

Mallard Pass_ISH2_12 July_PT4

Created on: 2023-07-12 17:26:00

Project Length: 01:54:08

File Name: Mallard Pass_ISH2_12 July_PT4

File Length: 01:54:08

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:13 - 00:00:37:03

Thank you. And set just before we start. Sorry. I was just going to say, a mindful of the amount of items that are on the agenda and also on into tomorrow with the hearing as well. Um, so I have asked a few of the people in the room, um, that was going to suggest, um, and obviously up to you, but if we needed to push on to half five today in order to get through things, um, that we at least we as the applicant team, which others will have to confirm.

00:00:37:12 - 00:00:40:08

Um, but just want to suggest that in case that would help.

00:00:42:17 - 00:01:13:20

We've had a similar conversation during the break as well. Um, there is a lot to get through. Um, granted, it may well be that some of the items we take in second written questions rather than already today said that there may be some questions that we we don't deal with specifically today to try and save a bit of time. But there will be opportunities for people to responding writing to them. And and yes, we will accept a little bit of flexibility in terms of the finish time. I think we're thinking more around quarter plus five. Um, it's a long week.

00:01:13:22 - 00:01:35:27

We've got worked in the evenings etcetera. So I think that would be our our preference, but we'll keep an eye on that. Think it will help if everybody could keep an eye on that as well. In terms of follow up questions where the points have been addressed already. If you could please just keep that in mind in terms of the focus and the need to get through the or as much of the agenda as possible, please, that'd be helpful. Okay.

00:01:39:22 - 00:02:10:07

With that in mind that I'm moving swiftly on to agenda item six B in relation to soil management and. Natural. England raised concerns in their written representation around the commitments to restore lands to its current agricultural land classification grade following decommissioning, recognising that the grading may alter over time given the potential time frame of the of the development.

00:02:11:01 - 00:02:59:06

The applicant, in response at Deadline three has provided an outline and updated that line. So a management plan with numerous updates in there and it would certainly welcome responses and detailed feedback on and in fact had a series of questions around that. But given given where we are in terms of time, think we will invite specific comments on the details of the outline soil management plan in second written questions. But there is a just an issue clarification that have on that for now, and that is that the applicant's response to natural England in their deadline three submission referred to the position that the land's graded the sound commissioning.

00:02:59:17 - 00:03:26:18

However, the land is graded at the time of commissioning. The land will be restored to the same grade as the land adjacent to it. Didn't quite follow what was. Being posed there in terms of the commitment

to restore the quality of the land. Particularly the reference to the land adjacent to it and whether or not the land adjacent to it would actually be the same grade as the land that it was and effectively previously, before the development was undertaken.

00:03:27:03 - 00:04:04:25

Yes, sir. Tony Kernan, on behalf of the applicant, think the long and the short of it is that the intention and the expectation and is that the land will go back to the same quality as it is now. And the debate we had with Natural England really related to how you measured that. The current classification system has been in place since 1988 and uses an old 1950 to 1980 climate set, for example. So we've got continuity. So it's it's probably ready for an update, but obviously that has the implications of everything we've done since 1988 goes out of date.

00:04:05:08 - 00:04:41:12

And I think I was just trying to make the point we didn't want to get locked into a 1988 methodology. At the end of it, the purpose, if you like, for the soil management plan is that where those tracks and how places have gone out? The way the soil is now and its profile and the particular soil will go back. So the top soil that comes off from that part of the field will be stored so that it can go back to that part of the field at the same depth, so that it's continuity with what's adjacent.

00:04:41:29 - 00:05:05:00

And when you're doing a land classification, it's that sort of 100m difference. There are differences in soil over shorter periods. The point is that you just get it to the same soil. So when you're farming it, you can't see any crop growth differential. So the commitment is there. It's just how we word it that's workable at the end of the the period.

00:05:08:27 - 00:05:18:20

Okay. As I said, I think this is an issue that we will revisit in writing, particularly in relation to the outline soil management plan. So I think we'll we'll perhaps leave that there.

00:05:18:23 - 00:05:27:18

It may just need to say the system or its successor may may just be as simple as that would probably cover it.

00:05:28:12 - 00:05:59:00

Thank you. We will revisit the issue in writing unless there's any urgent queries. I will move on from this particular point. As I say, there were other questions relating to soil management, but again, I think we'll deal with those in writing, if I may. And that takes us on then to see and the scope for sheet grazing and. The point that has been raised briefly already this afternoon.

00:05:59:09 - 00:05:59:24

And.

00:06:01:12 - 00:06:39:19

Just in terms of the prospects of sheep farming and the likelihood that we're dependent, given that's likely to be dependent on a third party and think suggested in the applicant's response to question 7.06 in our first written questions. So that would be a an unknown part taken on board that operation and the requirement for a low stock rate to avoid other consequences in terms of the lands with the sheep. And would that potentially undermine the economic viability of sheep grazing and therefore reduce the potential for that to actually be taken forward?

00:06:42:09 - 00:07:15:00

Tony Kernan on behalf of the applicant, sir. No, I don't think it does. The the economics of farming sheep goes up and down, as does the economics of pretty all agricultural products. Wool, for example,

is not worth much at the moment. Wool used to be the Cotswolds, etc. were built on wool, not on meat. So products change over time and the density of grazing is a bit lower than you might have without panels.

00:07:15:02 - 00:07:52:07

But from graziers I've talked to, it's around about the same you've got for organic i.e. no fertiliser. So it's a pretty high stocking rate and the economics of it will really depend on how much you're paying for your the rental. If you're renting it as a young farmer, see it as a, an opportunity for the existing farmers. Um, I think when I've asked a question of all the farmers involved here, they've all gone, oh, we're used to tractors and sheep, a bit more physical, but the next generation's coming along, so there's nothing to stop them taking it on.

00:07:52:09 - 00:08:11:12

All other farmers in the area, expanding their their sheep flocks because you can the sheep are well secured. We know we've got safe fencing. So as long as you can work dogs and you've got a handling pen you can set up in the corner, then it's quite easy to farm sheep through these areas.

00:08:13:12 - 00:08:41:15

Thank you. It does appear to be a potential rather than a guarantee, though, at the moment. Don't know. You refer to economic viability. Is there any chance you can provide some some feedback on that in terms of how viable such an operation would be? Appreciate the maybe some assumptions made in that and having regard to the stock rate, etcetera. Think that would be useful to try and quantify the likelihood in the current market perhaps?

00:08:42:04 - 00:08:48:19

I think so. From observations, it's increasingly the management choice and.

00:08:50:14 - 00:09:21:20

Firstly, it's. A lot easier than streamers and mowers and anything else because the sheep do the grazing said they're a bit like those electric mowers you can have that do your garden, they just keep it down. So in that respect there's a lot of saving and. There are more people now have practiced it and got used to it. So it does seem to be on most of the solar farms they go past to enforce. Most of them have got sheep there, not all the time. So you don't necessarily see them. Depends on the size.

00:09:21:22 - 00:09:40:18

Sometimes they put them in for a few weeks at a high stocking rate to eat them down. Others may have lower numbers, but not taking them off over the year. But it's certainly practical and feasible and I think increasingly is recognized as a business opportunity, a farming opportunity.

00:09:42:19 - 00:10:11:08

Sorry that you asked about whether it could be guaranteed. Think that was something we discussed and whether it could be a requirement that that stated you must do it by sheep. My caution when discussed it with the team was that if for some reason there's a drop in the market, you're effectively forcing somebody to do an enterprise that might not make money and there might be other agricultural enterprises that could equally achieve the same aim.

00:10:11:19 - 00:10:20:00

Yeah, well, I think that's my point because that is a risk. And so the sheep farming may not occur because of that particular issue. Um.

00:10:21:01 - 00:10:30:09

Equally that the uplands and the Lake District things they've kept the sheep going for, for centuries. So I think it's a it's a relatively low risk.

00:10:31:14 - 00:10:31:29

Okay.

00:10:32:05 - 00:10:46:23

Is there any possibility of. Perhaps trying to provide some kind of economic assessment around the case for for such operation, just to give some degree of knowledge about whether or not it is It is likely.

00:10:47:03 - 00:10:55:14

Yes. We would watch sort of budgets and projections to show the sort of income per hectare that sort of operation work.

00:10:55:16 - 00:10:56:01

Yes.

00:10:56:03 - 00:10:57:08

Yeah. Could easily provide that.

00:10:57:15 - 00:10:58:24

Given the stock rate given the land.

00:10:58:26 - 00:11:02:26

Available. Yes, sir. No, He can easily provide that price of sheep except.

00:11:04:02 - 00:11:06:03

Some useful context to have.

00:11:07:05 - 00:11:37:29

Second, just add to this, I think obviously certainly we can we can look to assist in that. I would just say that this is in the context of we're not seeking to rely on sheep farming for any kind of mitigation. It's an outcome that the measures in the will enable to happen if if it's viable to happen, but also allows for the other. We've been discussing that for the production. So think we can do that.

00:11:38:01 - 00:11:49:12

But within the context of it's only ever something we've said, it's an opportunity, not something that is fully secured through this year. We didn't create it. We're creating the environment in which it could happen.

00:11:51:10 - 00:12:06:12

Point taken. But think it is. It is offered as a potential means of reducing the negative impacts of the the loss of the agricultural land over a period of time during the operation of the development. So it's just to work through that particular point, really.

00:12:06:20 - 00:12:09:29

Yeah. Mr.. Baker Coming.

00:12:11:01 - 00:12:46:23

Hello. John Baker again, on behalf of the applicant in the land, we do set out that there's two ways of securing in terms of implications on biodiversity net gain. The assumption was we aim for a certain type of grassland and that is either achieved with sheep under low grazing or with a cutting regime. Um, you can't tell sheep where to graze and it's much easier to do certain outcomes with hand cutting

tools. Indeed, it might be a combination of the two. It's, it's not a thing that we absolutely desperately need as part of the delivery, put it that way, would stress that point.

00:12:48:06 - 00:13:12:21

And I'd also add, I'm not sure that we would characterize it as being mitigation for our impact to soils. Um, partly because of the reasons we've already touched on so much more repeat, which is the soil is what the soil is and will continue to be able to be used for whatever it determined to be used for. And it's a question of land use. And yes, the amount that you take that into account in the planning balance.

00:13:16:16 - 00:13:17:09

Thank you.

00:13:18:10 - 00:13:46:07

Yes. Diane Kentish writes from Walsall Parish Council. Could I ask a clarification question please, of the applicant? I may well have misunderstood this completely, but I'm led to believe from what we've said that you're going to take two metres of soil from the existing ground and store it and replace it back in exactly the same place at the end.

00:13:46:23 - 00:14:14:03

Mr. Kent? Yes, sorry. We'll be dealing with soil management on such matters through second written questions. Oh, I if we were going to discuss that a bit more length, but given the time and the length of the agenda, we are going to pick it up in writing. But so please feel free to respond to our questions. Second written questions. Opportunity. Apologies. Um, certainly it's an point in relation to the specific issue. Yes. Thank you.

