degree of over planting.

01:14:00:21 - 01:14:02:00

As described by Mr..

01:14:02:02 - 01:14:03:19  
Gillett and indeed as.

01:14:03:21 - 01:14:04:09  
May have.

01:14:04:11 - 01:14:05:21  
To be the case to.

01:14:06:14 - 01:14:06:29  
The.

01:14:07:05 - 01:14:13:00  
Solar panel degradation. So what what actually is the 530 panels?

01:14:13:02 - 01:14:14:03  
Is it is it.

01:14:14:05 - 01:14:17:02  
Before over planting or after over planting?

01:14:19:09 - 01:14:23:01  
Thank you. Yeah. It's marked up, and it accounts for.

01:14:32:00 - 01:14:32:16  
Yes.

01:14:36:08 - 01:14:37:15  
Okay. Okay.

01:14:46:16 - 01:15:08:12  
Sorry, my microphone is not being turned on. That's got me through most of the questions I wanted to ask this morning. Think other things can be asked during the week, so that is fine from my point of view. Is there anything else that anybody wishes to raise briefly in relation to the scope of the proposed development at this point?

01:15:16:18 - 01:15:18:28  
Okay. There is a Hi.

01:15:19:02 - 01:15:27:09  
Richard Williams again. Couldn't see anything in the agendas for this week on the funding statement. It's not me missing it. Or is it just not there?

01:15:28:04 - 01:15:31:06  
I think Friday. I've not actually got the

01:15:32:22 - 01:15:41:19  
agenda in front of me. I don't know if somebody must have it in front of me, but I'm. Pretty sure it's on Fridays agenda, which is part of the compulsory acquisition hearing.

01:15:43:05 - 01:15:50:21

Because obviously that will have an impact on the hypothetical scenarios that we were talking about earlier about project failure. So.

01:15:50:29 - 01:15:51:19

Okay. Okay.

01:15:51:21 - 01:15:56:02

You have questions about the funding station can be asked on on Friday. Thank you.

01:15:58:16 - 01:16:20:09

Okay. That brings us to the end of that session. Thank you for all your representations and contributions on that. Think we'll deal the action with action points as one big sweep up at the end of the whole day is probably the easiest thing to do. So we will come back at 2:00 an hour for lunch is okay for everybody.

01:16:20:18 - 01:16:21:03

Yeah.

01:16:21:05 - 01:16:31:07

So and then we'll come back and we'll consider item for onwards. So we'll adjourn now for lunch, returning at 2:00. Thank you, everybody.