00:14:16:08 - 00:14:43:06

This is Wally on behalf of Mallard Pace Action Group. Think the applicant has to some extent answered the question and don't think there's any doubt that sheep can be grazed successfully. But I think the question I have is this Is this truly a commercial enterprise for sheep and sheep production or lamb production, or is it actually a perfectly reasonable.

00:14:45:19 - 00:15:16:09

Management tool to actually help them manage the ground underneath the solar panels. I don't think that that is clear from their application. The the inference is that it is an agricultural enterprise. My reading of what they've said and what they're doing is much closer to a management of the sward underneath the panels. They also, in their written submissions, suggest that the sheep will only have access in the winter months.

00:15:17:00 - 00:15:57:23

So think we'd need to understand how they were proposing to graze it. And I would suggest that some of that land is very heavy and think there's a risk of poaching and potential damage to the grass towards the leaflet that they rely on within their within their application is a leaflet which is now nine years old and whilst the guidance is given is relevant, it does refer and is relevant to small scale solar farms. Most of the examples given, if not all of the examples given are on farms where they were livestock farms which put a solar farm into their enterprise as effectively a diversification project.

00:15:57:25 - 00:16:28:15

The sheep were already there and they could very easily use the grazing to run the sheep through. This is very different. We're starting with a scheme which is very large, extends over a large area. There are some quite significant implications if they are truly thinking about putting sheep on there that they would need to address, which hasn't been addressed anywhere around having easy access 24 over seven while sheep grazing mobile handling facilities which the gentleman has referenced, holding pens, they need to be corralled to hold the sheep.

00:16:28:20 - 00:16:40:01

In each grazing area, you need well-trained and steady sheepdogs and you need to be able to see the dog and the sheep if you're going to work them, which is an interesting concept within a.

00:16:41:24 - 00:17:02:23

A cellar area. You'll need water supplies, feeding troughs, depending on when the animals are going to be grazing. And there is an increased risk of sheep rustling, which effectively then starts to bring in a potential risk of wildlife crime. So it's not straightforward and think it would be helpful to have some clarity over exactly what is intended.

00:17:04:06 - 00:17:06:01

Thank you, Mrs. Woolley. Um.

00:17:07:16 - 00:17:37:24

Wasn't going to go into detail. Very brief. Yes. Think in terms of the latter list of points, we will respond in writing. I think I just did wanted to make the point that, um, the aim is that they will do both in terms of performing a landscape function and a potential enterprise function. But as I said before, in the latter case, they're not necessarily seeking to mitigate an impact per se. It's there to be a potential benefit.

00:17:42:08 - 00:17:43:00

Mr. Orvis.

00:17:44:01 - 00:17:45:01

Please. Thank you.

00:17:45:03 - 00:17:48:02

Tony Willows Action Group. I'll be very brief.

00:17:48:04 - 00:17:48:19

Thank you.

00:17:48:21 - 00:17:51:23

Um, with regard to the last comment sheep.

00:17:51:25 - 00:17:52:19

Have put forward.

00:17:52:21 - 00:18:00:17

As an alternative agricultural use. Um, it said that they're. They're optional, but as far as I can see it.

00:18:01:21 - 00:18:02:14

They, they.

00:18:02:16 - 00:18:34:28

Are being put forward by the applicant is an essential part in continuance of agricultural use. And if you're going to continue as agriculture, you should want to continue as a commercial enterprise and think the applicant is well short of. Proving that a commercial commercial enterprise of sheep under 530,000 solar panels is practical or indeed economic.

00:18:37:09 - 00:18:43:09

Thank you, Mr. Roberts. We await the applicants further submissions on on that issue. Okay. Um.

00:18:44:25 - 00:19:09:02

Moving on, if I may, to agenda item seven, water and flood risk. Now, again, there were a few questions at this point that related back to soil compaction. Soil matters. But think again. We'll pick those up in second written questions. And so there'll be an option to address those at that point in time.

00:19:12:06 - 00:19:12:21

However,

00:19:14:16 - 00:19:36:28

some questions do remain so in terms of the potential for flood risk due to the possible concentration of runoff from the from the panels has been raised as a concern. And Grapefruits Parish Council has written representation. They've produced some calculations of their own in terms of.

00:19:38:15 - 00:19:54:10

The fact that they believe 6.37% of the area underneath the panels will receive 100% of the rain falls on those panels. And I'm not sure if the applicant responded to that point directly. The deadline three submission.

00:19:57:19 - 00:20:03:17

Are there any comments you may have to offer at this point in time, or is that something you want to take away in writing and maybe preferable to do that?

00:20:05:25 - 00:20:11:12

And the applicant will bring in Mr. Evans to see if he is able to respond.

00:20:13:21 - 00:20:45:04

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mr. Evans, on behalf of the applicant. Don't think that point was specifically covered in the written representations of the last deadline. I would note that the authors have regular brain water gaps. It's not just a shooting of surface water. As precipitation falls upon it onto a concentrated drip line. There are several drip lines and that would allow rainwater to fall onto the subsoil underneath. But again, we can provide some clarity guess and the next round of written reps.

00:20:47:03 - 00:20:58:14

That'll be helpful. And it was wrapped to 061 just for reference. But yes, we'll receive further written submissions than that. Think. Thank you. Mrs. Holloway.

00:20:59:02 - 00:21:30:06

Mrs. Holloway, for my past action group. I can provide some clarification on that matter. The calculations were based on running off individual panels, not assuming it was a series of panels, and it would just run off the bottom. So it was taking into account the drip line on every single individual panel and think if you look at it in totality, the applicant themselves say that the water runoff will be 256%. I apologize.

00:21:30:08 - 00:22:06:15

I can't remember if it's percent or times, but it's a big number. It's certainly 256 times more than the rainfall on the ground. And if you take into account the field capacity days around 110 days per year, at some point in time for a third of the year, the ground is going to be saturated. And when you get rain running off into more into channels, which will happen off the individual panels, then there is a higher likelihood that that rainwater will run faster off the land than it would if it were coming down just as pure rainfall.

00:22:06:20 - 00:22:34:00

And that is and we know today from the experiences that we've had around the site, particularly in Bradford, of which there is much evidence provided with all the flood pictures that both Fluvial and Fluvial flooding is an issue and therefore we really request that this is taken seriously and it is a flood risk free area, albeit outside the site.

00:22:36:02 - 00:22:45:11

Thank you, Mrs. Holloway. I don't think the applicant's view is that modelling suggests that runoff rates will actually reduce from the baseline. But if you're able to briefly respond.

00:22:46:16 - 00:23:16:23

Yes, that's what I was going to say. The applicant's proposals seek to manage runoff rates, run rates through the outlined surface water drainage strategy, an outline of which submitted the application, and the details will be approved pursuant to the relevant requirement And the the the Environment Agency and the the flood authorities have not disputed the conclusions of our.

00:23:21:17 - 00:23:22:19

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

00:23:24:27 - 00:23:28:06

Julie Smith online with your hand up. Would you like to speak, please?

00:23:31:28 - 00:24:14:03

Thank you, sir. Um, Julie Smith, Rutland County Council. Um. Unfortunately, my colleague Robin Greene couldn't make it this afternoon. She's been on all day, but she's had to leave. Um, so she was representing the lead local flood authority. Um, but she briefed me just in case at lunchtime. Um, so I've got a few points to make, but won't make them yet. I'll wait later on. But one thing I have done quickly is is seen two references one to concrete bases under the mountain structures and one is piling.

00:24:14:13 - 00:24:22:21

Um, and that will make quite a difference. So I wondered whether you could ask the applicants whether they could clarify, please.

00:24:26:18 - 00:24:43:15

Thank you. Yes. In relation to concrete bases, that was a question on my list. But given that it relates to compaction and soil matters, I think we'll revisit that in second written questions if that's okay. So there'll be a chance to to respond at that point in time. Thank you, sir.

00:24:45:21 - 00:24:48:05

I did have a question in relation to

00:24:49:25 - 00:24:55:21

land drains and impacts on land roads, which came from Rutland County Council. Was that your second point?

00:25:01:16 - 00:25:44:00

And yes, sir, I think it's the lack of, um, detailed information. There is reference to various types of surface water control, um, swales ponds, um, etcetera. So but there's no level of detail. So the, I understand my colleague had submitted, um, within written reports the, um, some comments in reference to that and some recommendations of conditions, um, to be added or sorry requirements to be added to the DCO.

00:25:45:21 - 00:25:58:04

Indeed, we have seen those again, think given given the circumstances in terms of time. Think we'll probably address those through second written questions if that's if that's okay. Thank you.

00:25:58:15 - 00:26:00:15

Yes, that's fine. Thank you, sir.

00:26:03:18 - 00:26:11:16

Actually, there may be an opportunity to address that in the discussion around the development and sort of tomorrow afternoon. Understand. So we may come back to that tomorrow, that particular point.

00:26:13:05 - 00:26:13:26

Thank you, sir.

00:26:24:17 - 00:26:25:08

Okay.

00:26:25:15 - 00:26:35:09

Um, I think then that brings us on to agenda item number eight, which relates to noise. Um, I'll hand back to my colleague, Mr. Cliff.

00:26:57:02 - 00:27:02:14

Right. Thank you. Agenda item eight on noise.

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

I'll just let the.

00:27:07:15 - 00:27:09:07

Applicant's adviser takes his seat.

00:27:30:18 - 00:27:37:11

Okay. Just on construction noise. This is a question for Rutland County Council. Um.

00:27:44:20 - 00:28:23:26

I don't know, Mr. Johnson, if you've got obviously you're not the noise expert, but if you could answer the question best, best you can or follow it up. But in Rutland's Local Impact report, it raised the issue of noise and disturbance from construction vehicles, but it was quite a generalized remark. And my question is, could you clarify other particular properties, particularly locations? Is that just a generalized concern or are there particular locations and properties where Rutland feels there is a harmful effect? And to what extent would that effect be?

00:28:24:06 - 00:28:26:00

So we'll have to clarify.

00:28:26:02 - 00:28:26:17

With.

00:28:26:19 - 00:28:27:04

Our.

00:28:28:06 - 00:28:34:26

So Justin Johnson, Rutland County Council will clarify. I think it was more a general remark rather than

00:28:36:22 - 00:28:37:07

going through.

00:28:37:09 - 00:28:38:02

To specific.

00:28:38:04 - 00:29:13:08

Properties, but I will double check and respond to the written comment. Okay. Thank you. And whilst just moving forward to operational noise, because it's a similar question, think in your local Impact report or Rutland County Council's local impact report, there's a comment on concerns from low level humming. I think it reads as a generalized concern. But again, our question is are there any particular locations and properties that it could Rutland considers would be would be harmfully affected?

00:29:14:28 - 00:29:46:02

So Justin Johnson, again, let the County Council think this was one that was a point that was raised by our committee members and not so, again, a general point that we would want yourselves as examining authority to be satisfied that the controls in particular around the substation do protect those in particular nearest properties from any noise or disturbance from the general hum that substations tend to give off.

00:29:48:27 - 00:30:04:24

Okay. Thank you. I'll come back on to that. Thank you. So if you can come back on the first. Yeah, the first point on deadline for for the clarification on noise and disruption from construction vehicles.

00:30:09:06 - 00:30:12:03

But I just raise a question here, Mr. Chairman.

00:30:12:13 - 00:30:14:27

If you give your your name first, please.

00:30:16:00 - 00:30:23:20

Just try to work out because I can't hear a lot. I'm just trying to work out what's going on. Are we coming back to flood risk to complete it tomorrow then?

00:30:23:22 - 00:30:28:25

No, we're sorry. We're onto noise now. Yes. And I'll be.

00:30:28:27 - 00:30:30:11

Coming back to flood risk.

00:30:30:28 - 00:30:47:24

Not not tomorrow. And but we will be returning to it in our second written questions where we ask further written questions and there'll be an opportunity for all parties to comment on on those and the answers as.

00:30:47:26 - 00:30:54:22

Well, because it's obviously a major issue. And so we will be returning to it. Is that correct in examination?

00:30:54:24 - 00:31:09:07

Yes. And but certainly in questions whether or not we return to the next round of issues, specific hearings in September will depend on where we are in the examination and whether or not we feel it necessary to ask further oral questions.

00:31:09:09 - 00:31:15:00

Can I just ask why this is? Because I'm surprised. Well, surprised, actually.

00:31:15:16 - 00:31:34:16

Well, partly because I think, as Mr. James explained, that we will ask rather than specific questions, will ask some further written questions on that. And as I say, we'll consider all those answers and we may well consider it. We decide it appropriate to consider. It sets a further issue, specifically hearing in September.

00:31:39:12 - 00:31:42:20

Okay. Thank you. We can come back to noise.

00:31:44:07 - 00:31:44:23

Am.

00:31:56:26 - 00:32:29:29

On construction noise hours, which we didn't consider. Yesterday afternoon. We've got concerns from particularly from Action Group, on the extent of the hours being proposed raise now in noise because it's not just a noise issue, but it is noise is one of the key factors, I suspect, in terms of construction. Our noise concerns have been raised by the action group regarding, for example, eight hours of continuous construction noise or eight hours of construction noise in the day being excessive.

00:32:30:26 - 00:33:04:09

Uh, and what I wanted to ask the applicant was, is there any detail available on because obviously the construction will pass through the site and events will take place at the same time. It will be phased, as we discussed yesterday, but council further information be provided on the indicative times when particular construction activities will take place within the site. So so so residents and we as examination authority can understand how long those potential effects will take place.

00:33:05:05 - 00:33:37:07

And Mr. Fox's behalf of the applicant think the answer to that question is going to be no. Um, because we are not appointed a construction contractor who would be able to answer that question. Um, we've set out our working hours and we've set limits on noisy hours during noisy activities and certain hours set limits on our construction traffic movements. And would also note that in the camp we have committed to needing to get Section 61 consents to control noise.

00:33:37:09 - 00:33:48:05

It's actually 61 is the process that all all planning applications to use. Um, and Section 61 is in the context of the nuisance regime. Um, so I.

00:33:49:21 - 00:34:09:10

We can't get the answer now because we simply don't have that information now. But there are numerous controls in our documentation to avoid the impacts that we've been worrying about, and that has formed the basis of our assessment and also notes that the hours we proposed are commonplace and they're referenced in the relevant British standards.

00:34:12:13 - 00:34:17:22

And of course, the other point is if you reduce the amount of hours, you extend the amount of time construction takes.

00:34:19:00 - 00:34:49:05

And in terms of the British standards point, those projects, some local authorities have ours. I mean, think some of the some of the local authorities have not objected, per se, to these ours, which we we know obviously, there are other other objections in terms of those British standards. Are those for particular projects, particular sorts of developments? No. Some local authorities have more constrained generalised working hours. Obviously this is a national infrastructure proposal, but what the British standards actually relate to in that.

00:34:49:07 - 00:34:57:11

Respect, I will ask. He's online, but our noise expert Matthew Canard, is associate director at Hawley. Okay. Thank you.

00:35:00:17 - 00:35:32:19

Um. Hello? Can you hear me all right? Yeah. Um, I. Yes, I can respond. So to clarify, the working hours that are being proposed are fairly standard in my experience. Um, so you, you know, it's 7 to 7 a.m., 7 p.m. during weekdays and Saturday mornings for, for noisy construction work. Um, this is given as example, you know, example working hours in British standard 5228.

00:35:32:21 - 00:35:52:24

Um, but there's no it's not in the context of the scale of significance of different this is just general guidance or examples of typical controls which are typical in my experience, but not specific to, to a scale or of a particular development. This is fairly standard practice in my experience.

00:35:55:20 - 00:36:25:04

And as Mr. Fox has noted, we proposed further reductions beyond these these hours for the piling work which has been raised as a concern. So when the piling work will be undertaken, if planning is used, the planning will be further restricted to only eight maximum eight hours a day rather than a full 12 hours. So those further enhanced, which we consider the good practice.

00:36:26:10 - 00:36:39:19

Would also add to that the path that we have within the outlying camp committed to various community liaison activities. So your query earlier about understanding that that will come at the time that we have the information. Okay.

00:36:39:25 - 00:36:41:15

Okay. Thank you. Um,

00:36:43:03 - 00:36:57:18

turning to Miles per action group, having heard and you've probably read the responses that the applicants provided as well, have you any outstanding concerns in relation to the hours of working without getting to the specifics of types of noise, but the hours of the hours of working?

00:36:58:28 - 00:37:30:22

Mrs. Holloway for Malpass Action Group, think obviously the biggest noise that we would be concerned with would be the piling. And even eight hours a day into for our students is enormous. Now, don't know if there is any other circumstances that mirror putting in 530,000 solar panels and corresponding piling activity for other construction projects. Maybe there isn't a benchmark that exists today, and general guidance doesn't actually necessarily pick up this iteration.

00:37:30:24 - 00:38:08:02

I don't know the answer to the question, but we have had evidence from some other groups of some serious mental health impacts of from piling activity. It can be heard over two miles away. So depending on how much piling is going on across the site, you know, together, that will also have a combined impact as well. So I think, you know, we don't know the rules and regulations, but I just wonder if there is, you know, particular precedent for utility scale solar farms or not.

00:38:08:06 - 00:38:08:22

Thank you.

00:38:12:24 - 00:38:26:11

Thank you. Just on piling going back to my question a few moments ago, in terms of that specific construction activity, indicative details of lengths of time for that in particular locations. Any indication of that?

00:38:27:21 - 00:38:28:17

But because that's.

00:38:28:19 - 00:38:32:14

Obviously it is going to be the noisiest part of the construction works.

00:38:32:16 - 00:38:46:06

Yes. So the first point to make is obviously there's not necessarily that they will they will all be driven. We've said in our project description that they'll be references to might be screw mounted instead. Um, I mean.

00:38:48:09 - 00:38:57:17

The best that we can give is an indication of it would take X amount of time to drive one panel and then you can extrapolate that out. But

00:38:59:09 - 00:39:20:21

I don't think that's necessarily a realistic scenario given what we've talked about earlier in terms of construction happening, the various activities all happening at once. So to isolate. Individual paths and how long each might take. So a field could take X amount of time don't don't think is actually a realistic representation of of the noise as a whole.

00:39:22:06 - 00:39:44:21

And also make the point that these. These hours are similar to other cities and other more Germany where they might not be the installation of paths and fields, But obviously a road project involves lots of piling. Um, as to other energy, power stations.

00:39:45:21 - 00:40:16:18

And projects probably differ in terms of their proximity to residential properties, which the information probably is there, but we're really not wanting to consider that today. But things do, do vary, but in terms of assessing the impact of construction works, which they obviously they're, they're temporary. They're not they're not permanent, they're temporary, but instead that they need to be assessed. And that's a policy requirement. It would be helpful to get a some indication of the length of time that that, for example, the residential properties nearest to a location where proposed permanent works are likely to be required.

00:40:16:20 - 00:40:22:27

How long would those properties experience those works would be would be helpful.

00:40:23:13 - 00:40:43:12

And understood What we'd say just in terms of the assessment is that we've obviously assessed the worst case based on the amount of hours that we've allowed for in the scheme and then applied the methodology which considers hours, um, to come up with assessments. And what we've assessed is the worst that it could be.

00:40:43:14 - 00:40:47:12

Yeah. And what is that, what is that in terms of length of time experience of piling works.

00:40:47:14 - 00:40:47:29

It's.

00:40:51:02 - 00:40:53:15

What we said, which is.

00:40:53:17 - 00:41:14:06

Eight hours a day. But in terms of actually what was thinking about was over a period of time, how many days would a resident have to experience that noise for in say, there were piling works going on in a particular location within within the distance from the residential property where there would be an effect, a harmful effect How how how many days that would take place for.

00:41:16:09 - 00:41:23:02

And we might have to take that away. But I will just bring in Mr. Cans just in case you can talk more about the what he said in an assessment.

00:41:24:10 - 00:41:59:27

Um, yeah. So we mean what we like. Like Mr. Fox said, we looked at the kind of worst case noise levels when the, you know, the piling would be the closest, um, to any particular property. Um. Just think there's different thresholds in terms of noise levels. That would mean that, you know, an activity would be considered significant again, based on these British standards. Looking at a certain noise levels of a certain day, you know, the working day.

00:42:00:09 - 00:42:25:15

Um, so it's only within, you know, let's say 100 and about 130, 140m that you would have um, of any property which you would have levels that go above 65 decibel. But we can see that that would be for a short period of time because the air is involved is so small. Um, what is that?

00:42:25:17 - 00:42:29:20

Sorry to interrupt, but the short period of time, can that be defined a little bit more in your answer?

00:42:30:00 - 00:43:12:03

Uh, it's we considered less than one month. Um, and simply just because of the, the, you know, the, the areas involved would be would be so small. Um, but, you know, obviously the whole piling will last longer. Um, that hasn't been quantified in full, but the noise level will correspondingly decrease quite rapidly with distance. So yes, some planning will be audible but, but low levels which you know, again relating to generalised, um, you know, guidance on what, what can be considered uh, significant in the context of construction, even for, you know, a rural area.

00:43:12:10 - 00:43:46:26

Um, you know, we're talking about the vast majority time levels below 65dB and, you know, beyond 400m. Yes, beyond 400m drop down to 55dB. Um, and that, that represents, you know, the, the large majority of this, the solar PV area. Um, and so yeah, these in this, you know, these, these are low levels even in the context of construction. So, you know, there would only be, you know, some very short periods where levels are be considered elevated.

00:43:47:09 - 00:44:01:03

And again, these, these construction hours, you know, if you consider other construction projects, even in urban areas where they they might have long periods of of piling for foundations of buildings, etcetera, you it's um,

00:44:02:24 - 00:44:15:07

you know, there's thresholds which you know, even for piling noise, it's accepted as a temporary impact that can be elevated. But you know, further restricting the working hours is not really the way to to mitigate that.

00:44:16:06 - 00:44:40:10

Okay. Understand that. That's helpful. Thank you. Just one final question for Mrs. Holloway, who helpfully got your hand up in terms of points being made that think by the applicant and by think at least one of the councils that actually it's acknowledged that the longer the working hours, the likelihood is, the shorter overall duration of the construction works would be. Do you agree with that, that.

00:44:41:01 - 00:45:11:18

Um, Mrs. Holloway from Action Group, um, obviously this is a is a personal opinion, but think the continuous nature of piling the monotonous, continuous nature of piling will wear it to be six days a week would just be too much for some people given you know, the weekend is a time for the majority of people to take time out and relax on their heavy working week. I think if they are saying they're indicating it is only likely to take a month, then if they only lose half a day.

00:45:11:24 - 00:45:41:15

Within the scheme of things, it's not actually going to extend the construction period, it's not going to impact the construction period by that much. Um, I may have some evidence from other solar farms in respect of things that were perhaps promised by the developer in terms of what was likely to happen in terms of noise and duration and actually what ended up happening and the local authorities having to be involved. Um, I don't think it's quite as straightforward as perhaps has indicated.

00:45:41:19 - 00:46:08:14

Okay. And obviously if you want to provide evidence, then do so for the the next deadline. Also in respect of what happens elsewhere, consider obviously enforcement mechanisms. But what is in the noise management plan propose that's why keep on saying, you know, have a look at these management plans. I'm sure you have. But we'd happily sort of like listen to or hear comments on those because that's where lots of that important detail can be secured. Um, yes, Mrs. Wooley.

00:46:08:27 - 00:46:39:24

Just to give an example, it's in my written report and would refer you back to that. But they did extensive work on the pylons last year, which run, as you know, right the way through the site. And it was very evident and it really alerted me to the impact of the noise of a scheme of this size. Um, the noise levels were way beyond what I would have expected. Um, but there was lots of concern and it was very, very I hadn't appreciated how quiet it was until could actually hear this constant whipping.

00:46:39:26 - 00:47:07:03

And it was very impactful. The prevailing wind is from the southwest. So to suggest that however, somebody suggested 100m from the, um, from residential properties, we're 185m from, from the first solar farm and we can see solar farms, that of two aspects of the house. I am absolutely certain that I will hear piling way beyond 185m from where we're located.

00:47:08:00 - 00:47:16:02

Okay. Thank you. I'll come back to a couple of those points. But before we move on to operational noise, do you want to add anything?

00:47:16:04 - 00:48:04:11

Yes, I was just going to have a reference. So at 078, which is Bendix, 10.2 of the S, um, that talks about our assessment methodology and includes consideration of the hours and how that influenced the assessment. And there's the reference to the month is in table one of that. Um, so that explains the assessment and what this has done. And I think it does reinforce Mr. Khan's point that um, the assessment obviously is making assumptions about aspects of things at the worst case locations and the, the construction activities will move to be further and further away from, from receptors and findings to reinforce the point that the

00:48:05:26 - 00:48:13:21

noise, the noise management measures will be developed pursuant to a section 61% and is a well used to dealing with that. Okay.

00:48:13:25 - 00:48:18:06

I understand that. Yeah. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Um.

00:48:21:29 - 00:48:24:29

On operational noise.

00:48:32:13 - 00:48:40:28

In terms of noise affecting public rights of way. That point has been raised fairly frequently. I think the.

00:48:43:25 - 00:48:51:03

The maximum noise level for this, which would be a requirement, is 55dB.

00:48:53:23 - 00:48:54:09

Uh.

00:48:56:26 - 00:49:29:21

I want to understand is how will. That's the requirement. Includes a stipulation. That's the right word that the noise levels have to then comply with the relevant noise levels in the environmental statement. I've got a separate question about in the hearing, but I'll leave that till tomorrow. But in terms of the 55 decibel limit for public rights of way, which I think is I think I'm correct, that's what it is. But in response to one of our questions. The applicant has said that this would enable reliable speech communication.

00:49:32:01 - 00:50:05:01

Uh, obviously the background noise levels think in relation to some footpaths are as low as 36 to 39dB and which. So the proposed limit of 55dB is seems fairly high compared to the existing background noise. Reference has been made to other noise which I've experienced when I've been to the site, such as Noise from the railway line. Obviously a noise from traffic, but that's not a that's not a continuous noise train.

00:50:05:09 - 00:50:28:27

It's quite a busy train line isn't it. And but the trains sort of pass by every whatever number of minutes they do. And similarly, for road traffic or less maybe less predictable, but the noise from the examples in the substation will be generally a continuous noise, although it may be quieter at night than in the daytime, for example, generally. So in terms of those those effects on footpaths and the fact it's a rural location.

00:50:30:04 - 00:50:31:10

The way that.

00:50:31:21 - 00:51:08:04

Why is why is the limit so high in that respect and where it's where the response has been given about enabling reliable speech communication? How much how does that help? Sort of. A residents understanding the noise levels that will be experienced on footpaths, but also in terms of our job, in examining this in a rural area, it is that a relatively high? Is that a relatively high limit? So you could provide some more explanation detail of how that has evolved and how that has resulted in the effects that the environment statement has concluded would result?

00:51:08:27 - 00:51:41:14

Mr. Fox And half the applicant will will ask can to respond on point about how that number has been developed in reference to the relevant British standard. But I would also just note that in terms of the where will that actually would be operational noise effects, they are minimal and predominantly from the substation where there is no. Public right away at the moment acknowledged that we are suggesting a permitted permissive pardon.

00:51:41:29 - 00:51:55:19

Um, I'll come back to Mr. Mr. Kant on that. Um, but I appreciate the question, but I think it needs to be seen in the context of what we're actually talking about here in terms of the scheme and the operational noise that it causes. Um, but Mr. Kant.

00:51:56:23 - 00:52:33:19

Yes. So in relation to the speech points, well, you know, when I'm when you are now talking normal level without raised voice, that's about 60 65 decibel, you know, in close proximity. So you know level of 55 decibel means you don't have to raise your voice, you know, So as you're passing it, just to put it in context, that it wouldn't be so loud as you would need to raise your voice or anything. It would just be, you know, a bit like comparing to the level of, um, you know, it's to put in context, like you're walking next to a car, this idling, um, is that kind of low level.

00:52:33:27 - 00:53:07:28

So it's not like you have to raise your voice or, or shout, you know, when you're passing the some of the electrical plant, um, you know, the use is like we've explained the rationale for the 50 or 55 decibel, um, criteria. It's often reference for, um, certainly for private amenity like gardens, um, or, you know, balconies in other British standards. Um, there's a reference for, you know, we explain it up in appendix 10.2 of the.

00:53:08:00 - 00:53:39:08

Yes. Um. Which is a zero 78. So we explained the background to that. There was also there was also developed in response to question 901 from the examining authority. But essentially it's a it's a criteria that's considered, you know, for public amenity areas in some cases. Um, because there's no general criteria for for these kind of space.

00:53:39:10 - 00:54:09:14

And you know, in the context of a public right away where the, you know, the use is transient when you're passing by, um, sources of noise like this is particularly, um, precautionary, I would say. Um, so, so yeah, it's a low level of noise. Certainly would be lower than, you know, passing cars or passing trains, which would be, you know, usually well above 60 or 70dB. Um, so, so yeah, it's, you know, it's a low level of noise.

00:54:09:16 - 00:54:21:14

It would be applied for even public amenity areas. But in the context of a passing, you know, passing use like that, it would be audible, noticeable, but not significant really.

00:54:22:07 - 00:54:34:12

Okay. Thank you. And you said that the level is commonly used for gardens and balconies. In any of the guidance, is it stated that it can also be used for public rights of way in a rural area?

00:54:35:05 - 00:55:14:10

Well, again, the the there's no you know, you would not consider these uses are generally not considered as there's no criteria or guidance. They're generally really scoped out I think in this case because of the the concerns that were raised about public rights away. Um we we sought to apply some kind of precautionary criteria. Again um, generally you know, often they would be just simply ignored, you know, because the use is transient. Um, you know, in this case, you know, it would be a noise that would be noticeable, it would be different, but it would be very localized and it would just be an additional part of the soundscape for people to use.

00:55:14:12 - 00:55:38:16

But there's generally, you know, these types of views are not there's no direct criteria that applies for these types of use, you know, so it's generally for private amenity areas like a private garden, um, but generally outdoor areas, you know, they use for, for the public because the use is transient, because the use is temporary, they're generally not protected at the same level. But yeah.

00:55:40:07 - 00:55:41:09

If that makes sense.

00:55:42:20 - 00:55:52:16

And that's the level. But presumably the actual the actual levels that the substation substations capable of producing would be possibly less than that.

00:55:53:13 - 00:56:27:29

Is that? Yes. And, you know, again, the in appendix ten five, we showed that the most of the public rights away, the maximum level that they would actually predict to experience as a worst case would be about 50dB, given the standoffs that have been set of 50 meter maximum distance of separation in the in the design and access statement and the design principles for the projects, we're predicting closer to 50dB, you know, maximum from, you know, inverter stations or other sources like this.

00:56:28:21 - 00:56:35:12

Um, so, you know, these are low levels really in the context of, of transit use like that.

00:56:37:27 - 00:57:02:02

Okay. This is very a danger that having an actual limit set at 55 in terms of how it would the desire for good practice and obviously achieving lower possible levels, is there a danger that having a level of 55 might mean that the scheme will be designed just to achieve that rather than attaining a better a better level? What's in, for example, the Noise environmental management plan in that regard?

00:57:04:00 - 00:57:04:21

Well, the noise.

00:57:04:23 - 00:57:08:22

Management plant, it's not called the Noise Environmental Management Plan, but the noise management plan.

00:57:09:18 - 00:57:44:01

Well, there's so there's a requirement to secure an operational noise strategy. Um, and that's requirement 16 in the DCO. Um, and you know, at this stage, you know, we don't know the details of the equipment will be located and it'll obviously be designed on the basis of a range of considerations, including noise. Um, but you know, I think given these standoff distances of 50m, I think that, um, it's very unlikely you'd have high levels.

00:57:44:03 - 00:58:00:17

But yeah, I think it's a, it's another consideration. You know, it just be very difficult to phrase a, a precise requirement to say, you know, do better if you can. You know, obviously that would be a consideration in the design. But um.

00:58:01:18 - 00:58:14:10

Okay, there is something there, isn't there, in the I don't know if Mr. Fox can help, but there is something in there management plan or maybe I'm calling it the wrong thing which seeks that or is it not? And if there's not, can there be.

00:58:15:12 - 00:58:29:21

Some path that I've got the the in front of me which is not think you were thinking of. Right. Um which refers to the final electrical plant layout and specification will be designed such that noise levels predicted at residential properties do not exceed the limits set out in the application.

00:58:31:22 - 00:58:47:12

Okay. Okay. Well, is that question remains a little bit is that level. But noise levels can actually be less than that. What will join the design process? Enable the levels to be as low as as low as possible, because that must be a thing that should be attained. Given that.

00:58:47:25 - 00:58:56:26

Yes, although although I would argue in the context of the the results of the assessment, which show no significant effect, even if you did meet that level.

00:58:59:08 - 00:59:07:17

They would. And given our embedded mitigations, such as 50 meter set offs as well. I'm not sure.

00:59:09:13 - 00:59:14:25

Well well struggled to see what necessarily what the need for that would be in the context of our assessment results.

00:59:15:08 - 00:59:19:15

Okay. But in terms of getting levels to being as low as possible.

00:59:23:01 - 00:59:25:24

That might be something that's helpful on.

00:59:27:11 - 00:59:28:24

Mrs. Holloway, did you want to comment?

00:59:29:29 - 01:00:09:21

Mrs. Holloway from Marlow Past Action Group. Just a quick observation to limit the amount of noise you can site the solar stations as far away as possible from the public rights of way. So if you look at the indicative layouts of where the solar stations and there's a whole series of them are planned, for example, along one stroke, one bridleway. Whilst they may be a 50 meter distance, there could be an opportunity for them to be far further east on field 36 as an example, and that would reduce, you know, the further away, the more the noise would be reduced.

01:00:09:23 - 01:00:35:04

And I appreciate that the applicant might not want to do that because they would have to run the cable a bit further, etcetera. But maybe there's a middle ground which is, you know, considers the what you can achieve by moving every 5000 meters along if possible. And that's only an example. I've got a other example. Thank you.

01:00:35:28 - 01:00:36:28

Okay. Thank you.

01:00:51:21 - 01:00:53:23

Okay. And.

01:00:56:26 - 01:00:58:00

My next question.

01:01:00:15 - 01:01:03:24

This relates to question 9.07 about.

01:01:05:12 - 01:01:17:24

Links with health and wellbeing. Um, and obviously there's a variety of submissions on that matter, but just in relation to noise. I think the applicant.

01:01:19:12 - 01:01:35:02

States that minor adverse residual effects identified may correspond to some small changes in behavior, attitude or other psychological response effects, as well as in some instances to assault small, actual or perceived change in quality of life. But these will be limited, not significant.

01:01:37:00 - 01:02:09:18

And this is from operational. Operational noise. And in your documents you provided helpfully what that noise will sound like in terms of various like you describe the noises, hums and the sort of various sort of tonal references to the sorts of noise. But if that noise doesn't exist at the moment and then does. Start to exist for residents living in an area with predominantly relatively low noise levels subject to passing trains, etcetera, which you know and understand.

01:02:10:05 - 01:02:48:21

And there will be a effect on people. Will be minor and it may have more of an effect on some people or not. Don't know. That is a that is a quest. That is a question. But are these noise effects because they're just minor in terms of the potential impacts of those on health and well-being because they're minor? Are they just being dismissed or actually, if someone's having can hear a whatever it might be a low grade hum continuously. Is that something which actually could have a harmful effect, albeit a minor harmful effect, which is what this is what this is saying.

01:02:49:01 - 01:03:08:10

But we're not in a sort of a town or a city where there's quite a lot of background, continual noise. The noise levels generally, I experienced it there. The background noise levels were generally seem generally low, subject to as say, passing trains. But these minor levels, given that it's been recognized that there will be an effect of those on humans.

01:03:10:05 - 01:03:12:26

How should that be taken account in considering health and well-being.

01:03:14:15 - 01:03:53:02

Of the applicant? So the the assessment that we've carried out, um, and listen to the terms which imagine you're well used to your role and soul, um, are in line with the national policy on noise. Um, and the reference British standards which reflect back to the World Health Organisation. And those levels relate to health impacts, health and wellbeing impacts. Um, and we've not, as you said, we've not assessed residual significant effects. Now the, the, the um, what's referenced in our answer is a quote essentially directly from and about small changes in behavior.

01:03:53:22 - 01:04:05:01

Um, you know we've identified minor but think and I'll let Mr. can come in but even if they are minor they're on the small scale of, of the minor and, um.

01:04:10:17 - 01:04:42:15

I can only really state what the facts of our assessment are. The question of whether that should be taken into account in the planning balance, I think is a question for you. But I think that in the context of the is which don't which don't talk about mining and different effects and that being something to weigh against a scheme and that being the primary that well, the important relevant considerations for you. Um, I would argue that it should be given very limited weight in the planning balance.

01:04:44:05 - 01:05:19:08

Um, yeah. So if I can add to that, just to, you know, to clarify that the, you know, the assessment took fully into account the, the existing background levels in the area and baseline levels on, on a fairly robust, you know, fairly safe basis in terms of what the quiet periods of the day, you know, quiet peers at night. So we you know it was fully, fully cognizant of the nature of the area which is rural. Um, so, so that was taken into account. And, and even on that basis, the effects are like you say, they they minor adverse effect.

01:05:19:10 - 01:05:49:14

Now how people react to noise is very subjective and it depends on many factors and subjective factors. But um, yeah, on any objective basis, you know, these, these are, these are limited effects. If we look at the, you know, the impacts in the daytime, which is the, the when, you know, solar farm would be generally operating. Um they you know the the predicted levels even at the closest affected properties are, you know, the rated level.

01:05:49:16 - 01:06:21:18

So even accounting of the the hum effect the character of the noise potentially might be present even accounting for that that comparable to to levels you'd experience during quiet periods of the daytime. Um so you know think in and that's with everything running at full duty and the wind blowing towards the receptors etcetera. So think you know think like Mr. Fox said the effects are of fairly limited in reality but then you know.

01:06:21:27 - 01:06:23:12

Yeah that's, that's it.

01:06:24:02 - 01:06:57:17

And just to bring it back to the, to the um, which reminded myself, you know, it says it's not granted development consent unless it's satisfied that the proposals meet. The following aims avoid significant adverse impacts from noise which we do mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life. From noise which we've done as described in our embedded mitigation and very set offs. Um. County where possible, contribute to improvements to the vector management and control of noise. And that's what we've got through our measures in the Kemp the and requirement 16.

01:06:59:07 - 01:07:00:25

So I appreciate.

01:07:02:14 - 01:07:10:02

You ask that question. But in that policy context, I think there's give some guidance as to how much you read in the balance.

01:07:10:18 - 01:07:23:10

Okay. Thank you. On the point about minimizing and mitigating, what were the words from the other have other adverse impacts? Minor impacts are still adverse impacts. And going back to the public right of way point.

01:07:25:12 - 01:07:42:12

It goes back to that point about, well, 55 can be met, but it could actually be better than 55 if designed. You know, with good high spec noise insulation. Then again, does the need to be something added into. A document to ensure that there are

01:07:44:03 - 01:08:03:12

won't put in words that best endeavours necessarily where that will lead, but to ensure that they are as low as possible rather than just 50. Meeting. 50. Meeting. Meeting the Meeting. The limits that are set out in the environmental statement. Why not go lower than those where there are even minor effects? Because there's still minor effects, aren't there?

01:08:03:15 - 01:08:05:21

Think. Think. The danger of this is.

01:08:07:17 - 01:08:21:00

The what language you could use because if you said minimize half of life, then we can come along with a noise strategy and ourselves in the LPA could debate until the cows come home whether we've gone far enough to minimize

01:08:22:17 - 01:08:26:11

the advantage of having a number is that you have a target to meet.

01:08:29:00 - 01:08:40:03

So think we would be concerned with any kind of requirement that that sort to impose any kind of quantitative judgment on our noise mitigation strategies through design.

01:08:40:23 - 01:08:52:20

But there could potentially be something in actually our environment, the construction management plan, for example, in there, which would be secured by requirement. But I.

01:08:53:03 - 01:08:55:24

Think in construction environmental management plan that.

01:08:56:13 - 01:08:57:10

The operational.

01:08:57:15 - 01:09:09:28

The operational management plan, but that's also secured by a requirement. So if, if so, we can take it away and think about what language you can use. But I just want to.

01:09:10:06 - 01:09:37:13

Come back to the point about 10% or 70% is actually having it's a slight related to that point to that if it's in a requirement and then elsewhere, it's different. Maybe that's applicable here as well. Can I just

ask I'll come back to there's a couple of hands that missed. Sorry. I know residents have points on this, so just ask if there's any point at this point from the the local authorities on this who will be actually the ones enforcing the various controls? ET cetera. If there's any points you want to add.

01:09:40:19 - 01:09:48:21

Nope. Nope. Okay. Uh, there's two hands that I've missed. Missed? Not so much, miss, but, Mr. Kendricks, would you like to?

01:09:49:27 - 01:10:31:25

Yes. David Kentish, on behalf of Bryce from Parish Council. Just coming back to the decibel noise. The information that I've looked at shows an average for, um, substation of 60 and 80dB and also, um, within, within the actual, um, overall situation, there will be 84 plus containers housing inverters, transformers and switchgear. Now each of those will be producing a noise continuously, could be anywhere up to 60 to 80dB in each case that will become active overall.

01:10:31:27 - 01:10:57:18

So that noise could actually be exacerbated and multiplied when you actually get quite close to it. And when it gets close or is close to people's properties and that's 24 hours a day. So, um, the gentleman had talked about it's, you know, the decibel noise being quiet during the day. I'm not quite sure where he lives, but where we are when it's very quiet during the day, you do not get this type of noise.

01:10:58:11 - 01:11:03:07

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Is that Mrs. Davis? Okay.

01:11:04:22 - 01:11:41:08

No, thank you. I just wanted to say that, yes, it might be regarded as very minimal, but actually people are different the way they react to noise. And sometimes a very low noise is so annoying. It can impact on the health of that person. But also if it's continuous, does that mean 20 years, 40 years or 60 years? Is that how long that noise is going to have to be listened to in a rural area?

01:11:45:19 - 01:11:54:19

And thank you. Just going to take one more submission before so can and you can sweep up in response to all three. Mrs. Christie, your hands up as well.

01:11:57:15 - 01:11:58:10

Hello? Yeah. Yeah.

01:11:58:12 - 01:12:00:13

So it's Jo. Jo. Jo.

01:12:00:22 - 01:12:02:02

Mrs.. Mrs. Mercedes.

01:12:02:04 - 01:12:02:26

Husband.

01:12:03:06 - 01:12:04:13

Oh, right. Um. Yeah.

01:12:04:15 - 01:12:08:00

To do with noise. Um, currently the.

01:12:08:02 - 01:12:09:10

The the noise on the.

01:12:09:12 - 01:12:10:11

Drift, the.

01:12:10:13 - 01:12:11:05

Background noise.

01:12:11:07 - 01:12:12:26

On the drift. And it's a breezy day.

01:12:12:28 - 01:12:16:27

It's fluctuating between 16 and 24dB.

01:12:18:15 - 01:12:27:20

Um, and I think as I've said in my submission, at night, it will drop down to below five decibels of background noise. So

01:12:29:12 - 01:12:45:24

the percentage increase of, you know, of a substation being 50dB, it's you're up to up to ten times the level of noise. Um, and there's been no indication of this being any quieter at night. Um.

01:12:47:18 - 01:13:20:05

Whether at night the noise could be very significant, especially in the summer. You got your windows open. So a background noise of 20 20dB when you used to five decibels and the background hum or of machinery moving, if these axes are moving at nighttime, would be extremely significant, even though supposedly within W.H.O. guidelines as stated earlier on. So it's a matter of context and at what time of day this this is happening.

01:13:20:07 - 01:13:33:04

But as I say, this very moment, the noise levels are below, below 30 and generally fluctuate, fluctuating between 16 and 24. And it's a breezy day in the middle of the day.

01:13:33:19 - 01:13:40:12

So those noise sorry, those background noise levels that you refer to, where where do those come from?

01:13:40:14 - 01:14:16:20

Where I've just stood out on live on the drift next to one of the sites. And so it's on the pequest drift, which would be next to one of the development sites field I can't remember fields fields 1 to 3 off the drift. Um, so it's, it's smack within and it's a public right of way which will be directly affected as well as the houses on the drift. So just to put it in, it was really just to put it in context and the very significant percentage difference that you're talking about.

01:14:16:22 - 01:14:21:19

If if you're just saying, well, it's the same as a car and you've got 80 cars in the background.

01:14:23:04 - 01:14:24:06

Okay, that's my comment.

01:14:24:08 - 01:14:24:23

Thank you.

01:14:24:25 - 01:14:27:21

So there's noise levels. The ones you did yourself. They're not the applicants noise levels.

01:14:28:00 - 01:14:31:07

They're just using a noise meter on my phone.

01:14:31:12 - 01:14:31:27

Right.

01:14:32:07 - 01:14:33:00

Which.

01:14:34:19 - 01:14:42:01

As it may not be 100% accurate, but it's indicative. And that's the live, live reading at this very moment.

01:14:44:00 - 01:14:44:15

Thank you.

01:14:44:27 - 01:14:47:05

Okay. Thank you for that submission.

01:14:49:15 - 01:14:50:09

Mr. Fox, do you want?

01:14:50:20 - 01:15:32:25

Mr. Fox, in behalf of the applicant. Um, the first of all, just wanted to briefly come back and your point about minimizing and that we have sought to do that through our parameters and the design guidance and the work spans. Um, so that's, you know, minimizing isn't just about the actual kit, it's where it's located. Um, and thought it's also just relevant to mention in the context of when you ask a question about 55 DB and what that means, um, in the, at paragraph 10.8 .25, the, the combined noise levels do not see elevated level of 35 db almost all residential reception receptors.

01:15:33:09 - 01:15:49:04

And that even on the basis of conservative assumptions applying including plant operating at full duty all day. So I'll bring back to 35 DB and correct me if I'm wrong, but think he was saying that that is essentially the equivalent of two people having a conversation.

01:15:50:21 - 01:15:52:02

Um, so think, um.

01:15:52:15 - 01:16:02:27

So yeah, yeah. Just to be clear, I think, you know, we've got to separate the public rights away and you know, the public right away we're talking about levels of 50, 55.

01:16:04:02 - 01:16:05:22

55. Yeah, I understand that.

01:16:05:25 - 01:16:07:08

But the for.

01:16:07:10 - 01:16:39:26

Private residential properties like Mr. Christie's just talking about, we we're looking at much, much quieter levels. Um, and they are based on on background readings we took with, you know, very accurate equipment that fully recognize the nature of the area. We're talking about levels of 35 DB of its particular properties, closer to 30 DB as a worst case. You know, these are very low noise levels. You know, I'm sure in the room you are now at the moment, if no one is talking, it would be higher than that. Um, you know, these, these are low level of noise.

01:16:40:06 - 01:16:56:24

Um, and it does fully recognize, you know, when you're talking about levels of 60, 80 DB that were talked about, that's, that's, you know, that's the noise level at, at the source, you know not nowhere near the levels that any residents would experience. So just to make that very clear.

01:16:58:04 - 01:17:03:00

And so think that's important context of what the loan means and the answer to that question. Okay.

01:17:03:14 - 01:17:10:12

Right. Thank you. Those are the questions that I've got for today on Noise Air.

01:17:12:12 - 01:17:21:02

It's 5:00 am, which was when we were due to finish. Just give me two seconds while consult with Mr. Jack.

01:17:35:21 - 01:18:05:23

Okay. I think it's okay with parties from the response we had before. Mr. James has two highways questions that you would like to ask, so we should probably make use of this a little bit of extra time to ask those if that is okay of everybody. Don't think it's going to take too long and then we'll come back tomorrow to, uh, on economic etcetera, cultural heritage and in combination and cumulative effects and sites inspection arrangements. So. Mr..

01:18:05:25 - 01:18:06:21

James Thank you.

01:18:09:11 - 01:18:43:21

Thank you. So a shortened version of agenda item number nine. Highways and access. And any questions we couldn't get through today, we will oppose later in writing and in relation to access to the primary construction compounds and particularly the time restrictions for deliveries. And it's acknowledged by the applicant that there's some, albeit limited overlap with movements and school journey times and set.

01:18:43:24 - 01:19:20:16

And the response to question 11 zero two, which is 2037. So there is that small overlap there between those two movements. Should the outline construction traffic management plan delivery time restrictions be extended further to avoid any potential overlap? And what would the implications been in terms of practical terms for the construction process if there was a a small modification to those restrictions to avoid any possible overlap between deliveries with HGVs and school drop off times?

01:19:21:13 - 01:19:33:08

And Mr. Fox Applicant, I'll bring in Mr. Kirby, our transfer expert, because, um, hadn't understood that we were saying that there was a conflict, but I'll let you be coming.

01:19:35:16 - 01:20:22:15

Good afternoon. Mark Kirby from Velocity Transport Planning on behalf of the applicant. Just with regards the construction traffic deliveries, whilst the construction hours are identified as being between 7 and 7 12 hour construction period, the delivery of particularly heavy goods vehicles delivering to the primary compound is only identified between 9:00 and 3:00, and that's specifically identified with a mine to particularly the primary school in Great Casterton and and the college in Greater Casterton, which is on Route one, which is the route that to the primary access compound sorry, from the A1, from the strategic road network for heavy goods vehicles.

01:20:22:17 - 01:20:59:06

So the intention was to avoid the period where the school is expected particularly to drop off children in the morning. And we have looked at and gone into a bit more detail as to exactly what time the primary school starts, i.e., children will arrive prior to the start of the primary school and that is identified in the responses being 840. We've also identified that it's a ten minute HGV journey time from the strategic network from the A1 to the primary compound.

01:20:59:10 - 01:21:11:00

So if they're arriving at 9:00. The intention is that they would avoid the school addressed as best as is possible or the interaction with school particularly drop off.

01:21:13:15 - 01:21:27:13

Thank you. Appreciate the response to the question. My reading of the response was that there was still some, as I say, albeit limited potential for those two categories of movements to coincide. Is that not the case?

01:21:29:17 - 01:22:00:01

Paul Kirby, on behalf of the appellant think think the point that you might be making is could the heavy goods vehicles, whilst they oppose the construction traffic management plan, would identify that they would deliver at 9:00? That's what time the primary compound would open to accept deliveries, but they could still arrive prior to that is take it. That's the point that you're making. That's where the potential overlap would be. Um, that's certainly not the intention. And of course we don't yet as of yet have a contractor on board.

01:22:00:03 - 01:22:12:08

The outline Construction traffic management plan does set out the intention of those delivery times and of course those will be finalised when, when the construction traffic management plan is finalised.

01:22:13:15 - 01:22:50:07

Um, just to add to that, think, think we can, we can offer in the tmp that um, used to provide certainty that um, the CTP can be updated to provide it. They can't pass through the village before 8:45 a.m. that way there's there can be no conflict. And rather than moving it later, because that's not necessary, as long as you're making sure that they're not passing through the village. At the same time, any time people are arriving and just just to for the sake of completeness, um, the in terms of the afternoon, the vehicles won't be passing the school because I'm going the other way.

01:22:50:21 - 01:23:02:27

Yes, it was primarily the drop period I think was the potential time slot where there could be some say albeit limited conflict. But I appreciate the the offer of the update to the management plan. Thank you. Um.

01:23:06:02 - 01:23:12:00

With a housing authority like to comment on on that. So yes. Mr.. Jordan.

01:23:14:11 - 01:23:16:28

Phil Jordan for seventh District Council.

01:23:17:05 - 01:23:25:08

Not representing the Highway authority. But just picking up on that point, isn't the point that the busy times for schools would be?

01:23:26:05 - 01:23:27:26

Wouldn't just be 845, and.

01:23:27:28 - 01:23:32:11

After that time it would be likely to be 858.

01:23:33:14 - 01:23:34:01

30.

01:23:34:21 - 01:23:38:00

You know, isn't that where the overlap is in the time period?

01:23:43:08 - 01:23:52:12

I think what we're saying is that we'd be saying that HGVs couldn't pass through the village until after 845, so they wouldn't be there beforehand.

01:23:56:25 - 01:23:57:16

Mrs. Holloway.

01:23:58:17 - 01:24:25:07

Mrs. Holloway from Action Group. I might be misunderstanding it, but I think the arrangement was it should not be going through great Casterton until after 9:00. Therefore, it shouldn't start at 845. That's far too close to the the school times and any any overlap there may be. So therefore it shouldn't start coming through the village until after 9:00. That was the understanding of the original.

01:24:27:16 - 01:24:29:27

And what we've seen in the documents. Thank you.

01:24:30:23 - 01:24:38:10

And the applicant. Know the commitment in TMP is that deliveries would be between 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. two site.

01:24:45:19 - 01:25:03:11

Thank you. Mr. Fox participated in your offer of a review of the time restrictions. Just. Just reflect on those comments and respond in writing that be that would be helpful. Did we have any comments from the from the highways authorities before we move on from this particular item?

01:25:07:21 - 01:25:16:21

So yes, our highways engineer is line. Don't believe she's got a hand up. Oh, she has. Sorry.

01:25:19:09 - 01:25:19:28

Thank you.

01:25:22:10 - 01:25:58:13

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. Um, I would agree it's quite tight in terms of the time frame. Um, and I welcome the offer for the restriction to be not going through the village rather than arriving at the site because obviously they could go through the village a lot sooner and sit somewhere and wait. So think if that restriction could be considered, um, to restrict movements through great Casterton, um, rather than the site time.

01:25:58:16 - 01:26:20:14

Um, site arrival time, that would be much preferred. And I do think the five minutes, you know, 840 arrival, there will be some people lagging behind registration is at 850. Um, so I suggest 9:00 the same as somebody else has just suggested. Thank you.

01:26:26:19 - 01:26:29:16

Firm apologies. Mr.. Mr.. Willis as well.

01:26:32:02 - 01:26:57:11

Yeah. Thank you, sir. Well, you can't cancel. Yeah. I'm, fortunately don't have a Highways colleague on the call today. But with regard to the point, I'd echo what has just been said. Really think the authority would welcome clarification within the traffic management plan with regard to restrictions on time. And if that can include making it clearer about the times that restrict going through the village would support that.

01:27:02:01 - 01:27:07:09

Thank you, Mr. Willis. Mr. Fox. Any further points to to address there?

01:27:07:17 - 01:27:17:07

We've had feedback and we've heard the feedback and we will reflect on that in the updated. We will choose a time

01:27:19:09 - 01:27:19:24

notice.

01:27:19:27 - 01:27:20:18

Thank you.

01:27:22:13 - 01:27:53:22

I'm moving on into what will be my last question for today on on highways and Access. The outline Construction and traffic management plan seeks to provide 150 car parking spaces within the primary construction compound. Up to 400 staff will be on site during the construction phase. The applicant will seek to investigate the feasibility of a shuttle service so bus and work accommodation or to a railway station and think there's also measures in terms of

01:27:55:11 - 01:28:34:00

cycling, etcetera, that will be promoted and try and reduce car use to the primary construction compound. And just a question in terms of what will happen in the event given that those measures are seemingly voluntary in terms of uptake from members of staff, what would happen in in the context of any potential overspill situation should the demand exceed supply for parking spaces at the primary construction compound car park? How will that be managed and monitored? And will there be any overspill provision or measures put in place to avoid that situation arising in the first place?

01:28:35:22 - 01:28:36:07

And

01:28:38:03 - 01:29:07:00

I'll let Mr. Kirby talk about that in terms of how that might play out practically. But I would just add that, of course, through the requirement for us to bring forward a detailed CMP, we'll have to confirm what our methodology is, including including any shuttle bus. And so the answer to that question will come. With that detail if it is even indeed an issue. But I'll let Mr. Kirby just touch more about that.

01:29:08:20 - 01:29:48:05

Mark Kirby on behalf of the applicant, just to add, whilst the outline construction traffic management plan is in outline at present, there's also a travel plan that supports the and of course the travel plan will identify measures for more sustainable means of transport to the site. The shuttle bus, as we've we've already identified means of cycling, other means of getting to the site. But also it's where are the staff coming from? And at this stage, without having established that methodology as to where the staff are coming from, the majority of them could be in accommodation, which would make perfect sense to come via a shuttle bus.

01:29:48:27 - 01:30:12:08

Um, also the 400 limit is a maximum limit. It's certainly not an average. There are figures set out within the supporting documents that identify that average staff are considerably less than that. So think the 150 space car parking provision would be more than adequate, but the details will be agreed through the construction management plan and the travel plan.

01:30:14:25 - 01:30:48:12

Thank you. Appreciate The 400 members of staff is perhaps not going to be an issue for the entirety of the construction. And there are measures to try and encourage alternative use from from the car. But there is a potential risk. And again, appreciate there's more detail to come, but um, there is a risk, as I see, that there could be a situation whereby demand exceeds supply and at the moment there's no solution to that that can see, um, particularly given the fact that the grass verge and the area are particularly sensitive in terms of biodiversity value.

01:30:48:25 - 01:30:56:27

Um, is there a risk there that there could be some harm to those grass verges, for instance, as well as the traffic implications?

01:30:57:05 - 01:31:24:21

And Mr. Fox, on behalf of the applicant, I think what we will do here is update the TMP to ensure that's not allowed to happen. And secondly to if it's not clear already making clearer that when we submit the update, we will provide explicit detail on what the parking situation is. So then that's then able to be, um, approved. I mean. Yes. Yeah. So that, that avoids the ecological impacts you you've raised.

01:31:27:07 - 01:31:57:20

So just to come back, Mark Kirby, on behalf of the applicant, you mentioned the potential traffic impacts. Of course, staff will be arriving at the site prior to the start of the working day, which is 7:00 in the morning to 7:00 in the evening. So of course, those staff would be expected to travel between, say, six and seven. So the impacts on the local network, even if they were to come by car, would be outside of traditional peak hours, which is when we assess the impacts on the network because that's when the network is at its busiest period.

01:31:57:22 - 01:32:02:05

So the impact should be, well, completely insignificant in traffic terms.

01:32:03:21 - 01:32:13:21

Thank you. Yeah, just to clarify, I was thinking more in terms of vehicles parked on narrow lanes, which may restrict other vehicles trying to pass at a later point during the day.

01:32:15:18 - 01:32:52:16

Mark Kirby, on behalf of the applicant. Just just pick up on the point. Whilst that 150 space car parking provision is identified within the primary compound at present, of course, there's the opportunity for the staff as the phasing of the development is firstly agreed and set out, some of those staff will go to secondary compounds and the opportunity to provide temporary parking within the site itself, within the outer limits of that particular phase of development is, you know, more than opportune to do and the contractor will identify what would be required.

01:32:52:18 - 01:33:06:25

So again, as part of the outline construction traffic management plan, which will be finalised once that contract is on board, we can identify where that parking could occur. So it didn't occur outside of the the development boundaries.

01:33:07:29 - 01:33:18:02

It just adds think, think we can look to update the outline to essentially set out as a zone in roads in which we will say that

01:33:20:24 - 01:33:27:01

contracting contracted staff would not be able to park to deal with both the ecological and the kind of passing issue.

01:33:27:25 - 01:33:35:06

Thank you. Noted. Um, Mrs. Smith online. Would you like to comment on on that at all?

01:33:38:09 - 01:34:23:14

Yes, please, sir. Um. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. Um, I did raise the question about this 400 staff. Um, verbally, um, not in any writing with the transport consultant. And I was advised that it was, um, not well written. And it was indicated to me that it was 400 over, um, the entire project, um, in terms of uh, for, so a maximum of 150 up to 150, but in over the entirety of the all the phases, 400, not 400 at any one time.

01:34:23:16 - 01:34:56:00

So and I did notice clarification well, not clarification of it. It wasn't particularly stipulated, but it's quite clear from the additional information that was put forward to South Kesteven questions, um, that um, the 400 could potentially arrive at one time. So I wouldn't be too concerned. As Mr. Kirby said, they'll be arriving prior to well outside of peak hour traffic. So I'm not concerned about the, the levels of traffic, but am concerned about the parking.

01:34:56:02 - 01:35:12:09

Now um, given that there's only 150, but I'd welcome to see more detailed plans about um, not only the primary um, site, but also all the secondary sites as has just been discussed. Thank you.

01:35:15:21 - 01:35:21:03

Thank you. Um, would Rutland County Council like to comments?

01:35:22:27 - 01:35:24:26

Apologies. Apologies. Um.

01:35:27:04 - 01:35:29:28

Lancashire County Council. Mr. Willis.

01:35:31:18 - 01:35:32:15

Online still.

01:35:33:20 - 01:35:46:07

Okay. Thank you, sir. What? We're going to cancel now, as I say, unfortunately, don't have a highways Highways colleague on online today so we can take that away and consider it, if necessary, report back if that's okay.

01:35:47:04 - 01:35:52:14

Yes, thank you. That'd be helpful. Any further comments in the room? Yes. Mrs. Willey.

01:35:53:07 - 01:36:14:16

Mrs. Woodley, Formal action group could ask for clarification on whether the proposed parking in the secondary compounds was taken into consideration when the traffic surveys were done to look at the impact on local traffic. If those compounds are to be used for car parking. That wasn't our understanding from what we've read so far.

01:36:16:20 - 01:36:17:06

We have to.

01:36:17:25 - 01:36:18:15

Respond.

01:36:19:17 - 01:36:55:19

Mark, on behalf of the applicant. We did consider all of the traffic and our traffic surveys did pick up all of the network to each of the secondary compounds because, of course, the intention is that that staff would be shuttled between the primary compound and the secondary compound. But of course there might be a need for inspections, for management staff to arrive at various compounds through different phases. So there's inevitably going to be a small level of localized parking for that compound. But the intention is certainly that staff, the majority of staff, would be shuttled between the primary compound and the secondary compound.

01:36:55:21 - 01:37:23:01

But of course, there's also the the movement of materials between the primary compound and the secondary compound. So we've actually set out within our assessments not just the fact that there'll be materials moved on a tractor and trailer as the is the proposed means of, of moving those materials. But we've looked at the swept path assessment of the car and that tractor and trailer. So we have undertaken those surveys and look to them and there's no material impacts identified.

01:37:24:12 - 01:37:52:09

And if I can just give a reference where that starts to be talked about, because it was a sensitivity test that was specifically asked for by the RPAs. So it's in five paragraph, paragraph 5.3.12 confirms that we did the sensitivity test and then the rest of the transport assessment then goes on to explain the results of that. Just lost examination library on my computer, so I can't give you the document reference, but it's the it's the transcript in that paragraph.

01:37:58:18 - 01:37:59:05

Thank you.

01:38:01:09 - 01:38:23:04

And if I could just add, just to pick up the comment from the online, just when we're updating the outline to reflect the actions from today, we won't be saying how many parking spaces there will be in the secondary compounds because we don't know that. Now, if there were to be any that would be that would come with the construction contractor on board. Just to be clear on the timelines on that.

01:38:23:29 - 01:38:28:26

Noted. Thank you. Um, Mr. Smith, did you have a further point?

01:38:32:12 - 01:39:01:29

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. I just want to make one final point that there seems to be a heavy reliance on investigating the feasibility of shuttles. And I appreciate it's very difficult without a contractor on board. Um, if there was some way of firming up that they had to have shuttle buses because there's this reliance on it, um, then that would be welcomed. Thank you.

01:39:05:04 - 01:39:12:21

Thank you, Mr. Smith. Perhaps if the applicant could reflect on that comments when considering your revisions to the construction traffic management plan.

01:39:14:03 - 01:39:14:18

Yes, sir.

01:39:16:04 - 01:39:16:26

Mrs. Holloway.

01:39:18:00 - 01:39:48:16

Mrs. Holloway, on behalf of my action group. I'd just like to clarify the point about talk that talks about the use of the shuttle bus to mitigate the effects of the traffic and parking. But yet in the socioeconomic chapter, it also talks about employment coming from the local 50% of the employment coming from the local area. So somewhere there's a bit of a disconnect because obviously the local people are not going to use the shuttle bus.

01:39:49:13 - 01:40:06:00

If there are 50% people employed from the local area. So I think we need to understand, you know, are they outsiders or what is what is the mix? But I think we need to look at worst case scenario. Thank you.

01:40:06:02 - 01:40:07:00

Mr. Fox, if you could.

01:40:07:18 - 01:40:38:21

Come back at that. And unless Mr. Kirby says otherwise, we have access to worst case scenario. The the the bus is kind of takes out of the assessment and said, you know, obviously we want to improve situation so we would suggest the bus but we have assessed the worst case scenario of everyone arriving without a shuttle bus. And as Mr. Kirby said earlier, those movements would be happening pre peak time. And so there would essentially be no significant impact in traffic terms.

01:40:41:13 - 01:40:48:19

Thank you. Um, do you have any further comments? Points to raised before we wrap up?

01:40:49:17 - 01:41:09:06

Sorry. Should just add then. And it's for that reason that don't think that we can be more certain on the shuttle bus. We're not using it to say this is a mitigation for an impact that was significant. It's something that we acknowledge would be something good to do. But at this point, I would not want to put in a document that we have to do it because it may not be feasible for a number of reasons.

01:41:12:06 - 01:41:13:11

That's it. Thank you.

01:41:14:26 - 01:41:21:25

Okay. I'm just making a note of the the time. We are well over the original 5 p.m.

01:41:23:10 - 01:41:53:28

time that was was assigned for the for the hearing. And so we'll look to to wrap up for for today. And just to summarize if you have spoken today, it would assist us if you could please provide your written version of your submissions by the line four, which is the 25th of July. The recording of this hearing will be published on our website as soon as possible after the hearing. Thank you everyone, for your submissions today. It's been a long day but productive and

01:41:55:15 - 01:42:08:05

they will assist us in the making of our recommendations to the Secretary states and as a previously where we haven't managed to get through all the questions, we will look to address those in writing as far as possible.

01:42:08:07 - 01:42:17:06

So before you close this, you may have been going there but wasn't sure if the theme of your sentence Do we want to agree the actions or are we going to do that tomorrow?

01:42:18:18 - 01:42:28:21

We can do the actions for today, actually, can't we, to get them out of the way in case people aren't in attendance tomorrow? I've got them here so I can run through those. Um.

01:42:29:03 - 01:42:30:22

Yeah, that'd be helpful, actually.

01:42:31:12 - 01:42:33:06

So from this morning's.

01:42:36:01 - 01:42:37:18

From this morning's session.

01:42:47:17 - 01:42:50:18

Okay. From this morning's session for the

01:42:52:21 - 01:42:55:25

applicants and local authorities, updated statements of common ground.

01:42:59:05 - 01:43:17:09

Including principle areas of disagreement. It goes back to our discussion on statements of common ground and also statements of common ground. Common ground, including agreed protected provisions with network rail, including cable crossing or an update on on that.

01:43:20:25 - 01:43:27:03

And when, say, agreed protective provisions, if they're not agreed, then make that clear. And the reasons why.

01:43:27:14 - 01:43:32:10

If that if grateful that that could be noted as an update on the position because think.

01:43:32:18 - 01:43:47:27

Sorry, I'm just reading from the text. But yes, that's that's right. And and then thirdly, in relation to Statement of Common Ground statements of common ground and the statement of common ground, including principle, there was a disagreement with Mallard Pass Action Group.

01:43:50:24 - 01:43:59:20

Okay. Then moving on to landscape and visual matters. These are for the applicant, unless I otherwise say so. Uh,

01:44:01:20 - 01:44:06:12

to provide specific comments on additional viewpoints suggested by Action group.

01:44:09:10 - 01:44:13:08

Which will be helpful moving forward to the complete site inspection.

01:44:18:09 - 01:44:18:28

There.

01:44:26:10 - 01:44:33:16

Over the next one's covered check A report from RH Re viewpoints is in an examination library. Think it is, isn't it? That's.

01:44:44:04 - 01:44:45:14

Is that, you know, that's been.

01:44:45:16 - 01:44:46:19

Checked during the day.

01:44:49:15 - 01:44:50:00

Yeah.

01:44:51:06 - 01:44:55:03

I guess Appendix 6.6 of think.

01:44:55:05 - 01:45:07:15

That we have that. Think we have that think. If not we can raise that. Let's we'll just check that. This evening overnight. So let's. Let's put that one.

01:45:09:00 - 01:45:33:24

To one side. And then the note from the applicant on the substation matters that were discussed, including consideration of potential line drawings, showing maximum parameters and dealing with the existing topography of the substation site. And think also how. The landscape of visual effects being assessed.

01:45:36:21 - 01:45:43:06

The timing of the photo montage, and that's a relation to Mr. Hughes's point. We've got to wrap those up into one document. Think.

01:45:45:20 - 01:45:46:05

Okay.

01:45:50:03 - 01:46:05:21

Okay. One for the two local planning authorities, Rutland County Council and South Kesteven District Council. Any comments on the design access statement? Design guidance? I think that flowed from the discussion we were having about the substation.

01:46:10:06 - 01:46:19:09

Malpass Action Group. The next one is for I think this is to submit details re the example of the solar farm with security fencing.

01:46:31:03 - 01:46:34:28

Okay. And then moving to this afternoon's session.

01:46:36:21 - 01:47:06:23

Sorry to interrupt. Did just wonder if it would help? No. We focused around the substation notes, but given the questions yesterday and yesterday would have dwelled on the different aspects of the solar stations and the container boxes, I wondered if it might helpful for us to do kind of as well as the substation notes are kind of a general note on the role of the points and decorative drawings and the parameters in the assessment and how they all work together for the assessment and

01:47:08:15 - 01:47:10:17

particularly reference to certain stations inverters.

01:47:12:12 - 01:47:17:25

Yes. If that goes beyond information that's already before us, then that would be that would be helpful.

01:47:18:08 - 01:47:21:02

Just a stitching together as one. Yeah. Okay.

01:47:37:02 - 01:47:37:17

Okay.

01:47:37:19 - 01:47:39:29

And then moving on to this afternoon session.

01:47:43:22 - 01:47:53:09

Okay. Again, think that's all for the applicant actually consideration of specific percentage of BNG in draft requirement seven.

01:47:57:09 - 01:48:00:04

Secondly, to review the applicable metric.

01:48:03:25 - 01:48:10:08

Thirdly, response to potential effects on eyes from movements travelling to and from the site.

01:48:16:09 - 01:48:20:07

Response to Mr. Williams comments on ecological mitigation.

01:48:23:29 - 01:48:34:21

Sorry, I'm just on the point. You mentioned HGVs. Think presumably outside the main vehicles more generally, given the concerns about lives and cars, etcetera.

01:48:35:01 - 01:48:40:23

Yeah. Yes. Thank you for that clarification. All vehicle movements.

01:48:47:09 - 01:48:58:07

A new next section in terms of Mr. Williams points. I'd be grateful if we could perhaps say that for deadline five rather than deadline for Mr. Williams to put them in writing for the deadline for to us and to respond to.

01:49:02:21 - 01:49:04:09

But it's deadline five.

01:49:08:18 - 01:49:09:03

It.

01:49:11:16 - 01:49:14:16

Is that because you've not got the points noted down or.

01:49:14:18 - 01:49:15:03

Yes.

01:49:15:10 - 01:49:17:16

We can. There is a recording we got.

01:49:17:18 - 01:49:21:22

We can't take it from the transcript, but mean the recording.

01:49:21:24 - 01:49:28:13

Will be available probably in two days time. So. Okay. I think the comments were sort of fairly concise. So

01:49:29:29 - 01:49:48:06

yeah, if you can review the if you can review the recording provided for deadline for it, there's obviously a big issue with that. The letters. No, but don't doesn't sound as though that's overly onerous and explanation. The next one explanation of viability of sheep farming within the order limits.

01:49:52:24 - 01:50:07:26

And also in relation to the sheep farming response. In writing to the Post Action Group. Comments on sheep farming within the order limits. I think those are the comments on the practicalities of whether or not it was likely to happen within the order limits during operation.

01:50:12:09 - 01:50:16:16

The next one. Applicants Response to Rep 2061.

01:50:23:16 - 01:50:38:22

And then, as we've just discussed, the review of the potential updates of the outline construction traffic management plan in relation to I think it was two things, didn't it? Movement times in relation to Great Casterton and Construction parking.

01:50:42:08 - 01:50:42:27

Yes, that's right.

01:50:43:14 - 01:50:46:12

We finished. We're just checking what 60 you want is.

01:50:52:05 - 01:50:59:10

Secret parish councils written rap and specifically at that point on the run off right from the solar panels.

01:50:59:24 - 01:51:00:09

Yeah.

01:51:14:03 - 01:51:14:18

Okay.

01:51:14:20 - 01:51:16:07

And there's one more.

01:51:21:27 - 01:51:29:08

Going back to a noise. And this was for Rutland County Council. This was for Environmental health Environmental Health officer to provide

01:51:30:24 - 01:51:34:16

any feedback on noise effect.

01:51:43:08 - 01:51:48:24

And that is our list. Any that have been missed?

01:51:58:16 - 01:52:02:16

We also tied those up and those will go on the website as well

01:52:04:06 - 01:52:05:11

in the next few days.

01:52:09:19 - 01:52:11:01

Okay, everyone happy with those?

01:52:12:01 - 01:52:14:21

We've heard from Mrs. Smith online.

01:52:18:22 - 01:52:37:11

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. Um, I think there was a question earlier, um, regarding the bases, whether they Surrey, the mountain frames, whether they were going to be poles or concrete base. Thank you.

01:52:43:14 - 01:52:45:15

In relation to the the action points.

01:52:49:27 - 01:52:54:23

Yes. Thought so. Unless they are going to be provided a later date.

01:52:56:24 - 01:52:57:09

Thank you.

01:52:57:25 - 01:52:58:15

Thank you.

01:53:03:07 - 01:53:03:22

Okay.

01:53:06:20 - 01:53:08:00

Mr. Fox, Are you happy with that one?

01:53:09:10 - 01:53:09:25

Yes, sir.

01:53:11:10 - 01:53:13:27

That escaped me when I was doing my list. So apologies for that.

01:53:16:09 - 01:53:20:23

Well, it wasn't on my list either, but I'm happy to be providing any that clarification.

01:53:20:25 - 01:53:28:19

We'll add it to the list. Yeah. I think that's. That's fair. Thank you. Right. Okay. See, that's the action points.

01:53:29:20 - 01:53:36:08

Thank you. Then to conclude. Just a reminder that further hearings continue this week.

01:53:42:04 - 01:54:02:27

That comprises the remainder of issue specific hearing to which is Thursday morning issue specific three on the draft developed consent order and Thursday afternoon and the session on the compulsory acquisition on Friday. The time is now. 534 on this hearing is adjourned. Thank you.